



# **Non-Violence** **in the light of Mahaveer**

**Dr. HUKAMCHAND BHARILL**

*Bhagwan Mahaveer 2600th Birth Anniversary*

# **NON-VIOLENCE : IN THE LIGHT OF MAHAVEER**

(A Lecture)

**(English Version of the Hindi Book)**

*By :*

**DR. HUKAMCHAND BHARILL**

*Shastri, Nyaytirtha, Sahitya Ratna, M.A., Ph.D.*

*Shri Todarmal Smarak Bhawan*

*A-4, Bapu Nagar, JAIPUR-302 015 (India)*

*Editor :*

**PANDIT RATANCHAND BHARILL**

*Shastri, Nyaytirtha, Sahitya Ratna, M.A., B.Ed.*

*Principal, Shri Todarmal D. Jain Siddhanta*

*Mahavidyalaya*

*A-4, Bapu Nagar, JAIPUR*

*Translated by :*

**MANOHARLAL JAIN**

*M.A. (English, Hindi), LL.B., B.T., Retd. R.E.S.*

*Agra Gate, Ajmer*

*Published by :*

**PANDIT TODARMAL SMARAK TRUST**

*A-4, Bapu Nagar, JAIPUR - 302 015*

## ENGLISH

First Three Edition : 10,400  
(1986 to अद्यतन)

Fourth Edition : 1,000  
(13 April 2014,  
Mahaveer Jayanti)

## HINDI

Twenty Edition : 1,30,200  
(July 1985 to  
18 November 2011)

## MARATHI

First Edition : 5,200  
(1987)

## GUJARATI

Two Edition : 8,200  
(1993 to 2 Oct., 2001)

**Grand Total : 1,55,000**

Price : Rs. 8/-

Printed at :

**Shree Printers**  
Malviya Nagar, Jaipur

## **BY THE PUBLISHER**

( Fourth Edition )

There has been miraculous development of science during the 21<sup>th</sup> century. Whereas on onehand it has given countless luxuries to the people; on the other hand, the world is standing on the verge of destruction and terrified due to Nuclear weapons and similar other destructive arms.

The preachings of Bhagwan Mahaveer are more relevant & badly needed in the so-called modern world today, by which alone we can live peacefully and happily.

During 2500th Celebration of Bhagwan Mahaveer's attainment of the supreme bliss (1974-75 A.D.), the author, Dr. Bharill delivered his well-organised lectures on the subject of non-violence which were immensely liked all over the country and he had to speak on it years together at each and every place wherever he went or happened to go and this process is still in vogue. Besides, thousands of cassettes and video cassettes of this lecture have been prepared.

I do not wish to add anything more on this lecture. Please read it thoroughly and enjoy it. I request you to listen this lecture from Dr. Bharill himself. It is a different joy to hear him in his wonderful style.

Naturally, there was great demand for the publication of this lecture and so it was published in the form of a booklet in Hindi 'अहिंसा : महावीर की दृष्टि में' - (Non-violence in the light of Mahaveer) and subsequently in English and Marathi as mentioned on second page of this booklet.

Since there is tremendous demand of the English booklet, this fourth edition has been brought out.

Dr. Bharill is not only a popular orator and skilled teacher, but also an experienced writer, a deft story-writer, successful editor and a spiritual poet. In all fields of the community and literature, his away is far and wide. It is only due to his detachment, wonderful administrative capacity that Jaipur has become a great spiritual centre today.

We have published more than 45 lacs copies of 82 of his writings in eight languages. 18 books among them have been published in English.

It is a worthwhile contribution of Pandit Todarmal Smarak Trust in the spread and circulation of the spiritual revolution in the present era.

After the establishment of this Trust, the Trust has initiated a number of schemes to propagate Jain Philosophy and through the medium of these, the message of Lord Mahaveer is being spread throughout the country and abroad. There are 21 departments working under the ceiling of Todarmal Smarak Bhawan, under the able guidance of Dr. Bharill.

We are highly obliged to shri Manoharlal jain for English translation of this lecture and to Shri Akhil Bansal for management of this publication.

I take leave of the readers only with the wish that the whole world may go through this lecture, Understand the correct nature of non-violence and gain the supreme bliss.

**Jaipur**  
1 April 2014

**Yashpal Jain**  
Publisher,  
Pandit Todarmal Smarak Trust

## NON-VIOLENCE : IN THE LIGHT OF MAHAVEER

( मंगलाचरण )

जो राग-द्वेष विकार वर्जित लीन आतम ध्यान में ।  
जिनके विराट् विशाल निर्मल अचल केवलज्ञान में ॥  
युगपद् विशद् सकलार्थ झलकें ध्वनित हों व्याख्यान में ।  
वे वर्द्धमान महान जिन विचरें हमारे ध्यान में ॥

(Benediction)

Who is bereft of attachments and aversions and is deeply engrossed  
in the self;

In whose omniscience which is great and all pervading,

All the substances are reflected at one and the same time and  
described in his holy sermon;

Let that great Vardhman Jin be constantly present in the state of  
my meditation.

In this benediction Lord Mahaveer - Vardhman has been  
requested to be constantly present in the state of meditation  
of the devotee.

Why ?

Because according to Jain tenets a being who attains  
complete bliss, i.e. Siddhahood, does not return to this  
world. Therefore, the poet does not want to see his prayer  
fructified by praying to the Lord that he will have to come  
back once and awaken this land of ours.

The substances that are gone do not return to us, like  
our childhood that will never come back; however, they can  
reappear in our meditation, in our consciousness.

If you do not have faith in me, close your eyes for a  
minute and think of the time when you were studying in the

sixth class. On the occasion of Holi, once you filled a balloon with water and place it below the cushion in the chair of your teacher.

When the teacher came and sat in the chair, the balloon gave way and water was released as if from a fountain. This was followed by a fountain of laughter in the class. When detected you were punished for the mischief. However, when you remember the incident, memories of childhood become afresh.

Some such incident must have happened in your childhood. The sweet childhood that has gone by cannot come back. However, it does return in the moments of our meditation and consciousness. Similarly Lord Mahaveer who attained complete liberation cannot come back in the mundane world. However, he can come to us in our meditation, in our consciousness.

Therefore, it has been prayed -

"Let that great Vardhman Jin be constantly present in the state of our meditation."

But why? The times in which we live are so callous that death does not have any meaning. Thousands of people will go their way seeing a man dying or dead by the side of a road. Nobody feels the need to inform the member of his family if he is dead, or to send him to a hospital, if he is not yet dead and thereby save his life. All pass by as if nothing has happened.

People today have become so indifferent that the news of death does not move their hearts. Everyday people read newspaper while taking tea. They go on taking tea and reading news like the one that Bihar has terrible floods in which a lac of people have been eliminated and some ten lacs have been rendered homeless.

Their hands do not shiver, the cup of tea does not fall down and break, when reading such terrible news. They go on enjoying their cup of tea and telling their neighbours that Bihar is in the clutches of terrible floods with one lac human

beings killed and ten lacs becoming homeless. They relate such events as if talking about the feats of a circus in the city. There is absolutely no sign of grief on their faces.

The substance is that a modern man has lost the sensitiveness about the death which was there at a time. There were times when if a cow died in a locality the residents of that locality did not even take water till the corpse was removed. The conditions now are that even on the funeral ground cups of tea are freely enjoyed.

Today when people go in a funeral procession, it is difficult to find whether they are ready for a marriage procession or a funeral one. The same talks, the humorous anecdotes, the same political discussion; if the season is of cricket, many will have transistors with them and they will be talking about the scores of the game.

What has happened to the world of today? Other events apart, a modern man does not remember even his parents after three days of their demise. On the third day, the farmer goes to his fields, for he has before him the sowing season; the shopkeeper opens his shop due to the season of sales; public servants join their duties saying that they have no casual leave in balance.

When the offsprings for whom the parents commit sins and collect property, carry away the burden of sins with them in aftertimes and leave their earnings to them, do not remember them for more than three days, what to say of others?

In such callous times what is the sense in remembering one who left this earthly abode 2510 years ago, and even after so many years in praying that :

"Let that great Vardhman Jin be constantly present in the state of our meditation."

What did after all Mahaveer Bhagwan give us so that even after 2510 years, we remember him and sing his praises?



From the worldly point of view he did not give us anything. In fact he did not have anything which he could give us. He was a naked Digamber saint, he did not have even a scarf with him. We, however, do not remember those who gave us the treasures of this world. For how many days do we remember our parents who leave all their belongings to us, after demise ?

But we do remember Mahaveer, lacs of people wish for His presence in their thoughts, on occasions of their deep contemplation. What, afterall, did he gave us ? This selfish world does not remember anybody without any purpose.

He gave us such lofty principles, he showed us such a path by heading which we can attain happiness and peace even today.

Some people say that the path shown by Mahaveer twentyfive hundred years ago, might have been useful in that age, but the world has now undergone change. Those were the days of bullock-carts and now we are living in an age of rockets. Principles enunciated twenty-five hundred years ago are of no avail today. As such they now call Mahaveer out-of-date today.

I want to tell such people that Mahaveer has not become out-of-date, he is up-to-date even today. Those who put on such clothes or get their hair dressed in such a fashion that it may become difficult to determine whether one is a boy or a girl and who considers himself up-to-date may not understand my contention. It should, however, be remembered that people become up-to-date on account of their thinking and not on account of the clothes they put on.

One who becomes up-to-date with his dress, will have to become out-of-date one day or the other, for dress does not remain the same, it changes with times. My father used to put on a pagree (head -dress). When he used to sit before a looking-glass to bind his pagree, it took him not less than an hour, likewise, when he used to go out in the market with his pagree on, he did not consider himself less up-to-date

than anybody else. We left the pagree and accepted the cap and began to consider ourselves up-to-date with the cap, on our heads. Our children have thrown away the cap and have become up-to-date making us all out-of-date.

Whosoever becomes up-to-date with a particular kind of dress, will have to become out-of-date one day or the other. If none others, his own children will declare him out-of-date.

When people used to put on pagrees, people used to throw them to winds, later on caps were so thrown. Today people do not put on any of these. As such their hair have begun to disappear. You must have seen many bald males, but not even one single bald female. Do you know why males alone are bald, not females ?

Ladies have at least a bit of their sarees on their heads to fly; but males do not have anything that may fly; as such their hair begin to disappear. They have the hair at present, but when the hair will not be there, what shall disappear ? A such wisdom lies in having something on our heads to fly away or disappear.

Whatever it is, this matter cropped up by the way. We were talking that a man is not up-to-date with his dress, but with his thinking.

Even if we regard people up-to-date having dress, Mahaveer cannot be out-of-date, because he was without dress.

I put on dhoti-kurta and you put on suits. This difference, however, is of dress only. Underneath dress, bodies are alike.

People can say that differences in bodies are apparent. Some are white, others black; some fat, others thin; some tall, while others are dwarfs.

Yes, there are differences in bodies; but our soul – the God inside – are all alike. The differences are only outwards. If we go into the depths of our soul, we shall come across a great similarity.

So the original contention is that none is great on account of dress alone; greatness goes with the thoughts. The teachings of non-violence of Mahaveer Bhagwan enunciated before 2500 years are more essential today than in the days of Mahaveer himself, because violence has assumed terrible shapes today.

It is said that in days gone-by people used to fight with lathies and stones. Such fighters when wounded were sent to hospitals, not to burning grounds. Then came the age of swords, which could kill people only at a distance of about four feet. The sword is of no avail if the target is at a distance of ten or twenty meters. Then we made progress and invented bullets whose killing capacity was only a hundred or two hundred meters. However, today we have manufactured such bullets that China can be wiped out with one and India with another. Killing-potential has also been so much developed that America may press a button and exterminate China and another to blow off India.

And do you know whose responsibility it is to press these buttons ? They are persons who drink at least three bottles a day. When we, who take hot water only, become so much confused that sometimes when we want to light a bulb, our fan begins to move, for the wrong button is pressed; what to say of those who take three bottles a day ? If they take a decision to wash off China from the surface of this earth and if by mistake the button of India is pressed, what will happen ? All of us will be killed in vain.

It is said the U.S.A. has manufactured so many destructive weapons that she can destroy the whole world as many as forty times, if she so desires; U.S.S.R. has also reached a stage wherein she can finish this world at least twenty-five times. China has also reached the capacity of annihilating this world five times. Call it misfortune or adversity, today India is also in a position to perform the above feat once at least. However, there is no need for any anxiety, for such an eventuality will never arise that this world should be finished seventy-one times, for once

annihilated there will be nothing left to be destroyed for the second time.

Once a philosopher was asked how the Third World War will be fought. He replied that he could not speak about the third, but the fourth one would be fought with sticks and stones: His contention was that if there is a Third World War it would be so terribly destructive that the whole world would be annihilated and we shall reach that pre-historical age, when people used to fight with staffs and stones. So, it is a great sin to think of the Third World War; it would be an attempt at universal suicide.

We are sitting on a pile of gunpowder, just a spark of fire from anywhere may destroy the whole world in a moment. Violence today has become so deadly that the non-violence of Mahaveer is more relevant today than in his own days. It is on account of this that I say that Mahaveer has not become out-of-date, he is absolutely up-to-date.

The battle of Ramayana lasted for six months, but the number of dead was in thousands only, not in lacs. The battle of Mahabharata was fought for eighteen days only; the number of killed therein was lacs only, not crores; but the real war of today, even if it lasts for eighteen seconds, the number of dead will not be thousands, lacs or crores, it will be in countless numbers.

In ancient days soldiers fought and only they died; wars of today, however, are not limited to soldiers or to battlefields. They have enveloped the whole world in their scope. Soldiers alone do not die in the modern wars; farmers, workers and businessmen also die; agricultural farms, factories and machines, markets and shops are all blown off. What to say of others, we who talk of non-violence today and our saints would also not be spared in modern warfare, temples and mosques all would be razed to the ground. Modern wars are all destructive. The more deadly violence has become today, the more the need for non-violence of Mahaveer. How far is it correct to call Mahaveer out-of-date and otiose in such circumstances, is a matter for deep thinking.

Modern wars have become very detached, without attachments or aversions. In previous wars killers killed whom they aimed to kill and the dying knew who were killing them; today, the dying do not know who are the killers and the killers as well do not know whom they are killing.

Ram throws a bomb from above and his brother Laxman dies and the temple is eradicated. Rahim throws a bomb from above and his own brother Karim is hit and the mosque is blown off. Harminder Singh throws a bomb from above and his brother Gurminder Singh is killed and the gurudwara is finished.

When somebody throws a bomb over some other man, we do not say that Ram threw a bomb over Rahim, we say that America threw bombs over Japan. This fight with bombs has become an engagement between nations, and not between men. Wars between nations are more deadly, because they mean collective destruction.

Originally fights were between people, then they were fought between families. After that races began to fight and now countries.

The battle of Ramayan was between two persons – Ram and Rawan. It is known like that. Then we come to the age of Mahabharata. Then families started fighting. The battle of Mahabharata was fought between the Pandwas and the Kaurawas, which were two families and not individuals.

Let us proceed further. The riots in 1947 were not between Ram and Rahim, they were between the Hindus and the Muslims, which are two communities. The wars in 1965 and 1971 were not fought between Ayub Khan and Lal Bahadur Shastri or between Smt. Indira Gandhi and Yahia Khan they were fought between India and Pakistan.

When individuals fight, individuals are killed; when families fight, families are defaced and when nations fight, nations are annihilated.

A nation does not mean only human beings. There are animals and birds, farms and fields, machines and factories, and temples and mosques in a nation. When a nation is destroyed, all these are destroyed. When a bomb falls somewhere, along with human beings, animals and birds, germs and insects also perish, trees and plants also wither away; it is said wherever a bomb is dropped, the land there is so changed that not even a blade of grass grows there for a thousand years.

Violence today has been nationalised; it no more remains individual.

Non-violence of Mahaveer alone can check this dreadly deluge. Therefore, I say that non-violence of Mahaveer is needed today more than in the days of Mahaveer himself. It can, therefore, be said that Bhagwan Mahaveer is up-to-date even today.

This, however, relates to the usefulness of the non-violence of Mahaveer in the context of today. The prime question, however, is what the real nature of non-violence in the light of Mahaveer is ?

It has been a fashion of today to define non-violence as non-killing others; that alone, is regarded as non-violence. But nobody gives a clear picture of violence also. If we have to leave violence and accept non-violence as a way of life, we shall have to go deep into the nature of violence and non-violence. Acceptance and renunciation without real understanding have no meaning; it is, in fact, not possible to accept or remember something without correct understanding. It is, therefore, very necessary to understand violence and non-violence from all aspects before renouncing violence and accepting non-violence as our way of life.

Once some disciples reached Maharishi Vyas and requested him to teach them such beneficial things in brief, telling them what he had written in eighteen religious texts in Sanskrit which they did not understand and for reading those long treatises they had no time. Maharishi Vyas replied,

"those eighteen religious treatises were for people like ourselves. You need to know this much only :

अष्टादशपुराणेषु व्यासस्य वचनद्वयं ।  
परोपकारः पुण्याय पापाय परपीडनम् ॥

If you do good to others you will draw merit and if you harass others, you will attract demerit. Know this, accept this and make it a part and parcel of your life – your life will have some meaning."

Imagine likewise that the followers of Mahaveer also approached him and requested him to explain them the gist of Jain philosophy in two lines for they had not time to read big volumes of Samayasara and Gommatasara in Prakrit and Sanskrit. Mahaveer says

“अप्रादुर्भावः खलु रागादीनां भवत्यहिंसेति ।  
तेषामेवोत्पत्तिर्हिंसेति जिनागमस्य संक्षेपः ॥

"Origination of attachments and aversions in our souls is violence and their non-origination is non-violence — that is the essence of Jain philosophy."

By saying that the origination of attachments and other feelings in the soul is violence, mental violence has been emphasized, material violence has not been referred to. As such the natural question is if Mahaveer does not recognise material violence. If he accepts its existence, why does he not declare that massacres in this world are violence and their absence is non-violence ? This is the easy and true definition of violence and non-violence which every-one can comprehend. Why has it been made difficult in understanding by confusion of words ?

It is not like that. Mahaveer accepts material violence also. We shall have to understand his thoughts from depths. You well know that violence is committed by mind, word and body.

The government checks physical violence. If somebody kills another, the police will arrest and produce him in the

court which would sentence him to death. If not death, he would be sentenced for life. If one only attacks somebody, the police will catch hold of him and the court will punish him with imprisonment for two or four years, but if one kills others by words of mouth, threatens him with death, calls him bad names, or abuses him, the government cannot do anything ordinarily.

Once I went to a police station and complained the police inspector present that a particular man had threatened me with death and that my life was in danger. He retorted, "What can I do in this matter?" I said, "What do you say? — you make arrangements, give me police protection."

He replied smilingly, "If each one of the ordinary people are given two policemen, we shall need one billion and two hundred millions policemen. Where shall we get so many policemen?"

I said to him, "Whatever you say is correct, but what shall I do? My life is in danger."

He began asking me seriously to register a report in the police station.

I asked him what its effect will be?

Smoking a cigarette, he replied with confidence, "You need not worry, when you are murdered, the murderers will be arrested as early as possible."

I was terrified and asked him if something could be done before I was actually murdered.

In his helplessness, he said, "Please tell me if there is any law under which I may arrest somebody without his committing any crime and send him to jail. At the most we can demand bail or bond. Nothing more can be done. We cannot arrest them or put them in jail or give you police protection."

I thought over the position deeply and reached the conclusion that the law is alright in its place, for we have



become murderers in words, that we kill ten to twenty people everyday, even if we have not actually murdered a simple creature in the whole of life. We murder people in workds on all pretexts. Sitting in a train or in a bus, we ask our neighbour to give us some more space to sit. The man becomes tight. We also cry aloud, "Have you alone purchased a ticket ? Am I without a ticket ? Get away otherwise you will be wiped away."

On every such occasion we think and utter such threats of exterminating others. If the police start taking action on all cases of violence in word, who will remain outside the jail ? We have, however, not to worry for jails have no place for murderers in words only.

Look at these mothers and sisters. They are very religious. When they get up in the morning they take bath themselves, bathe their cows, clean their buckets and will take milk from those only. Think, how religious they are.

Imagine, that the month is December, it is better cold; a mother is cooking food in the kitchen and the two years old child is weeping outside the kitchen, he wants to go to his mother, but the mother says :

"If you want to come to me in the kitchen, change your clothes, otherwise the kitchen will become impure."

There is possibility of pneumonia if the child puts off his clothes; and if he does not change them, it is not possible to reach his mother. What shall the poor child do ? At least it so happens that he transgresses the bundaries of the kitchen again and again, as Pakistan does in Kashmir.

And again just the Government of India sends its letters of resentment again and again, that religious minded mother threatens her own child with burning him in the fire if he enters the kitchen without changing clothes. She takes out the burning logs, shows them to the child and threatens again and again to kill the child, if he enters the kitchen without changing clothes.

Now I put you a question. If that boy reports to the police that his mother has been threatening to kill him, should the police arrest that mother ? I think you will not like that it should happen like that.

Leave aside the question of the mother burning her child; even if she sees his finger burning in a dream, she may become senseless. When that mother can be so heartless in words, what to say of others ? And so the law which does not take note of such violence in words, is correct in its place. But the government may not be able to check this violence; it, however, has to be checked.

Yes, it must be checked. While the government checks the violence of the body, the community checks the violence of the words.

How ?

Those who employ their voice usefully, the community honours them, and those who misuse it, the community condemns them; it may, however, not do so due to its goodness but it does not at least respect them.

All of your – so many big people are sitting on the ground and you have seated me on this high seat (Gaddi). Why did you do so ? Only for the reason that I have been explaining you the teachings of Lord Mahaveer.

If I begin to shower abuses on you just now over this speaker, what will happen ? Will you invite me again with respect to address you ?

No, never. See, what your president is saying. He says that extending invitation again is a question of the future. Consider what will happen just at the moment.

Whosoever makes the best use of his words is respected by the community and whosoever misuses these is slighted or insulted.

Thus, with a fear of being insulted and greed of the honour that the community may bestow, we keep restraint

over our language. If I begin to abuse you all in my mind, what can the community or the government do ?

It is for this that Mahaveer declared that religion starts where the government has no entry and the community does not work. He has thus proclaimed correctly that the germination of attachment and other passions in our soul is violence and their non-germination, non-violence. That is the essence of Jain philosophy.

It is thus clear why Mahaveer has introduced the word 'soul' while defining violence and non-violence. Please remember that for purposes of understanding, soul and mind have been treated as one.

Initially violence originates in the mind. If violence of anger etc., is not controlled by the mind, it expresses itself in language. If language is not enough, it expresses itself through the body. That is the sequence of the origination of violence.

At present the proceedings of this gathering are peaceful. If some people start hooligansim, what will happen ? Don't worry, there is no cause of anxiety. I am only giving an example to clarify my point.

Then please tell me if there is disturbance in this meeting, what would happen ?

Nothing would happen. As long as the anger of those who are responsible for the management of the meeting is in the limits of their minds only, nothing would happen. When the anger overflows their minds, my lecture will be stopped and the speaker would be handed over to the manager. He would ask those who want to hear peacefully to do so and those who do not want to hear, to go to their places and tell them that they need not create confusion in the meeting.

If this does not work, and if the disorder increases, he would become excited and ask the volunteers to drive them away.

Thus we see that violence in the shape of anger and other passions first rises in the mind, then in words and finally in the body. Mahaveer thought it better to deal with the mother of the thief rather than with the thief himself, so that there may be no thief at all. If violence does not rise in the mind, there is no question of its expression in language or physique.

Thus Mahaveer deemed it useful to attack violence at its roots. It is for this that he says that the origination of attachments etc., in our souls is violence, while the absence thereof is non-violence.

Violence, when it rises in the mind, will certainly express itself somewhere or the other.

There was a teacher. If there are teachers here, please do not become angry. That way I am also a teacher. There is no cause of worry. The teacher referred to asked his wife to prepare meals a little earlier for he had to go to school that day.

His wife told him that meals could not be prepared so soon since she would be going to hear the religious discourse of a lean and thin Pandit, who had come from Jaipur.

The teacher became angry and told her emphatically that meals should be prepared soon.

The poor wife of the teacher was terrified; she listened to half of the discourse and cooked food in a hurry. But before the food was ready, the teacher was out of temper and he left for school without taking meals.

Imagine how angry the poor wife would have become. She had to leave the discourse and her husband went to school without taking meals. The teacher was already away in the school. However, the children were at home. She began to beat them.

The teacher was no less angry for he was hungry, but his spouse or children were not there in school. There were other children, he began beating them.

If for once violence rises in the soul or the mind, it would express itself somewhere or the other definitely. Therefore, Mahaveer said that violence should not originate in the minds and souls of men. With this in view, he defined violence as emergence of attachments and other passions in the soul and non-violence as non-emergence of passions like at attachments and aversions.

It was the 2500th year of complete liberation from worldly shackles of Mahaveer. The year was being celebrated throughout the country in all earnestness. We were also moving about and delivering the message of Mahaveer to all the countrymen with a thousand pilgrims and the wheel of religion (Dharam Chakra). After completing our pilgrimage of the religious places in three months, we reached Gujarat.

We were preaching the message of non-violence of Mahaveer in a public meeting, when the man in the chair spoke out :

"This is alright, but tell us how to check violence." I said, "I am going to tell you that also. There is prohibition in Gujarat, and yet people drink. Now tell me how this prohibition can become successful."

I elaborated my point and said, "One measure is that if somebody roams about drunk in the market, the police should catch him, slap him and snatch whatever amount of money he has in his pocket. Will prohibition be successful thus ?

"No, never."

"Then what shall we do?"

"As long as hotels where illegal sale of wine goes on, are not raided, we cannot get success."

"Yes, this is alright; but the police may raid some of these hotels, may get some bottles of wine and enjoy it amongst themselves and may leave the culprit by accepting a few hundred rupees as bribe. Will then prohibition be successful?"

"No, nothing is going to happen thus."

"Then what shall we do?"

"As long as these factories which manufacture wine illegally are not destroyed, we cannot get success in the matter; for, if it is manufactured, it would come to the market; when it comes to the market, people will consume it. Finally, when they consume it, it would disturb their minds."

If we want that the minds of people should remain unattached, we shall have to see that they do not consume liquor and that it does not come to the market for sale. And if we want that it should not be sold, it should not be manufactured. This much we have to do.

Likewise, if we want that violence should not originate in our lives, we shall have to check it at the level of our souls, our minds; for, if it rises on these levels it shall definitely erupt at the level of language and body.

It is for this reason that Mahaveer goes to the death of the matter and declares that if we have to check violence, we have to check it at the level of our souls and minds. As long as our hearts are not clear and we do not have purity in our souls, it is very difficult to check the constant flow of violence.

This explains why the word 'soul' has been included in the definitions of violence and non-violence. Now the point is that Mahaveer calls the origination of attachments and other passions as violence.

The whole world treats love and attachment as non-violence, but Mahaveer terms them as violence. The matter is a bit complicated. You have to listen to its exposition very carefully.

It is on account of this particular characteristic of non-violence as propounded in Jain philosophy that it has been said that Jain non-violence begins where non-violence of other religions ends.

The whole world asks people to love our species and Mahaveer says this love – this attachment is violence. Is it not wonderful ? Only nodding of heads won't do. You have to understand things in their depths. You cannot disagree with the exposition and become indifferent to it. As well nothing is going to happen by accepting it without complete understanding. We have to understand the principle enunciated with patience.

Doctors are of two kinds, doctors of pen and doctors of ointment. Research scholars Ph.D. etc., are doctors of pen and those who perform operations are the doctors of ointment.

When a surgeon perform an operation, there are the patient, the doctor and two or three nurses. The patient is senseless but the doctor is in his full senses. If the patient dies at the time of the operation, the responsibility thereof lies with the doctor. When the doctor of pen operates, the doctor is alone, while the patients may be one or two hundred, may be tens of thousands. The doctor and the patients both are in their full senses. If some harm done, both the doctor and the patients are equally responsible.

While a doctor is busy performing an operation and the patient is not deeply out of senses according to the need of the operation and recovers his senses earlier, what will happen ? Have you ever thought of it ?

If the patient is afraid, he will try to run away from the operation table; if he is angry, he may drive the doctor away; whosoever, runs away; one who is going to face death is the patient, not the doctor. As such the best thing for the patient is to lie down silently as long as his wounds have not been stitched, dried up and stitches opened by the doctor.

By declaring that the origination of attachments and other passions is violence, I have opened everybody's stomach. Some can have distaste, some can become angry, while others can leave the meeting and go-away. Some who are powerful can stop me from speaking but remember you

may run away yourselves or you may drive me away from the meeting ground, the harm will be certainly yours, not mine.

Therefore, the best thing is that you should all sit and listen to me peacefully, till I explain the principles and they have been clearly understood by you all.

So the fact of the matter is that Mahaveer calls love and all sorts of attachments violence. That which you call love and peaceful living, are all conducive to restlessness; are all at the roots of violence.

You all understand that the most of the material violence takes place in battles and battles are fought due to three reasons - wealth, woman and land.

The battle of Ramayan was fought due to a woman; Rawan kidnapped the wife of Ram and so the battle was fought. Similarly the battle of Mahabharata was fought on account of land. The Pandawas said to the Kauravas; "We shall somehow pass our days if you only give us five villages." The Kauravas replied, "You cannot get even a small piece of land equal to the point of a needle without defeating us in a battle." This was how Mahabharata began.

We need not find examples of battles due to wealth in History and Purans, particularly in this meeting of businessmen who are known for their greed of money. This story does not relate to you alone. The whole world has become business-minded today, Profession like medicine has become a trade. So many shops have been opened in the name of religion.

All the wars today are fought for business. A country attacks another just to establish its trade and commerce in the country invaded. The big nations stimulate small ones to fight in order to sell their weapons.

Thus all the wars in this world are fought for wealth, woman and land.

Now I ask you one question. Are all the battles for wealth, woman and land due to attachment or aversion.



It is as clear as daylight that they are fought on account of attachments and not aversions. Considered from the Ramayan point of view, Ramchandraji had great love for Sita, but Rawan also did not have any aversion for her. If there was any aversion, he would not have kidnapped her and taken her to his kingdom. He would also not have given her so many facilities, would not have prayed her to accept him and would not have given her temptation of making her the chief queen, offering her more respect than that bestowed upon even Mandodari.

All this shows his attachment, not aversion. Such tendencies can be results of attachment only, not of aversion.

It is, however, true that this love of Rawan being for a woman other than his own, is purely sexual and absolutely unjust, but after all it is love. It is, therefore, easily established that the battle of Ramayan was fought on account of the love for a woman.

Likewise, the Kauravas had attachment for the land, but the Pandvas also had love for the same land, otherwise they would not have demanded even the five villages.

You can argue that if they had not demanded even five villages where would they have lived. I say villages are not needed for residence. I have not got even an inch of land and I am living with great ease. Why did they need villages? During the period of exile they lived without villages. What was the need of villages then without which they became ready to fight a battle?

The truth is that they had his much attachment. Let aside becoming a sovereign of the land, they wanted to become landlords of five villages only. Thus the battle of Mahabharata was also fought on account of love for the land. The battles fought for wealth, are also due to love for it, not because of aversion.

It is thus easily proved that attachment lies at the root of most of the violence in wars. It is for this that Mahaveer has called the origination of attachments and other passions violence and declared that their non-emergence is non-violence.

Attachment lies at the root of violence not only in wars but also at the root of all violence in enjoying the pleasures of five senses in this world. Even non-vegetarians take the meat of those animals, whom they like. In palatable dishes, we find attachment and not aversions of those who enjoy them. When persons take those articles which have been regarded as uneatables, we discern attachment at the roots.

People allege in vain that the cat has natural enmity for the rat. How is that possible ? Does anybody have enmity for one's dear eatables ? The cat eats the rat with great interest. Do you have aversion for pure and simple diet that you eat and enjoy ? Just as you take the eatables that are pure and simple and those you like most with great love and eagerness, in the same way all creatures enjoy their food with attachment towards it. Attachment, thus, is at the root of violence connected with out food and drink.

The pleasures of five senses are enjoyed due to attachment only. The same attachment lies at the root of our using toilets which entail most inhuman violence. Persons not conversant with facts, use leather articles prepared with leather of living animals for their love towards them, which is the cause of their attraction towards them.

What more today ? All the five sins are basically committed due to feelings of attachment. It is on account of greed that people tell lies, steal and accumulate wealth.

People deceive others by telling lies for love of wealth. The thief breaks open the safe of the rich man (Seth) for money that has been kept inside. If the thief had any aversion towards the Seth, he would not open the safe of the Seth but his skull. All possessions are accumulated due to attachment towards these objects.

Those who indulge in attachments alone and not in aversions threaten the chastity of our mothers and sisters; turn over the pages of history and you will find that those who attacked the chastity of ladies were all infatuated with love. We read everyday in the papers that some college students teased a beautiful, lovely, laughing and smiling and gaudily dressed butterfly in the market; we have never read that a black, dirty looking, whitehaired girl was ever made the target of their sinful advances. We tease those only, whose very sight inspires attachment.

Thus the root cause of all the five sins is the feeling of attachment. So says Pandit Daulatramji in his Chhahdhala :

यह राग आग दहै सद, तारैं समामृत सेइये ।

चिर भजे विषय कषाय, अब तो त्याग निद पद बेइये ॥

Attachments, aversions etc., are such a fire that is never extinguished. Just as fire burns in the winter, the summer, in the day, in the night; in fact burns always, same way these feelings of attachments and aversions always impart unhappiness.

This fire may be of Neem or of Sandalwood; it does the work of burning only. It is not as if Neem alone burns and Sandalwood causes cold. Sandalwood may be cool and cold giving, but its fire will always burn. Fire is fire irrespective of whether it is Neem or Sandalwood.

Likewise attachment whether it is towards our own people or towards others, whether it is towards good people or bad, it is violence – an evil. It is not so that attachment towards our own people is good and that towards others is bad. Attachment towards good people is also bad since it is violence.

Let us understand this clearly. This wonderful principle of Mahaveer is a great invention of Jain philosophy. As long as we do not understand it with the depth it deserves, we cannot understand the non-violence of Mahaveer.

By terming the origination of attachment etc., as violence, Lord Mahaveer has opened wonderful vistas of fundamentals. If we keep aside our own accepted conceptions of the nature of things and try to understand this great truth with a pure heart, we can definitely comprehend this wonderful truth of philosophy, we can achieve it, accept it, and live it in our lives.

If we can do this, we can without any doubt, surely and easily attain happiness and peace.

Violence due to aversions etc., also originates due to attachments only.

Let us ponder over this deeply. How did aversion that caused material violence, arise ? The aversion for the man whom we loved originated only on account of his ungentle behaviour or due to his being an obstruction in the possession of a particular thing that we liked most.

If somebody defames our teacher, who has been a benefactor or somebody who misbehaves with our parents, who have offered their all to us, we naturally develop a feeling of aversion for that man. If we treat that man violently, that violence will be due to aversion. Considered deeply, it would be clear that behind this violent attitude is the esteem and love that we have for our teacher or parents. So, such violence due to aversion is also, in fact, due to attachment.

The word, 'attachment' is very pervasive. It includes all perverted feelings. The whole of delusion including wrong faith, which also includes aversion is called attachment. However, here by adding, 'and others', aversions etc., have been referred to separately.

Some may argue that there would have been no controversy, if instead of 'attachment etc.' the word 'aversion etc.' were used, for everybody understands that aversion causes violence. In that case attachment would have been covered by 'etc.' Thus we would have elaborated our point and that would not have disturbed the minds of the people of this world.

But, if the word 'attachment' was not used so specifically, those who treat attachment as religion, would never have accepted it as violence and the position would not have been clearly stated. It is for this that 'attachment' has been clearly specified here and aversions etc., have been included in 'etc.' Dull and hard-hearted disciples do not understand the language of signs. They require things to be explained very definitely and clearly.

In spite of so much care, there are people who hold that 'attachment' means impure or excessive attachments only, not pure and weak attachments.

It has, however, to be considered that Mahaveer must have in his mind the most pervasive meaning of attachment, when he used it in the definition of violence. Did he not know that attachment is pure and impure, or weak and strong ?

Some again argue that the feeling of attachments towards the pleasures of five senses and passions is violence; but how can religious attachment be called violence ?

Attachment, however, is attachment. It does not make any difference what the object of attachment is. Do you not know that the religious attachment (fanaticism) which you want to keep outside the limits of violence, has caused so much bloodshed in the world, in fact rivers of blood have flown on that count.

If you turn the pages of history, you will know that lacs of Jews were put to death in the name of religion. Even before our eyes Hindu-Muslim and Shia-Sunni riots are results of religious attachments. Even behind the confrontations between the Digambers and the Shwetambers, the same love of religion plays its part. Is there any limit to foolhardiness ? We want to save the religion of non-violence by staking our lives. We cannot present non-violence, by staking our lives, it breeds violence only. We are forgetting this solid truth today.

Attachment towards religion is not any kind of religion, it is only a kind of attachment. As such it is attachment, not religion. Religion lies in detachment only.

Wonderful things have happened. Even the followers of complete detachment today have begun to treat attachment as religion. It is as if water has caught fire.

Mahaveer himself was a completely detached Saint. How could he call 'attachment' religion. When one becomes a detached soul, he leaves all attachments, breaks the shackles of attachment towards everybody. One cannot become a completely detached person with attachment towards anybody or anything whatsoever.

The natural conclusion, therefore, is that if religion lies in detachment, then attachment naturally should be irreligion.

It is strange that we do not try to understand such a simple thing. This truth cannot be understood without abandoning our preconceived notions.

There are three categories of sons. We can understand it in the following manner :

Four of you came to my place. When properly seated, I called my son Parmatma Prakash and asked him to bring a glass of water, as per my habit. The son, however, understands that there are five persons including the four guests. He brings five glasses and also a jug full of water, for he understands that the season being hot, some of the guests can have two glasses also. It is not a question of milk or tea which one may hesitate to demand.

The second son brings only one glass of water. When questioned, he replies that he was asked to bring one glass only. An obedient son, indeed ! How could he bring more than one glass ?

The third brings half a glass only for fear of overflowing.

We are all children of Mahaveer. Let us think of the category of sons we belong to – first, second or third.

Bhagwan proclaimed that attachment and other passions are violence. The first son understands that all kinds of attachments, pure or impure, mild or strong are violence. Along with aversions etc., are also violence.

The second type of son holds that he would accept only attachment as violence, because it has been clearly mentioned in the text.

If such a son is told that 'etc.' with attachment includes aversion also, he does not listen to it and argues why aversion alone should be treated as included in it and not right faith etc.

Third type is one who says that he has accepted impure attachment – strong attachment as violence, if the Lord has declared attachment to be violence. It is not necessary that we treat all attachments as violence. The text indicates 'attachment etc.', and not 'all attachments' to be treated as violence.

Now you have to decide which type of Mahaveer's son you are – first, second or third. I have nothing to say in this matter. I leave the decision to yourself.

Thus we see that Mahaveer in his exposition of violence and non-violence, has used the word attachment in its all embracing meaning; all types of attachments are included in it; it also includes aversions etc., since they are just the other side of the matter.

A question, here, is possible. Does violence happen only with the origin of feelings if attachment etc., irrespective of the fact whether a creature dies or not? Does the death of a creature have no relation with violence?

Yes please, the matter stands like that only; the world, however, says that until creatures are destroyed, and animate beings exterminated, how can we call it emergence of

violence ? This ignorant world connects death with violence; considered deeply, truth is otherwise.

If the death of living creatures is regarded as violence, we shall have to regard their birth as non-violence, for life and death are events opposed to one another like non-violence and violence. By regarding birth as non-violence and death as violence, the understanding that these days violence is spreading in this world disappears automatically, for the ratio of life and death is always equal; one who is born dies and one who dies, at once takes birth somewhere or the other.

To save oneself from this complication, if somebody regards life and not birth as opposed to death, the matter will become more complicated, for a person lives for a number of years, while death is a transitory stage.

Thus, by treating death as violence and life as non-violence, non-violence would occupy a stronger position, when people accept with one voice violence is spreading these days.

So neither birth is non-violence nor life; and so death is also not violence. Whosoever are born naturally die; then how can death be called violence ? In this world, death without violent feelings is not called violence.

Lacs of people die when there are heavy floods. It is only said that it was a terrible devastation, destruction, great loss of life and property, but it is not said that there was any violence in it. However, where police opens fire to quell some violent demonstration and even when a single person dies, it is said that there was havoc of violence. It is reported in press in bold letters; the man in the street demands that the murderous government should resign. But nobody calls the government murderous after devastation caused by floods.

The people of India know this fact very well and in their heart of hearts, the truth is deeply, ingrained, in their innermost being there is a strong faith in non-violence.



A very clear proof of this is that after the gas-leaking tragedy of Bhopal (M.P.), the Government obtained a majority of more than two-third, even after the demise of thousands of people; while in Rajasthan the Chief Minister had to resign after the death of one person only in police-firing.

The reaction of the people after the inhuman murder of Smt. Indira Gandhi was the same. The countrymen showed by their vote that they were totally against the heinous murder and violence. Consequently, Indira Congress got unique success. Everybody knows that such a great majority could not be had even if Smt. Indra Gandhi had herself fought the election.

In fact this was not a victory of India Congress of Shri Rajiv Gandhi; it was victory of non-violence over violence. The Indian people have clearly voted for non-violence as opposed to violence.

Considered from the natural depths, the Indian people are, even today, the worshippers of non-violence which is ingrained in their very existence just as oil in til-seed or butter in milk.

Natural calamities do arouse the feelings of sympathy and compassion in the minds of the Indian people; but that does not agitate their minds, does not excite them. However, when there id deliberate violence, the minds of the people become agitated and excited. This anger towards murders and massacres of the Indian people express their deep faith in non-violence.

To comprehend this deep understanding and strong faith of the Indian people in non-violence, we have to dive deep in their hearts. We shall have to study their behaviour pattern very critically; we cannot do by looking at the surface only.

Mahaveer is deeply ingrained in the innermost of the Indian people. His influence goes very deep in their lives.

Death can be adevastation; not murder, not violence. The law of the land also recognises this. If somebody fires a

gun with a view to kill somebody, but if fortunately the man fired at is not killed, the shooter is comprehended as a murderer. However, when a doctor performs an operation with an intention to save the patient's life, and even then if the patient dies on the operation-table, the doctor is not regarded or termed murderer.

If death is regarded as violence, the doctor would be a killer and the shooter with a view to kill will be non-violent if the target does not die, which is not proper and he cannot be regarded as non-violent. The conclusion is that the occurrence of death or otherwise has no connection with violence, while it is with the presence of feelings of violence.

Suppose I am speaking somewhere like this, and somebody hits me with a stone, which however goes off from near my ear with a whiz.

I said to that man, "What are you doing ? What would have happened if my head had broken?"

He became tight and said, "your head has not been broken. You could only complain if it was factually broken."

I explained to him, "Then I would not have said anything. I would have been taken to the hospital."

Man with perverse consciousness thinks that violence would have occurred only when the head was broken. I ask you if violence is in my head which when broken would bring it out ? Was violence to rise in my head or in his heart ? In fact violence rose in his heart, when he took up the stone for hitting me.

Violence rises in the heart of the violent - in his soul, not in the object of violence. We should understand this very clearly. Death due to murder is material violence but ordinary death is not even material violence. Attack on others with violence in the mind and soul, is called material violence. Death of any kind without mental violence does not get the name of material violence.

When somebody talks against violence and condemns it, mental violence alone lies in his mind, for in the world of non-violence, what is desirable is not the absence of death, but absence of killings and murders.

However, the present proposition is much ahead of that position. The desire to kill alone is not called violence, instead all types of attachments including a desire to save the life of somebody are termed as violence. For knowing more on this point, you are advised to read my essay on non-violence in "Tirthankar Mahaveer and his Sarvodaya Tirtha."

Desire to kill or save others is interference in their lives. How can interference in the life or death of others in this sovereign world be treated as non-violence ? Like the condition of no war between two countries, non-interference in others' affairs is also completely included in the feeling of non-violence. If an attack on others is violence, so is interference in their affairs; it is an attack on his sovereign powers.

According to Mahaveer, every soul is a sovereign matter; it is completely responsible for its own good or bad. Any kind of interference therein is not acceptable to the godly scheme of things. Acceptance of this supreme truth is the worship of Bhagwati non-violence. Bhagwati non-violence is the supreme achievement of the life work of Mahaveer; it is the cream of his holy divine voice, it is a remedy of getting rid of the circle of births and deaths, it is, in fact, the divine nectar.

Gentlemen, if you want to be happy, drink deep of this divine nectar, consume this great medicine. When I inspire you to drink this very holy water, some people begin to say, "Whatever you say is very good, but what can be done by our becoming non-violent ? One single grain of gram cannot break the oven. So explain non-violence to the whole world, let them accept it as a way of life, we shall then accept it ourselves."

We have to tell them this, "Non-violence is nectar, whoever takes that cup, will become immortal, happy and calm."

If an individual accepts this holy non-violence, he would be happy; if a family accepts it, the family would be happy; if the community accepts it, the community would be happy and if the country accepts it, the whole country would be happy.

Therefore, rather than push things to others according to the saying "charity begins at home", we should ourselves start this holy mission of understanding and accepting non-violence ourselves sincerely with true heart.

What else to say? Let all living beings not only understand this principle of non-violence as propounded by Mahaveer with the depth it deserves, but should accept it as a glorious way of life and achieve bliss and peace. With this holy wish, I stop. ■

## Lord Mahaveer

(A Prayer)

Who is a hero in destroying delusion, deception, pride and  
anger and the pleasures of senses,

Who in the midst of countless obstructions, has followed the  
path of self-realisation,

Who like a skilled sailor takes us to the other shore of the  
world and its pleasures,

He is that adorable Jinesh Tirthankar Mahaveer himself,

Who is bereft of attachments and aversions and is deeply  
engrossed in the self,

In whose omniscience which is great and all prevading,

All the substances are reflected at one and the same time  
and described in his holy sermon,

Let that great Vardhman Jin be constantly present in the  
state of my meditation,

Whose holy conduct is boundless as the sea,

Whose qualities cannot be enumerated and described even  
by the holy preceptors,

The essence of whose teaching is the science of detachment,

I bow to that All-seer Sanmati a hundred times,

Whose teachings include the welfare of all living beings,

Whose equanimity and equality are famous in the whole  
world,

Who declared in his divine utterance that every particle is  
independent,

There is no doer or protector of this world; every action is  
complete in itself,

Let all attain Godhood, Let there be peace in the land,

Such is the divine message of the welfare of all in the  
teachings of Lord Mahaveer,

- **Dr. Hukamchand Bharill**