

## We Have Submitted Evidence

The Govt. of Bharat has asked both the parties to this dispute to submit all the relevant historical proofs and documents, as to whether any Hindu temple was destroyed for the construction of Babari Masjid? Evidence means that human or material testimonials, which is in favor of this party that there was a Hindu temple existing that was forcibly converted into a mosque; or alternatively, there was something other than a temple, say a vacant land; or that this Mosque was constructed without any intervention into the then existing modes or systems of worship.

We have submitted archeological, documentary and iconological evidence. According to this evidence, there was a Hindu temple. Abundant evidence of various types indicates the all-comprehensive tradition of this convention prevalent in the beginning of the 17th century that the Babari Masjid was built on such a sacred place of a Hindu temple that was forcibly destroyed and that there is a universal acceptance of the fact that it was the birth-place of Shriram.

But, we may be permitted to give our general comments with respect to the evidence submitted by the All India Babari Masjid Action Committee. Firstly, the most startling fact about these documents is that none of them have any evidentiary value for the issue involved here, for which the Committee was asked to submit its proofs. Yes, there are some intellectual arguments in some matters. Most of the documents presented are the composition of the people with political inclinations. But the opinion of the greatest of the men also is not considered to be evidence, until some factual evidence is not linked with it, on the basis of which they have formed a significant opinion of theirs. But unfortunately, there is nothing except mere opinion only.

Our next comment is that all these piecemeal evidence do not present any coherent picture about any thing. In fact, several documents refute each other. For example : certain ancient sources co-opt Ram Katha with the Bouddha traditions; whereas some other pamphlet-mongers say that Ramayan is the symbol of Brahminism over the Buddhism. Some say that there is no historical essence in it; whereas few others say that Ramayana is the dramatisation of Aryan victory over the south. Some say that Janmabhumi was a vacant plot; others say that there was a Buddhist Stoop on the site. A.I.B.M.A.Committee has not made it clear as yet whether this evidence is presented in favour of factual situation there.

Our third comment is that quantitatively the B.M.C.s evidence is enormously excessive. But in view of the main question i.e. whether it is sufficient either to prove or disprove as to whether there was a flourishing place of worship of Hindus prior to the construction of Babari Masjid, the evidence is clearly very scanty.

The legal narration is too longish through this part of the Evidence, thereby re-iterates the judicial issue; but it does not finally dispose off various rights and wrongs of the history attached with the question. But it certainly goes to prove that the Hindus have maintained their claim in the Court regarding this place.

The testimony is apparently missing from these documents that could show that Babar or any other Muslim Chieftain saw a vacant plot and since he was disgusted with its vacantness; he ordered construction of a Masjid there. There is not a single contemporary or near-contemporary testimony, which could show that Valmiki had created / invented the history of Shriram from a cipher. We have submitted the evidence of the fact that the ancient Hindu authors have considered Shriram as a historic character and treated him like that only. Whereas this was not the point of argument, for which any proof was demanded. But our friends in the Babari Masjid Committee while clandestinely making efforts to make the historicity of Shriram a topic of dispute; they never submit any evidence for this, but certain opinions (of certain people) which belong to a much much later period only. Hence these documents relate to other aspects of this topic than that of the existence of the temple prior to Masjid construction there; therefore they are all outside the preview of the matter under consideration.

But, we have submitted our comments based on the rebuttal of each one of the historical documents of all sorts submitted by the Babari Masjid Committee. We have confined our comments on the judicial documents so far as they are concerned with the historical facts and they are brief too.

## Brief rebuttal of the BMCs documents

[A-1] No evidence is given in the documents mentioned by C. Rajagopalachari. Only the statement of Gandhiji is mentioned therein that the events of Ramayana are the stories. but what of that? If we are not misled by the word story and go on reading the book, then we come across the fact that C. Rajagopalachari considered the mythical Shriram and historical

Shriram as different.

[A-2a] No evidence is given in the quotations of Periyar E. V. Ramaswami. He considers Shriram as a person of mean character and a representative of the Aryan clan, which has been a most unscientific class. He has been condemned very badly. But basically Ramaswami does deny the historicity of the Ramayana, he only denies its holiness.

[A-2b] No evidence has been factually given in the documents mentioned in the name of Jawahar Lal Nehru. It only mentions that the separatist Dravidians, who stage the distorted version of Ramayana, are so propagate the modified theories of the Aryan community only. In fact, this is the dramatisation of the historic events of northern victory over the south. Though this is not a proof of the historicity of the Ramayana. But this is at least a proof of the firm confidence of the contemporary people that historical elements are present in the Ramayana.

[A-3] Although the quotations of Dr. Sukumar Sen also do not present any proofs, but we could meet at least one really intellectual from among those learned experts invited to prove the Babari Masjid Committees case. We come to know from whatever Dr. Sen has written that Valmiki is a historic character and the story of Shriram was existing prior to his times. Besides, we also come to know that there were many traditions of Shriram Katha and also many versions of Shriram Kathas; and Valmiki has created his extremely prestigious story by drawing from these materials. Despite the current efforts to posit Buddhism against Shriram, the fable of Shriram finds a place in Buddhist Akhyanas. It has been very proudly said in the Buddhist sources that Buddha belonged to the Ikshwaku clan as Shriram did.

The assertions that there are many versions of Ramayana, are no evidence against the historicity of Ramayana. There are two different stories about creation in the Bible. Two different genealogies are given about Jesus. In fact, every story of Jesus life is given by authors differently in various Gospels. But no serious intellectual conclude from this that Jesus was never born.

[A-4] There is no evidence even in the description of P. S. Shridhar Murty. His articles are full of useless statements and meaningless propositions, which have been composed on the basis of the Hitlerian theory of the Aryan community.

These whimsical tendencies, which are mere surmises and un-testified, have been proved as

completely conspiratorial in nature, when they mix up their internal disdain towards Brahmin / Aryan community with the gruesome fact that all the important characters in the Shriram traditions (like Shriram, Valmiki, Vishwamitra etc.) are all non-Brahmins and that crooked beast called Ravana was a Brahmin.

There need not be any coherence in the anti-Aryan theory of casteism of both Ramaswami Naicker and Shridhar Murthy. Because all the possible facts go to prove only one thing. Hence there is no necessity of co-ordinating among all their facts.

[A4a] There is not evidence in the mention of S.K.Chatterjee. He only gives an opinion, æthere is no historical fact below the surface. No learned person of Indian history now agrees that the hero of Ramayana, Shriram was any historic personality, which could be cast in any specific period of time. This opinion has been already rejected by all people including the intellectuals, who have said, that Ramayana is a dramatisation of æAryan victory of south India, which is considered as equivalent to a basis in the history. Hence this assertion of Chatterjee is a blatant falsehood.

## Equally false is this statement also that Ramayana

æis a literary creation of some poet, who has been named as Valmiki. Because, when Valmiki had composed this great epic, a number of poetical works involving Shriram Kathas were available in different parts of Bharat.

[A-4b] There is no evidence even in the quotations of Dr. B.R.Ambedkar. He opines that, æThe Ramayana has turned to be an advisory work from a pure historic work in its second edition, whose objective was to impart education of proper conduct .....[in third edition] like Mahabharat, this was made into a treasure of sub-stories, knowledge ..... Thus the statement of Ambedkar goes totally against the assertion of S. K. Chatterjee. From this, it can be said definitely that Ramayana has evolved in a historic atmosphere.

[A-4c] The document produced by Dr. Jyotiprasad Jain also does not give any evidence. They only lay claim that all the temples in Ayodhya are Jain temples. But Dr. Jain concurs with our thought that Babar and other Muslim rulers have destroyed several Hindu temples [including Jain temples]. It is alright, Shri.Murthy promises to invalidate this in subsequent pages. But in the next 29 pages, he never returns to this topic at all.

[A-4d] Although Shri Murty says that the Gazeteer gives no evidence. Even then, some of the petitions of the Muslims are based on Nevils Gazeteer - 1905 only. Murty has rejected the Gazeteer saying that they have been written by such persons, who neither studied history, nor the archeological reports. Murty's only argument for it is that this report does not tally with the Gazeteer of 1905. The place where this report does not tally is — the Gazeteer of 1905 says that Babar stayed in Ayodhya for one week whereas Gazeteer of 1960 says that he stayed there for some days.

In fact, in spite of Murty's condemnation of the Gazeteers the Gazeteers prove that there was no reason for the British surveyors, who were generally impartial and discretionary people, to be suspecting the veracity of this local tradition that the Babari Masjid was constructed on a demolished Hindu temple. All the relevant British Gazeteers state the same fact that Babar or his henchmen had demolished the Hindu temple to build a mosque on that spot.

[A-4e] The pillars of Babari structure and the architecture thereon do not give any evidence—but, they are not in favour of the anti-temple assumptions at least. In repudiation of the statements of Shri. Murty given on the pages 31-35 and 41-43 (which is based on the conclusions of the research team led by Sher Sing), we direct them to refer to our own evidence, specially the Appendix-28. In fine, this assertion of Shri. Murty is totally wrong that similar stones are used in this Masjid as they have been used in other Masjids also. Kasouti (touch-stone) is no doubt a popularly current brand. But that is not the issue here. The stone used here is Schistose. This statement of him is also not correct that the architecture of this place belonged to Buddhist era. After the archeological work by S/Shri. A. K. Narayana and B. B. Lal, their sources have become totally timeless.

[A-5] There is no evidence in the documents mentioned by Dr. R. L. Shukla. His pamphlet begins with an exciting political lecture. Later on, he had condemned several archeologists and historians by calling them as fanatic, infamous, bragging, Antagonists to social changes, etc. and accused them personally. These have no relation, whatsoever, even remotest, with instant discussions. In fine, he is not a scientific personality and his pamphlet does not deserve to be taken as a piece of scientific evidence.

[A-6] There is no evidence in the documents pertaining to the Jatak Kathas. It appears to have been included since they inform that the clan of Dasharath and Shriram hail not from Ayodhya but Benaras. But there is no such living tradition for over last one millennium, that

could claim that Shriram belonged to Benaras. Our claim over the site of Shriram Janmabhumi is based not only on some nondescript single script dug out from the pit of the oblivion, but it is firmly based on a well-established living tradition.

[A-7] There is no evidence in the documents of B. Raghavan and C. Godkumburu also. They merely describe some more different versions of Shriram Katha. Besides, they once again go to prove, like the claim of S.K.Chatterjee that Ramayana is not a literary creation of one single poet, who has been named as Valmiki. It has been written in his book such of the points, which have been left out by Babari Masjid Action Committee after merely mentioning them in the Index thereof that (in spite of the prohibitions imposed recently by the Islamic Govt. of Malaysia) as how the Muslims in Malaysia and Indonesia hold Shriram in high esteem and faith; and narrate his stories and stage the same.

[A-8] There is no evidence in the documents of Shri. Malladi Venkataraman also. Whatever he furnishes, is merely a whimsical theory, according to which Ayodhya, in fact, is a Greek word Agdon and Shriram was ruling in Egypt. He has presented flights of his wayward imaginations that are patently untestified. If we wish we also could have included some such whimsical theories. But we had determined to present only the testifiable evidences. We were not expecting to receive unfortunate trash papers in the form of evidences of our opponents.

[A9] The documents of Sushil Shrivastava also do not give any evidence. He gives birth to an artificial problem by reading the guidelines listed in 'Ayodhya Mahatmya' to know the situation of the Janmasthan. After so much of hair-splittings, he could shift the intended site from its actual spot away only by two dozen yards. Thereby the 'Koushalya Bhavan' has come closure to the Janmabhumi than the Babari Masjid. Thus from the angle of the Systemology, it is nothing but twisting of the original text only.

[A-10] The details furnished by Aravinda N. Das also do not give any proofs. But he also repeats the same trick adopted by the historians of JNU (see document No A-16) in their famous statement, wherein they albeit mention the pleasant part of the conclusions of B. B. Lal (that Ayodhya was not found prior to 7th century B.C). But they conceal other conclusions, wherein it is said that the Babari building is standing exactly on the same spot where was standing one building belonging to 11th century. After intentionally hiding the articles found on the spot, they suddenly begin to accept that there was some building (earlier), and they again further submit that it might not have been a temple. Thereafter they

express the opinion that the stone pillars and the ancient report indicate that a Buddhist Stoopas were there on that spot. That way those Chinese travellers, mentioned by them, also have not described that there was some such Stoopas there on that spot. They have only mentioned about the Buddhist presence in large numbers in Ayodhya. If Shri. Das is not a stark illiterate like Bhattacharya in respect of Bharatiya culture, then he must know at least this much that the Stoopas are a solid wholesome structure, not supported by any pillars.

(A-11) The anonymous author (who include the chief expert Sher Sing with similar opinions as that of Shridhar Murthy). (see A-4) of the birth-place of Epic Hero do not give any evidence. But they have done a commendable job by citing H. R. Nevil that locally it is confirmed.....that Janmasthan was in the Ramkot and this marks the Shriram Janmasthan. In 1528 Babar.....destroyed the ancient temple and built a Mosque on that spot. In fact, we also have been reiterating the same always. Why the lovers of the Babari dispute do not present any such documents that would be stating, that Babar had seen this vacant land and got a Mosque built on that spot. In fact, such a document alone could be evidence. But whatever has been said here, otherwise, provides the proof in favor of our viewpoint only that the Babari Masjid was constructed on a (site of) forcibly destroyed temple.

(A-12) Rajesh Kocher also does not provide any evidence. In fact, he is moving more with the imagination about those things, which he is able to define in clear terms. If his claim that the Ayodhya was in Afghanistan, is accepted then whatever work has been so far accomplished in respect of the archeology of Ramayana Sites shall have to be done again. But the ticklish point is that this author does not present any argument in support of his claim. Whatever has been said by him is that the Aryan people might have been living in Afghanistan prior to the time of Shriram, as determined by the Puranas i.e. about 1900 B.C. He has also said that some of these sites have been excavated there. Even if it is accepted without saying that there is an element of history in Ramayana, it does not, in any way, give any indication towards Shriram. There is also no indication of any evidence of any type in the document in favor of his suggestion that Shriram was living in Afghanistan.

(A-13) Chidananda Dasgupta also does not give any evidence. Yes, he criticizes a lot and also flung the accusations. But overlooks the real issue involved in this case. The factual point is that it is a historic fact that the construction of a Masjid after destroying a Ram temple in Ayodhya was not an isolated incident. But it was one amongst thousands of such incidents



that had happened under a general policy adopted by the Muslims within the entire area conquered by them. The person who wastes one full page in deriding the people afflicted by a spirit of discussion towards appropriate historical evidence must have presented on his own at least some irrefutable proofs. We can not help saying that the instant testimonial proves to be unreliable, to say the least.

(A-14) Prof. R. S. Sharma also doest provide any pieces of evidence. In the interview given to Pranava K. Choudhari, he calls Shriram Mandir as æficticious. This attitude of his is, to say the least, unscientific. Because the solid traditions of the facts and archeological evidence that go against his statement cant be explained thereby.

Pror. Sharma says, æA. Fuehrer just accepts the obstinate local tradition in1891 without any proper verification that Muslims had destroyed three temples in Ayodhya including the one on the site of Shriram Janmabhumi. But such sweeping statements have no basis whatsoever. This obstinate local tradition has been underlined earlier also by Balfore in 1858. The local Muslim have written about Janmabhumi in 1735 and also by the grand daughter of Aurangzeb much earlier than that.

On the basis of all this, we could have drawn our conclusions regarding the Proffesor and we could have also said that he is trying to be ignorant intentionally. But we do not like such vituperation. Hence we would prefer to say that if the author of the recently published book æRamas Ayodhya and Communal History and the learned Proffesor could afford to be totally ignorant by terming the documentary evidences available in abudance as ætotally baseless, then how on earth could they expect from us to adopt a serious outlook towards all those neo-phytes (non-professionals), whom our friends of Babari Committee have brought together to conjure the æevidence.

(A-15) Sher Sing also doest give any evidence, but still he tries nevertheless. He claims, æall this mischief was started by P. Carnegi in 1870. His accusation was that the pillars used for the construction of Babari Masjid by the Muslims belonged to the Janmasthan. In fact, this was already told by Fr. Tyfenpheller in 1767 itself and recently Dr. S. P. Gupta also had testified the same through ultra-modern methods, for the use of which Shri. Sher Sing was insisting. Shri. Sher Sing expects that the historian of the JNU should subject the Shahtir of the Babari structure to Carbon-14 test, which is said to be prepared of the sandal wood and was taken from the earlier Shri Ram temple, according to the Gazeteers of 1960. In fact, this



wooden Shahtir was fitted under the orders of British Govt. during the course of its repairs after the riots in 1934. Carbon-14 Test could confirm its date only. Shri. Sher Sing, who was leading a research work team involving the disputed issue, should have known at least this much.

(A-16) The 25 historians of JNU also do not furnish any evidence. They only attempt mud-slinging on the arguments presented by the Hindus. After taking into account all the facts, no coherent alternative proposition emerges even from the oft-quoted statement of these historians of JNU. A proper reply to all these statements of these historians has been given by Prof. A. R. Khan (in his articles published in Indian Express dated 25 Feb 1990 and 01 Apr 1990) and by a Belgian intellectual Conrad Elst (in his book titled 'œRama Janmbhumi V/s Babari Masjid'). Prof. Khan has termed these documents as 'œillusive in character. He has bared open its hollowness by criticising its scientific method. He has also drawn the attention towards 'œnot only suppressing and hiding of the evidences but also their twisting in these documents. Even after all these, the entire pseudo-secularist intellectual class goes on quoting the statements of these 'œfamous JNU historians on this issue treating them as the gospel truth.

AIBMA Committee should have shown as to how this document supports their case, then we would have given an appropriate reply to that conclusion. Now, we can only say this much that the assertion of these 25 historians nowhere struggles with the problem. But it beats around the bush on all its sides.

All these 25 historians appear to be ignorant of other concrete facts, which clearly establish that sufficiently prior to the British regime, the Hindus have been using the Mosque or at least its compound for the worship of Shriram. Perhaps, do they consider it as insignificant? That's why they do not present any argument to prove it or to somehow make it ineffective. Since these historians of JNU are deriding at both the archeological discoveries and entire documentary evidence, hence all the documents do not influence our case at all.

(A-17) Sakina Yusuf Khan also does not present any evidences. But as she is a journalist, some cognisance needs to be taken of her article titled 'œNo Pillars-Basis at Ayodhya: A.S.I. The report is totally contrary to the rules of the science from various aspects. The totally clear support recently given by Prof. Lal for the existence of pillar-bases belonging to 11th century has been neglected here. Secondly, a claim is made therein that as per the decision of the

A.S.I, there is no such pillar-bases; whereas there is no such statement in the Report. Since the excavation work was mainly related to the Ramayana period, the report about the mediaeval articles was too brief.

(A-18) Prafull Bidwai also doest furnish any evidences. Yes, he tends to lecture on the points of contriving concocted evidences and falsify the people, especially the history. There is a very serious matter. If Hitlers Propaganda Minister Gobelse returns today and if he doest get any evidences in his favour, then what will he do? Which cheapest falsehood would he invent to force his enemies for thier own self-defence? The answer is absolutely simple. He would say, it is the falsehood compaign of the VHP. Goblse is as he was.

Prafull Bidwai has started his in statement with a serious accusation against us that we have concocted an archeological œvidence pertaining to œthe existence of a Shriram temple on the disputed site. How can any archeologocal evidence be concocted? We are not intrested in his magical formula. We have got an irrefutable evidence. Yes, probably the Babari supporters side may require to examine it.

(B-1) None of the documents listed under group-B furnish any evidences, except giving it in favour of our case.

The Pharsi carvings in the Babari Masjid do indicate that Mir Banki has constructed it on the œorder of Shah Babar (Ba-Farmuda-e-Shah Babar), not on his own will. The date carved on it tallies with the peroid (March-April 1528) when Babar was either in Ayodhya or in its Proximity. The carvings are produced as evidences of œconstruction of Babari Masjid by Mir Banki in 1528œ. We have no disputes with these. Because, if Mosque is there, then it must have been built by some body.

(B-2) œBabar ki Vasiyat (will of Babar), a brief but extremely wonderful declaration of a non-communal regime, it doest give any such evidences that the said Mosque was built on any other site than that of a demolished Hindu temple. Otherwise this proves several things. In fact, many intellectuals have already reached to the conclusion that this document is fabricated. How non-sensical it is to include a pre-testified fraudulent document in the bundle of œevidences? In fact, it is a proof for some thing else.

(B-3) Babars own diary also doest give any evidence other than that, that he had gone to Ayodhya. As it is very well known that the period when he was consider to be in Ayodhya or

somewhere near it, the pages containing these details are missing how interesting it is that one page of the æBabar-Nama translated by Smt. Beveries is presented. But other pages of the annexure pertaining to carvings and further two pages with the foot-notes as also other relevant pages have been cleverly concealed. Smt. Beveris has revealed in these pages all such things, which are already accepted by all and sundry; which has been recorded by all further Gazeteers pertaining to Ayodhya. And that is, æa temple was destroyed to make place available for a Mosque there.

Factually it is not concealed also. It is mentioned in A-11 and it has been severely attacked by calling it a æpre-planned part of æhide and ædistort.

(B-4) Alexander Cunningham doest give any such evidences which has any connection with our

case. He himself says that he has interrest only in those Buddhist places and buildings, which find a mention in the travelogues of Chinese travellers, especially in the descriptions of Hue-en-tsang. The brief and insignificant references about historic place of other religions appearing in their descriptions are merely incidental. Hence the silence of Cunningham in respect of the topics, with which he has nothing to do i.e. Shriram Janmabhumi cannot be the proof of the fact that the Hindus do not consider the place as the birth-place of Shriram; and therefore that was not a sacred place for the Hindus. This document is totally irrelevant and it only adds to the physical weight of the documents sent to the VHP than to the substance and essence of evidence.

Even then it is useful. Suddenly, Cunningham confirms the fact that Ayodhya is considered to be the city of Shriram and he does not mention about any Buddhist building etc. on the site of Janmabhumi. Thus he once for all silences a false rumour spread recently to keep us running behind the baloons of non-communal conspiratorial tricks.

[B-5] Dr. R. Nath also does not provide any evidence pertaining to the issue under consideration. He tells us that the structures of mosques are of various types. So, what of that?

But his reaction to the inclusion of his book in the evidence of the Masjid Committee for our purpose, is much more interesting than this. Indian Express (03 January 1991) has published the following excerpts from his lengthy article, æThe reference of my book is unclear and I do not know which of my statements has been mentioned in this context. I had gone to see the

site in my personal capacity and I got an opportunity to study the mosque. I have absolutely no doubt that the mosque now stands on the site of a Hindu temple in the north-eastern corner of the Ramkot Mandir-Garhi. Originally, the river Sarayu (Ghagara) was flowing from the close vicinity of this Garhi.

[B-5] Smt. E.B. Joshi does not give any evidence at all. According to her the Faizabad Gazeteer of 1961 was published very belatedly and its writing appears to be inspired by some special motive. The opinions of earlier writers have been suppressed here. But no new research-conclusions etc. have been presented to prove the veracity of her claim of suppression. It is evident that this was done under the pressure of the then Govt.

Thus, it appears still more strange that the Babari Committee people on one hand, refer to this document, which condemns the Neyvils Gazeteer; and on the other, they refer to it in the petitions filed in the courts, wherein they have quoted from the Neyvils Gazeteer as the evidence. The decision given in the document No. E-25 very definitely makes it clear that the materials described in this Gazeteer are admissible as evidence under Part 57 of the Evidence Act.

Under these circumstances, the silence on the part of Smt. Joshi in respect of destruction of the temple is an attempt to intentionally hide a universally accepted fact of history.

[C/D] Simultaneous jointconsideration is felt necessary in respect of C and D groups. Because they are relevant to the Revenue Records and judicial proceedings and supplementary to each other. They are evidences by themselves. Court of after court; and one author after the other have expressed a definite conclusion that a Mosque was constructed after destroying an already existing temple and they have regrets for that. A British Judge has expressed it thus : æIt is most unfortunate to have constructed a mosque on the site, which is considered as specially holy by the Hindus. Because of their pompous colonial indifference, he says, æSince it had happened 356 years ago, now it is time-barred. The British were so impartial surely that they agreed with the complaint of the Hindus that it had a concrete base too. But due to their special colonial mentality, they wanted to maintain the status-quo.

The document D-2 at least proves that this Chabutara (platform) was erected in 1857 keeping in view the riots between Hindus and Muslims on one hand and between the Hindu-Muslims and the British on the other prior to 1857. After seeing all this, it cannot be said that the claim of the Hindus on this site is a latest political gimmic to create a æHindu Vote Bank

and some similar meaningless things. Hindu society has never relinquished its claim over this sacred place.

[E/F] The documents under the category E and F also does not furnish any evidence except what we all already know very well and which is the main disputed problem that œafter forcibly snatching away this place by Babar from Hindus, it was in effective governmental possession for a pretty long time.

The court orders dated 03 March 1951 given by the Civil Judge of Faizabad, related to the culmination of this structure once again into a Hindu place of worship in 1949, is particularly missing in these documents. From this, it can be surmised that our friends of Babari Committee do not wish to draw attention to this fact that the said Judge also had considered the claim of Muslims as doubtful that they had recited prayers in that structure in December 1949. On the contrary, these unargued testimonials of the local Muslims were mentioned, wherein it was said that this structure was never used since 1936 onwards. Because our intention is not to get entangled into the imbroglio of exchange of seemingly intellectual arguments of the evidence for the purpose of fighting the judicial cases. This much we have to say about judicial (court) documents.

All the legal battles pertaining to the right to property etc. arising out of the circumstances forcibly created in 1528, wherein include even the matter of effective utilization of the structure prior to 1949 also, is totally irrelevant to that issue, whereupon the Govt. of Bharat has requested to produce the proofs and evidence; and that issue was whether the Babari Masjid was constructed on the site of a forcibly destroyed Hindu temple. This becomes further irrelevant with the more basic issue of handing over one of the lands, which have been considered as most sacred by the Hindus, back to Hindus. If any one of the holy places is forcibly converted into a mosque and it is being effectively used as a mosque; even then it would remain as a forcibly imposed symbol of desecration, sacrilege and great insult.

## Strategy of Dispute

In the stark absence of any valid evidence, the BMAC was not in a position to hope for a decision of this dispute (case) in its favor. Hence the best possible next step for it could have been only to create a show that whatever evidence we (the Hindus) have produced is factually no evidence at all and simultaneously do everything at their disposal to prevent the

decision going in favor of the Hindus. Many of our evidences have been dug out of the Govt. Archives. Attention has been drawn towards many of them through public platforms. If the BMAC had wished so, it could have challenged the credibility of that evidence. Not only this, the Babari Committee has not submitted even an iota of evidence in respect of the explanations that both the quick-believing Hindus and Muslims had accepted this concocted story intentionally spread by the Britishers without raising any doubt.

No such evidence has emerged even from the anti-temple arguments and counter-arguments presented from various intellectual forums including the press, which could either outrightly reject our case or term that evidence as unreliable. A number of anti-temple verbal canard spread through the press have been included in the documents of the Babari Committee, that make much ado about nothing but does not present any evidence.

Efforts were also made to treat the archeological conclusions publicly pronounced by Shri. B. B. Lal and Dr. S. P. Gupta as unreliable. These efforts were not made by any well-versed Archeological experts or even by those, who have even a glimmer of archeological knowledge of the Janmabhumi; but they have been made by Prof. R. S. Sharma or the pleasure-hunting historians from the JNU, who have been co-incidentally brought up in the Marxist traditions and who are notorious for several blatant misstatements about history.

Whereas the most competent Archeological experts and Art Historians like Deputy Superintending Archeologist of Madras Circle of A.S.I Shri. K. K. Mohammed (Indian Express dated 15 December 1990) Indologist and Editor of Dinamani Shri. Travatan Mahadevan (Indian Express dated 05 December 1990 and the Author of æHistory of Mughal Architect Dr. R. Nath came out in open support of Prof. Lal and Dr. Gupta. In fact, Dr. R. Nath was cited by the Babari Committee in its support. Dr. Nath had confirmed that he had gone on that spot on his own and he got an opportunity to study the mosque. He further says, æI have absolutely no doubt that the Masjid stands on the site of a Hindu Temple in the north-east corner of Ramkot Mandir Garhi. (Indian Express dated 02 January 1991). Not even one among those Hindu antagonists, who have dumped a lot of lectures down our throats about the preference of Science over the Myth, in spite of our irrefutable scientific evidence. But they have not segregated themselves from the anti-temple Myth.

All the anti-temple arguments and counter-arguments are nothing but a strategy adopted to divert the attention from the main issue. Instead of furnishing any appropriate evidence, the

dispute-loving Babari Committee is raising the ever-new, ever-fresh bogies for creating further confusion. As a result of all this, we were forced to deal with the stuffless statements of partial and unworthy people while writing this reply, which any really wise men would not have paid any attention to. For example, take the case of an anti-Hindu politician like Ramaswami Naicker himself. What did he know about the issue of Ayodhya? Even then his one-sided and generalized opinion was submitted as evidence and we were forced to reply to it. Believe us, we were undoubtedly alert on this occasion to fully devote our time, intellect and energy to scan and scrutinize the evidence of all types that are considered as important by our opponents. But it is always not possible to repudiate all their false claims through the newspapers, the builders of public opinion. And because of this, an illusion was created through such false claims published in the new papers, that the anti-temple pre-conception is based on some base of strong evidence only.

A strong example of these diversionary tactics in the bundle of documents submitted by the Babari Committee is that they could float a minimum of seven different propositions regarding Shriram Janmabhumi :

01. He was never born at all.
02. He was born at some other place.
03. He was born at a distance of few dozen yards in the north where now stands the Sita Rasoi (Sita's Kitchen).
04. He was born in a village called Dhudam in Punjab.
05. He was born in Afghanistan.
06. He was born on the banks of Sarayu in Nepal and
07. He was born in Benaras.

That way even the Babari Committee people themselves do not believe six of these. But they hope that we should disprove all seven.

Our Demand

Not a single idolater has remained in the Arabstan that demands the return of their Kaba. Islam has destroyed them completely. Thereafter Islam began its work by smashing their places of worship and destroyed several other cultures. Thus the Manikiyanns and Nestorians of ancient Iran and Central Asia as also the Buddhists also are not there now, who could present their claims for their places of worship and Viharas (and the very few Zoroastrians i.e. Pharsi are remaining now, they are so exploited and so less in numbers that they are too afraid to raise their voice.)





Though we too are not unaffected, we are living despite all these atrocities on us and we are demanding that the most reverential places of worship for us be returned to us. It is our demand that the Muslims in Bharat concede to the legitimate right of the Hindus over the three temples viz. Kashi Vishwanath at Varanasi, Shrikrishna Janmabhumi at Mathura and Shriram Janmabhumi in Ayodhya.

We are not demanding the return of all those thousands of places of worship, which have been destroyed and forcibly converted into mosques. Let the local Muslims doubtlessly continue to use them. Our only demand is for the return of these three holiest places. Because they are our most ancient sacred places of worship. We would prefer to receive them from Muslims through an administrative order. This is a superb opportunity for the Muslim community to voluntarily recompensate for the enormous massacres, exploitations, atrocities, abductions, enslavements, destruction of the temples and conversions of the non-Muslim communities on the strength of sword by their earlier generations in Bharat as also outside.

During last two years several nations and communities have preferred to formally accept their past mistakes. Japanese have publicly begged pardon of the progeny of Korea for the exploitation of their ancestors; the Soviet Russia for starting the Korean war; the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa for extending ideological support to the Apartheid; the Soviet leaders for slaughtering the Polish Army Officers in Catin by their Russian predecessors. In other words, they have publicly begged forgiveness from the people or their scions for the mistakes or excesses committed against them. They even went to the extent of revising the text on the Catin Memorial and arranged a joint function in the presence of Polish President at that place. New paths could be paved by unequivocally accepting past mistakes.

Hence the time is very propitious now and we wish that the Muslim community in Bharavarsh should voluntarily rise up to the occasion for finding an amicable solution of this issue. Two Masjids and a non-mosque would be an insignificant price for an immeasurable cordiality that would generate through this gesture of goodwill. By doing this, the Muslims would win the confidence of Hindu society. They would be assured that Muslims have broken the chain of unholy acts on the part of their ancestors once for all.

It is our firm belief that reforms could be brought in the religions/communities and human societies also. When the Christians had come to Bharat, they had broken the idols of our

Gods and Goddesses and they were indulging in conversion activities also. But now they are not doing like this. Hence we are assured that the religions could be reformed through the process of humanisation. We do not wish to keep the relation of the present Muslim community with the crimes committed by some of their ancestors. We firmly believe that if the concerned parties so wish, then the past could be forgotten. It is our expectation that the Muslim community would come forward for displaying such a goodwill that it would alter the regrettable pages of the history for good.

We shall conclude this solicitation for exhibiting cordility and a sense of honesty towards the history by quoting an example from the documents presented by the Babari Masjid Committee only. This document is the The vasiyatnama [will] given by Babar to his son Humayun. This is a beautiful secular work. But unfortunately it has been proved as fabricated. There is nothing dramatic in it. The veracity of the various slogans of communalism and secularism are also suspect today.

Even then, since our friends in Babari Committee consider Vasiyatnama as a genuine and authoritative statement, hence we appeal to them that they also act upon it, especially on that part where it is said that œ there live people of various religions in Hindustan. You do not allow your mind to get affected by religious prejudices and give justice by being impartial and duly respecting the religious sentiments and religious customs. Especially do not kill the cows. Because, this is the only way to win the hearts of the people of Hindustan. ....You should never destroy the religious places of worship of any community.œ [œThe Crescent in India by S. R. Sharma, Pp272].

Hence, we appeal to All India Babari Masjid Action Committee, all the Muslims in Bharat and in fact, all the well-meaning people to fulfill the last will of Babar. We also call upon them that the co-operate in imposing a universal ban on cow-slaughter and respect the holy religious places of Hindus, especially Kashi Vishwanath, Shrikrishna Janmabhumi and Shriram Janmabhumi.

[10] Shriram Charan Paduka Pujan

Shriram-Janaki Rath Yatra, Tala Kholo Andolan, Opposition to short and long marches, Shriram Shila Pujan, Karsewa etc. are various dimensions of Shriram Janmbhumi Mukti Andolan. Shriram Charan Paduka Pujan programme is a link of the same chain. As Bandhu

Bharat was carrying on the administration by taking orders from Shriram Charan Paduka after their worship, similarly a dream of bringing Ram-Rajya in the country by worshipping these Padukas. The Paduka Pujan programs were performed not only in all the cities, but also in almost all the villages in the country. Our workers could reach even those villages, where they could not go on earlier occasions. Padukas moved in thousands and thousands of villages and they were worshipped. The enthusiasm shown by the people for Paduka Pujan was appreciable. Because, the public considered it to be its own program. One more chapter was added in the concerns of the Govt. on account of the success of the Paduka Pujan programs. It was but natural. Because, whenever any organization became strong or its program become more successful and popular than expected, the power that necessarily becomes worried, may that power be of the godly king Indra himself, or any other. The significance of Paduka worshippers was greater than that of the Ramshila worshippers. Because, all were well-versed with the importance of Shriram. But very few were knowing the importance of the Padukas. Bandhu Bharat had renounced the power for Paduka Pujan. It is only by renunciation that an individual or the society could achieve something in life. In the words of Pujya Jagadguru Shankaracharya Swami Vasudevanand, these Padukas were like fire. Their worshippers could achieve good health and also digestive fire in the stomach. But those who opposed them, the Padukas burnt them to ashes like the fire.

Worship of Charan Paduka has been going on as a very important Pujan since times immemorial in this country. Bandhu Bharat had earned respect and honour in the society at that time, Because of Charan Paduka Pujan only. He is still respected in our society for that even today. The reception accorded to this programme was very heartening. This was slightly different from the Shila Pujan programme. Shila Pujan had linked the people with the Shriram Janmabhumi Mukti Andolan and Paduka Pujan consolidated the awakening among the public further. It was expected that about three lakh Karsewaks would be enrolled; but actually their number increased to ten lakhs. This has been the greatest achievement of this programme. The programme began by worshipping Padukas on 26 September 1992 in Nandigram, where Bandhu Bharat had worshipped Shriram Paduka then. The country-wide programme of Paduka Pujan was performed from 06 October 1992 to Vijaya Dashami.

The programmes of Paduka Pujan were performed all over the country in a most attractive, beautiful and effective manner. But the programmes in Bihar and Jharkhand need a special mention. Shriram Charan Paduka Pujan was taken to common masses through district-wise

smaller carts. This led to a very wide spread public awakening in these provinces. In all millions of people from 20,000 villages took pledge to construct Shriram Janmabhumi Mandir at Ayodhya. During the Bihar tour of Shri. Ashok Singhal, 15 massive public meetings were organised. His inspiring speeches awakened unprecedented enthusiasm among the people in the state.

(11) Lanka-Kand in Sundar-Kand of Ayodhya : 1992

A grand temple was already constructed on the Janmasthan of Lord Shriram in the hoary past i.e. during the period of Kush Maharaj. Thereafter there came about modifications in its design, size and shapes, but the temple remained constant all along. Babar got a mosque constructed by destroying the existing temple on Shriram Janmabhumi in 1528. Prior to 06 December 1992....

## What was there in Ayodhya?

Prior to the collapse of the structure, the ritualistic Pujan, Archan and Kiran of Shriram Lalla was going on regularly in the morning and evening for over past 43 years. That way, lakhs of devotees were coming for the Darshan-Pujan-Archan of Shriram Lalla every year. But on the day of his manifestation i.e. 23-24 December devotees from the farthest cities and towns of the country used to come specially for offering their obeisance to Lord Shriram, who was the embodiment of Dharma.

Unrebuttable literary, revenue and archeological evidences of a temple on Shriram Janmabhumi were available from the beginning itself. In the course of time, some ancient edicts and idols; and certain old maps and pictures were found with the royal family of Jaipur (Rajasthan) which go to prove the existence of a temple prior to collapse of the structure on that spot.

## What Was Expected To Happen?

Sants had appealed through the VHP to Karsewaks from all over the country to arrive in Ayodhya for performing Karsewa on 06 December 1992 for temple re-construction. Only a symbolic Karsewa was planned as per the orders of the Supreme Court. According to the program of the VHP, the Karsewaks had to take bath in the river Sarayu early in the morning

and bring a handful of sand to Shriram Janmabhumi and thereafter they were expected to undertake cleaning the Chabutaras (raised platforms) erected through Karsewa began from 26 July 1992.

## But What Happened?

Shriram Mandir was the symbol of dormant self-respect of Hindus during the days of slavery. The Karsewaks were invited in huge numbers from all parts of the country for performing the Karsewa in Ayodhya in the context of efforts being incessantly made for the re-construction of the temple in a bid to re-establish the faith, self-identity, and confidence of Hindus. Certain over-enthusiastic Karsewaks converted this symbolic Karsewa into actual Karsewa. On that day in Ayodhya .....

“ A virtual flood of Karsewaks literally lakhs and lakhs in number went on coming from all the sides in Ayodhya town with the handful of sand from the banks of the Sarayu river while shouting the slogan of ॐJai Shriram as per the scheduled program.

“ At about 10.15 p.m. the preparations began for the Devata Archana for the temple re-construction soon after the arrival of Jagadguru Ramanujacharya Swami Vasudevacharya, Vitragi Swami Ramdev, Mahant Paramhans Ramchandradas, Mahant Avidyanath, and important Hindu leaders like Shri. Seshadri, Shri. Sudarshan, Shri. Ashok Singhal etc.

“ On the other side, a batch of Karsewaks was turning adamant to hoist saffron flags atop the domes, as was done previously during the regime of Mulayam Singh. The uniformed volunteers had made a human-chain for the security of the structure from all sides. Swami Dharmadas Pahalwan and other Sants got busy in preventing the Karsewaks from entering the sanctum of the Mandir, but all went in vain. Could any human efforts ever stop the surging tides of an ocean?

“ Just a little earlier to the scheduled Muhurat of Karsewa at 12.05 p.m., one Karsewak climbed up the dome at the risk of his life and shouted the slogan, ॐJai Shriram. Then what? A long queue ensued of those desirous of climbing the domes. They had no value either for their bodies or for their lives. They were seeing only the dome-like archer Arjun looked only at the bird's eye.

- “ Many Karsewaks began the Karsewa on the domes picking up the bamboos, wooden pillars, iron pipes, iron angles and bars fixed for the barbed compound.
- “ The structure went on getting damaged slowly — first the doors, then the walls and later on the first dome on the right was reduced to dust at 12.35 hrs.
- “ Tumultuous slogans of æjai Shriram rent the sky, soon after the fall of the first dome. Conch shells began to reverberate the atmosphere; Jhanjh, Majiras, etc. were beaten and the Turahiyans has blown. In the mean-while, the plaque fixed with the carving of the Babars firman to the Mir Banki thereon was rooted out from the walls.
- “ At about 2.00 p.m., the huge door was broken. The second dome collapsed and in the same order, the third and final dome also floored to dust. With this, the uproarious slogans of æjai Shriram, æjai Shriram began to pierce the whole surrounding.
- “ The whole township was drowned in the great hullabaloo; no one was in a mood to listen to any body else. The condition of æbeating one’s own drum and singing ones own tunes prevailed all over. Some one was excitedly shouting the slogans, whilesome one else was clapping violently. Some people began to carry with them the pieces of broken bricks, stones and debris to their houses as the Prasad of Shriram on their shoulders and heads. While some others got engaged in realising their dream of re-constructing the temple by clearing all the debris heaped on the spot.
- “ Not that, only men were engaged in the Karsewa, women also were not lagging behind in this cause of Shriram. Women of every age group, every class, and every level, literate and illerate alike were sharing the Karsewa in their own style. The valiant Durgas of Durga Vahini were on the job whole-heartedly. Some were encouraging the Karsewaks with their enthusiastic slogan shout- ing, while many others were engaged in the work of clearing the debris. All were utterly aghast and taken aback by seeing the wonderful feats by the Karsewikas from Maharastra and southern Bharat.
- “ Fortunate are those, who had an experince of fulfillment and success of their life by taking part in the Karsewa, who had seen this sight with their own eyes and who broadcast this news of wipping out the main symbol of cultural slavery of Bharat throughout the country.

## Why did it happen?

Hindus were always being suppressed ever since the destruction of Shriram Mandir in 1528. No one listened even to his just and legitimate demands. Hindus have been insulted all along during all the regimes, may it be of Muslims, or of British or even of our own independent Hindustan. Every one was concerned and worried only about the Muslim sentiments. They were not even aware that the Hindus also could have some sentiments. Hindu tolerance was always considered as his weakness. The feelings of antagonism that was suppressed in the Hindu heart for years of around insults, atrocities and deprivation got exploded like a sheating volcano on 06 December 1992 and the task that could have been achieved in years, was accomplished in just a few hours.

The political parties and the politicians wearing the garb of pseudo-secularism went on suppressing the Hindus through all possible and impossible efforts, BUT WHY?

Irrefutable proofs were submitted one after the other, but they were not accepted, WHY? Of the literary and archeological evidences in respect of the existence of a temple on this spot, the quotations of ancient religious scriptures were not accepted since they belong to Hindus; the quotations from the books written by the British were not accepted because they were reportedly writing and saying like this only with a view to keep Hindus and Muslims fighting with each other always; the quotation taken from the books written by the Muslim authors were not accepted since the Muslim authors of those times had excessively exaggerated the matters only with a view to increase the Islamic grandeur. So far as archeological evidences were concerned, they were rejected not by the arguments of the historians or archeologists like S/Shri R.S.Sharma, D.N. Jha, Suraj Dhan etc. But by the hair splitting arguments of the advocates of the courts. Hindus went on giving logical arguments and the Babary Committee people went on indulging in illogical and irrational arguments in the meetings and the Govt side became the mute spectator.

The leaders like S/Shri V. P. Singh, Mulayam Singh, Ram Vilas Paswan, Indrajit Gupta, Somnath Chatterjee etc. kept on provoking the Hindus by issuing anti-Shriram Mandir statements, while Muslim leaders like Shahabuddin, Banatwala, Ovaisi etc. went on adding to this provocation by their own irrelevant statements. The Prime Minister Shri. Narasimha Rao was pouring petrol into the fire by repeatedly calling the structure as Masjid, where the



worship of Shriram Lalla was going on forever last four decades. The Hindu heart was torching, flaming and burning within itself by listening to all these vituperations all along.

After the failure of all the talks with the Muslim leaders at the intervention of the Central Govt; after repeated rejection of our appeal to the Muslim leadership for their co-operation in the construction of Shriram Mandir; after government refused to listen to the demand for handing over Shriram Janma- bhumi to Shriram Janmabhumi Nyas; after the failure of getting justice from the court in time and after getting roundly disappointed from all the concerned people, the anger, dejection and imposed helplessness that was sheathing in the Hindu Society — all these assumed the form of a ferocious, boiling volcano, which exploded on 06 December 1992. Sundar Kand of Ayodhya turned into a Lanka Kand. This day would be written in the annals of the country in golden letters.

## Could it have been averted?

Not once, but a number of opportunities did come, when the solution could have been found by seriously thinking, keeping the vote-politics away-

The Govt. did not attempt to convince the Muslims that they give up their claim over the site that is so reverential for the Hindus. On the contrary, they went on pushing the Hindu youth force in the antagonistic direction by perpetually opposing the reconstruction of the temple on the spot.

WHY did they insist on Section 143 instead of Section 138(2) while entrusting the matter to the Supreme Court? WHY?

WHY these efforts for Mandir-Masjid side by side?

WHY was this disagreement for the Karsewa undertaken for the re-construction of a temple on the acquired land?

WHY was this hesitation in directing the Lucknow bench of Allahabad High Court to declare its decision early?

WHY these perpetual attempts for entangling the issue in the labyrinth of legal intricacies?

Whereas the issue was simple and fully clear that whenever the Rambhaktas were not provoked, the structure remained secure. Shilannayas on 9-10 November 1989, Karsewa that went on from 09 to 26 July 1992 bears testimony to this. And whenever the Rambhaktas were incited, provoked or challenged; the structure received damages. They performed Karsewa in the sanctum, when Mulayam Sing addressed 48 anti-Hindu rallies in 49 days throughout the



Uttar Pradesh during October-November 1990 and publicly provoked the Hindus by boasting that not even a tiny bird could stretch its wings in Ayodhya and converted entire state into a virtual prison, so that not a single Karsewak could reach Ayodhya for Karsewa. Similarly, Prime Minister Shri. Narasimha Rao incited the Karsewaks with his verbal acrobatics, and the outcome of this provocation is there before all to see.