

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD,
LUCKNOW BENCH, LUCKNOW

O.O.S. NO.4 OF 1989

THE SUNNI CENTRAL BOARD
OF WAQFS AND OTHERSPLAINTIFFS

VERSUS.

GOPAL SINGH VISHARAD
AND OTHERSDEFENDANTS

STATEMENT OF P.W. 18
PROF. SUVIRA JAISWAL

IN THE HON'BLE COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD,LUCKNOW BENCH, LUCKNOW.

O.O.S. NO. 4 OF 1989

(R.S. NO. 12-61)

Sunni central Board of Waqfs. U.P.

and others Plaintiffs.

Versus

Gopal Singh Visharad

And others Defendants.

STATEMENT OF P.W. 18

I, Suvira Jaiswal W/o Late Sh. Vishwanath Prasad Jaiswal, aged about 66 years, R/o 101, SMR Majestic, Jupiter Colony, Sikh Road, Sikandarabad, solemnly affirms on oath as under:-

I retired from the post of professor in Jawahar Lal University in June 1999. I worked in that University since 1971 and became professor in 1984. I worked in the center for Historical Studies department in that university. I did not hold the post of professor in any special subject. I joined Patna University in 1962. I came over to Jawahar Lal University in 1971 from Patna University. I obtained M.A. degree in 1953 from Allahabad University. My special subject for study in M.A. examination was the History of Ancient India. I especially studied the subject of Religion and Society in Ancient India and I have also published two books on this subject. I have done my Ph.D. also. My subject in Ph.D. was "Origin and Development of Vaishnavism". I have studied about Shri Ramchandra also.

I have written some articles also on Ramchandraji. My article on Shri Ram Chandra has been published in my book translated in Hindi. No particular place has been mentioned about the birth of Ramchandra in history books i.e. authentic books i.e. no mention has been made of his place of birth. In my view no mention has been made in history books wherein it has been indicated that Shri Ram was born at the place where Babri Masjid was situated. On the basis of excavation conducted by Sh. B.B. Lal it can be said that there is no proof to show that there was any settlement i.e. habitation in Ayodhya in 700 B.C. Conferences are held from time to time with regard to ancient Indian history and I used to take part in these conferences regularly. I have been participating in the conferences of Indian History Congress continuously. One such conference was held in Calcutta in January, 2001 in which I had participated. I have not come across any such proof which may indicate that Babri Masjid was constructed after demolishing Ram temple. My articles were published in Social Scientist, Actaorientalia, Indian History Congress proceedings, Indian Council Historical Review, etc. One of my books is titled "Origin and Development of Vaishnavism". Another book is titled "Caste". My first book was published in 1967 for the first time.

[Cross examination on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara Defendant No.-3 by Sh. R. L. Verma Advocate]

I was born in district Farukhabad, Uttar Pradesh where my father was posted at that time. My father was a resident of Ghazipur. My mother hailed from district Motihari in Bihar. My mother and father both were staunch Arya Samajis. The rituals performed right from my birth to my marriage were in accordance with Arya Samaji tenets of Vedic Dharam. According to Sanathan Dharam the sub-caste of my parents was Jaiswal. The people of Jaiswal

sub-cast fall under Vaishya category among the four categories of Sanatan Dharam. It is likely that the Jaiswal sub-cast may fall under Sudra category among the four categories. The Jaiswals have been categorized as Vaishyas in Uttar Pradesh but in Bihar they have been included in Backward Castes. She further added that she had no proper knowledge about this. I can't say whether my maternal predecessors were followers of Vedic Sanatandharm or not. I do not know whether the marriage ceremony of my parents was solemnized in accordance with Vedic tenets or manners. I believe in God only in the sense that I have faith in humanity. I don't have faith in any external power or any miracle. I do not consider God as a supreme power. As far as I know I found my parents as Arya Samajis only. I may further add that probably my father became Arya Samaji in 1904. I considered myself from the very beginning i.e. from my birth itself as Arya Samaji. It is fact that Arya Samajis do not have faith in worshipping idols of God but they accept the existence of God. All the rituals pertaining to marriage, mudan, etc. performed in my family i.e. in the families of my brothers, sisters, etc. were performed in accordance with Vedic Religion and not according to Sanatan Dharam. It is correct that Vedic Religion prescribes performances of rituals in accordance with four Vedas. Somebody may be Hindu but he may be an atheist also. The meaning of atheist is that such a person who does not have faith in any religion. I may further add that Hindu is considered Hindu by birth. Any person continues to be Hindu right from birth unless he adopts another religion and gives up Hindu religion. I considered myself to be Hindu even today on this basis. I do not do any worshipping and singing of bhajans etc. I passed my graduation and post-graduation examinations from Allahabad University. When I was studying in M.A. at Allahabad the professor of History Sh.

Ishwari Prasad had retired. Dr. Ishwari Prasad has been considered a good historian. Any historian becomes controversial on any particular issue. I did my Ph.D. from Ptana University under the guidance of Dr. Ram Sharan Sharma. I completed my Ph.D. in 3 to 3 and a half years. During my research I studied some of the portions of Mahabharat, Valmiki Ramayan, Vishnu Smriti, Vishnu Puran and Harivansh Puran. I studied Bhagvat Puran and Raghuvansh Puran also. I know Hindi and English languages. I know a little bit of Sanskrit also. I have not studied Sanskrit language nor have I obtained any degree in it. The book of Mahabharat which I studied was in Devanagri script. Any historian can say that original book of Valmiki is in Devanagri script. The Purans that I studied i.e. Vishnu Puran, Bhagvat Puran, etc. were also in Devanagri script and they were published by Gita Press. The oldest script of India is said to be Brahmi script. It is also considered divine script. I cannot say this. Mahabharat is neither Ved nor Puran but it is an epic which was later on considered to be a religious book. There are four Vedas, namely, Rig Ved, Yajur Ved, Sam Ved and Atharva Ved. The Rig Ved is the oldest of them all. Prayers of various Gods and Goddesses have been offered in Rig Ved. No prayer of Ishwar has been offered in Rig Ved. Only Gods and Goddesses have been offered prayers. Image or idol of any God and Goddesses has not been shown in Rig Ved but natural phenomenon has been worshipped as a symbol. The time of Rig Ved is the time of the advent of civilization. It would be wrong to say that a person having faith in religious belief will be considered Hindu. There is no relationship between Hindu religion and religious beliefs. Hindu religion can be understood after considering worldly and written knowledge of all types. I have read Yagyavalkya who is concerned with Smritis. Manu and Yagyavalkya have not mentioned the world

‘Hindu’ and therefore, question does not arise of knowing Hindu religion by going through Smritis. They have not mentioned Sanatan Vedic Dharma, they have mentioned only Vedas. It is wrong to say that Smritis meant such a compilation which the Vedas it self appeared and gave it to saints who told it to their pupils and the pupils compiled it.. The Smritis are human creations. It is believed that Vedas are God gifted works. But history does not accept it. There are myths that Vedas were kept intact at the time of deluge. There is myth that Vedas were there even before the civilization that come into existence after the deluge. It would not be proper to say that the Vedas existed 4000 years before the civilization as per faith but they existed ages before. There are six Vedangs for the study of Vedas. One of them is Vyakaran, the second one is Nirukta and Nighantu. I am not definite whether it comprises Jyotish also. It comprises kalp, Chhanda and Shiksha (education). It is correct that there is description of Vedas and Vedangs in dharamashastras. To understand Dharma, state administration was also taken into consideration besides Shruti and Smriti and the behaviour of elite also taken note of it in this regard. It would be wrong to say that the religion prevailed over politics in ancient India but politics prevailed over religion. In medieval period politics and religion were inter-related. I would rather say that in ancient as well as medieval periods, politics and religion were inter-related. I would not say one dominated upon the other. Bhashya and Nibandh can also be the source of knowledge about religion. It is correct that all the Smritis that I read are the names of Rishis and Munis. Puranas are also considered to be the source of knowledge about religion. Mahabharat that I read is not considered Puran. Mahabharat can not be said to be authored by one person. Shri Ved Vyas is said to be the so called author of Mahabharat. Moksha Dharma and Bhagvadgita are parts of

Mahabharat. These things have been shown there. I can not say now whether definition of religion has been given in any chapter of Mahabharat or not. It is correct that I read in Mahabharat that Yaksha asked Yudhisthira that if he could define religion, the lives of his four brothers could be revived. I do not remember whether Yudhisthira gave any definition of religion or not. The word 'Dharma' has been derived from 'Dhri' in Sanskrit. 'Dhri' means which can be adopted. But every thing which can be adopted can not be Dharma. I am not sure but Manu might have written that here are four things to be adopted such as Vedas, Smritis, morality and good behaviour which may give satisfaction to others. It would be half truth to say that Hindu religion was founded on the basis of duties. By half truth I mean to say that not only duties but rights have also been described in that context. It would be wrong to say that if a person having faith in Hindu religion performs his duties fully, no rights will be violated. Hindu religion does not have single prophet but there is description of all the Gods and Goddesses in it. The image of these Gods and Goddesses might have been created in 500 B.C. i.e. they have been described since then. I accept Vedic period but I do not accept Puranic period becomes very large because Puranas continued to be written for a long time thereafter. The historians accept Vedic period from 1500 B.C. and it comes to an end round 700 or 600 B.C. The period which follows Vedic period can not be called Puranic period. According to me the period which followed Vedic age is linked to the period of Buddha. Buddha period existed for one or two centuries and thereafter Maurya period followed. There was no mention of images of Gods and Goddesses in Vedic period and in Buddha period also. Buddha scriptures do mention these things. There is mention of the worship of Shiva idols in 400 and 500 B.C. The worship of Kali idols is believed to have come into vogue in 6th or 7th A.D.

The worshippers of Shiva preceded worshippers of Devi Goddesses. It would be wrong to say that according to interpolations in Vishnu Puran and Bhagwat, Pauranic Period followed Vedic period. No one is considered to be the founder of Vaishnav Dharma. There are a number of sects among Vaishnavites. The worshipping of Vishnu idol are found in 200 B.C. The evidences that have come to light so far show that the temple at Vidisha might be the oldest one. I think the first temple of Vishnu existed in Vidisha according to the evidence brought forth so far. A document found in 200 B.C. speaks of establishing Garuda Dhvaj was established. This inscription is in Brahmi Script but I read its translation in Sanskrit which has been given both in Prakrit and Sanskrit languages. I read this document in 'Select Inscription and Epigraphic Indica' of G.C. Sarkar. In ancient India Brahmi, Kutila Kharoshti, etc. scripts were in vogue. Script has neither been the subject of my study nor have I studied it. I have not studied the book 'Lalit Vistar' which contained the description about 64 scripts. I said again that I studied 'Lalit Vistar' but I did not read that it contained the description of 64 scripts. Prakrit is not the script of Sanskrit, Prakrit is rather a language. Several Prakrit languages have been mentioned in Buddha period. Pali is also a sub-language. It is wrong to say that because Sanskrit was a difficult language Buddha used Pali to make his message understood in Pali language which was simple and easier to understand. It is further said that learned men do not agree that Buddha used Pali for spreading his message because Pali was not language of Magadh. No Vishnu temple had come into existence in South India till 600 A.D. I have read Vishnu Puran. Ten special incarnations have been accepted of Vishnu. I do not remember that whether a mention has been made of 245 incarnations or not. They have rather mentioned 24 Vyuhs. It is wrong to say that 22 lotus gates have been

erected for ushering one into the Vaikunth Lok and I mean them only. The ten incarnations of Vishnu are Matsya, Kachhap, Narsimha, Parasu Ram, Krishna, Kalki, Varah, Vaman, Ram and Bal Ram. All these incarnations are considered Vaishnavites. I have seen idol of Vishnu. There is a separate idol of Vishnu. There is combined idol of Vishnu and Lakshmi together. There are numerous conceptions of Vishnu. He has not been conceived as a separate entity. There is Meenakshi temple in South India but I have not seen it. It is correct that Vaishnavites worship a symbol of a part of Vishnu's body. I have not heard the name of Banka district in Bihar. Vishnu Pad (food) is worshipped in Banka. I do not know. But I know that in Gaya Vishnu-Pad is worshiped. Ram incarnated or descended in Treta Yug. That is, the Ram incarnation of Vishnu is considered to have descended in Treta Yug. Out of ten incarnations of Vishnu, Ram is the seventh incarnation. In medieval period the worshippers of Ram were known as Ramayat. They are known as Ramanandis also. Swami Ramanand is considered to be founder of Ramanandi sect. Buddha was the founder of Buddha religion. The advent of Buddha religion in India influenced Sanatan Vedic Dharma to great extent but it did not vanish. Idol worship was also introduced in Buddha Dharma afterwards. As influence of Buddha Dharma increased the Vedic Dharma decline. I have heard the name of Adi Shankaracharya. He spread the message of Advaitvad in India.

Adi Shankarcharya was born in 8th century i.e. 1400 years after Buddha period. 6th century B.C. is considered to be very important from historical point of view because a number of movements took place during that period and a process of material and ideological deliberations developed. Ramayan period starts from 200 B.C. and

extends upto 3rd century. Historians are of the opinion that the Ramayan period is not in a sequence. It is correct that Ramchandraji has been described as a great hero here in chapter 2, 3, 4 and 5. It is also correct that Ramchandraji has been accepted as the incarnation of Vishnu in Chapter 1 and 7. Bauddha literature of 6th century is not available so there is no question of any mention of Ramayan in that. Religious literature is the main source for a historian. Non-religious literature can also be the source of research for history. Religious literature includes Brahman and Non brahman literature. Mahabir Jain, Gautam Buddha, makkhligoshal, etc. were the prominent ideologists of religious movements in 6th Century B.C. Evil customs and wrong practices of Hindu religion (besides other things) were the main reasons of the development of Jain and Bauddha Dharma. It is correct that Mahabir and Gautam Buddha, who were Kshatriyas, opposed the influence of Brahmans but this was not only reason. Some more scriptures came into light such as Ved, scriptures concerning Yajurveda, Taitireya and Shatpath. Aitreya is a religious book with Rigveda. It is correct that Mahabir Jain and Mahtma Buddha refuted Yajna rituals in Brahman scriptures and called them evil practices. Narad Muni was linked with the word 'Narayan'. I cannot say whether he was Vaishnavite or not. It would be wrong to say that Chhandogya Upanishad was authored by Narad. I do not know who wrote it. It is correct that in Chhandogya Upanishad Narad told Vishnu that he had read all the Vedas and mantras but he did not know what Atma was. It is in this continuation that Adi Shankaracharya developed the Concept of Advaitvad. The period succeeding Vedic period can be called the Upanishad period but this assessment is not scientific. The Bauddh literature authored by Mahatma Buddha pertains to the period of 300 B.C. and this concerns with Nikaya and Tripatak. Some

Jatak stories are considered to belong to BC and some after that .They pertain 400 B.C. while others are considered to pertain to after 200 A.D.

Dashrath Jatak of Bauddh literature pertaining to Baudh period contains Ram Katha (Story of Ram). I am not certain about the definite period of Dashrath Jatak but original story of Dashrath Jatak is quite ancient. It is correct that the mention of Ram Katha of Balmiki Ramaya occurs in Dashrath Jatak. I have read it. Ram, Son of Dashrath, is the same Ram who is found in Balmiki Ramayan and in Dasrath Jatak stories.

It is correct that chronologically Ram was born in Treta Yug. No period is known as Ramayan period. It is not correct that Balmiki Ramayan pertained to the period earlier than Buddha period. Dashrath Jatak also does not belong to period earlier than Buddha period. But it is presumed that Ram Katha was popular orally even earlier. A number of Yugs (ages) have been contemplated in myths and four Yugs, viz., Satyug, Treta, Dwapar and Kaliyug have been mentioned. According to myths the description of Ram falls under Treta Yug. Mahabharat starts from Dwapar and the battle of Mahabharat ends at the advent of Kaliyug. I am not sure whether Kaliyug started after the battle of Mahabharat came to an end or after King Parikshit but I know that Kaliyug started immediately after the battle of Mahabharat.

Period can not determine on the basis of 18 Puranas but the mythical period can be known with the help of all these Puranas. One of periods of these Puranas is Sarg period which is the first period. I do not know whether there is a mention in Sarg Kal as to how the Adi kal was formed. The second period in Puranas is Prati Sarg. There

was a deluge during this period and the whole creation of the universe was destroyed. It is said that the whole universe was created afresh. It is correct that the third period is known as Vansh Kal wherein lineage of Gods has been given and all these are mythical periods. The fifth period is Vanshanucharit. It is correct that there is description of the lineage of ancient Royal dynasties in Vanshanucharit Kal. Vishnu and Bhagwat Purans pertain to the lineage of Kings and princes. Garud Puran also detail with the lineage of Royal dynasties.

I do not know whether any mention has been made of the lineage of King Parikshit in all the above mentioned Purans or not. I do not know whether Ikshwaku dynasty has been described in Garud Puran or not. I don't know whether the lineage of Dashrath and Ram has also been described therein or not.

The period of all Purans can be determined on the basis of the facts mentioned therein. Vishnu Puran is the work of 5th –6th Century A.D. I considered the periods of Vishnu and Bhagwat Puran on the basis of my research and the Cross-examination given by the scholars as I have stated above. It is correct that the Purans have been written in prose may be in prose and poetry. It has also been stated that Purans are in poetry and some portions may be in prose also. Some Purans contain description of Gupta period. It is correct that Vishnu Puran describes the character of Vishnu. I do not remember whether the description of Buddha occurs in Vishnu Puran or not. I have studied Malvikagnimitram written by Kali Das. I do not remember whether it contains the description right from Bindusar to Shung dynasty or not. The period of Shung dynasty is considered of 200 B.C. Kanv and Shatvahan are considered separate entities. Their period is accepted as

1st Century B.C. after Shung dynasty. It is correct that the influence of Bhrahiminical Society increased during the periods of Shung, Shatvahan and Kanv dynasties. It would not be correct to say that the whole Shung dynasty which had adopted Buddh Dharma was converted to Vedic Sanatan Dharama but I agree that the influence of Sanatan Dharm had increased tremendously. This is half truth that Vedic Sanatan Dharma developed greatly under Shung dynasty. That is to say that the whole society was transformed. It is not correct to say that Shaiva and Vaishnav religions prospered under Shung dynasty throughout the Country but it is correct that the two faiths developed a lot in society. It is not correct to say that Adi Shankaracharya was born during the period of aforesaid three dynasties. I do not remember as to who was the King when Shankaracharya was born in Kerala in 8th Century. I have heard the name Kumaril Bhatt. Kumaril Bhatt was younger to Shankaracharya. But both of them belonged to 8th Century. Adi Shankaracharya died at a very early age of 32 years. I have not read about any relationship between Shankaracharya and Kumaril Bhatt. Adi Shankaracharya can be linked to Shiva. He founded Advaitvad. According to some people he was the worshipper of Shiva while other opine that he was worshipper of Vishnu. I do not know whether he was the incarnation of Shiva or Vishnu. It is correct that Adi Shankaracharya established Maths or monasteries. I can not tell the places where he established this Maths. So far as I remember he established a math in Puri, second in Badrinath and the third in Shringeri math. Perhaps Shringeri Math is in Karnatka. It is said that he established four Maths in all the four direction of India. I have not studied this in detail. It is believed that all of these four Maths even exist today also. As the period of Adi Shankaracharya was not included in my research, I do not

know which God's message he preached or propagated. My research work was confined to the period 200 B.C. to 550 B.C. Period of my research has been mentioned in my book. I think that Vaishnav religion and worship of Vishnu are different things. I cannot tell as to when or on which date the Vaishnav religion came into existence. We find in Rigved that Vaishnav religion came into existence with the worship of Vishnu. I do not believe that Vaishnav religion came into existence from the period of Rigved. According to me the process origin of Vaishnav religion started from 200 B.C and it developed gradually and this process continued upto medieval period.

It is correct that by the time Adi Shankaracharya was born in 8th century, Vaishnav religion had developed a lot. Buddha religion was also in existence in 8th century. It is not correct to say that Buddha religion had gone abroad after having been vanished from India. It is correct that Adi Shankaracharya was known as latest Bauddha. I do not know whether there was any Sanyasi of Vaishnav sect in 8th century or not. It is correct that all those Shaivites who had become sadhus were known as Sanyasis and similarly all those Vaishnavites who had become Sadhus were known as Vairagis. There were two types of Vaigaris. There were two types of Vairagis viz. Ramandi and Ramanuji Vairagis. It is believed that the founder of Ramanandi Vairagi sect was Swami Ramanand.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-
S. Jaiswal.
19.09.2001

Typed by the stenographer as dictated by us in open court. In continuation for further cross-examination be present tomorrow i.e. on 20.02.2001.

Sd/-
19.9,2001

Dated :20.02.2001

[In continuation of 19.02.2001, the statement on oath of Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. – 18 begins]

It is not so that the philosophy propounded by Ramanand was equivalent to that of Adi Shankaracharya. It is not fully correct to say that the difference between the philosophy of Ramanand and Adi Shankaracharya was only that Adi Shankaracharya did not encourage idol worship and Ramanand Ji enunciated the principles of idol worship. It is correct that Ramanand Ji was the devotee of Ram. Ramanand Ji's year of birth, according to Agastya Samhita is considered to be 1299 or 1300 A.D. At that time there was rule of Tughlaq Dynasty in the 13th century. It believed that Ramanand Ji had a number of disciples of various castes, but this is somewhat controversial. Ramanand Ji's disciples fell into two categories – i.e. Sagundhara and Nirgundhara. Nar Haridas perhaps belonged to Sagundhara and Kabir and Raidas belonged to Nirundhara, but it is also controversial. I have not done any research in this. Swami Ramanand Ji lived in Kashi, but I do not know whether he lived on the bank of Ganges or not. I had not read in any book or religious book that Swami Ramanand Ji lived on the bank of Ganges but I have read that when he was going from the bank of Ganges, Sant Kabir was lying on the way and Swami Ramanand's foot fell on him and he gave Kabir "Ram Mantra" but it is also disputed. I have neither heard nor read that a Math was established on the bank of Ganges by Swami Ramanand Ji which exists even today. I cannot say that this Math has been the main center of the fourth sect of Swami Ramanand. It is correct that Sadhus and Vairagis of Ramanand sect are in Kashi and Ayodhya. It is also correct that their Math and Temples exist there even today. When Swami Ramanand

gave Mantra to Kabir Das Ji, at that time Swami Ramanand Ji would have been an old man.

The rule of Das Dynasty started in 1206 and continued upto middle of that century. Rule of Khilji Dynasty followed Das Dynasty. Bakhtiyar Khilji had been a Ruler of Khilji Dynasty. I have not read that Bakhtiyar Khilji imprisoned Kabir Das for singing a bhajan. This is wrong to say that Kabir Das was 65 years old at the time of the rule of Bakhtiyar Khilji and Ramanand Ji was born 150 years earlier. I have limited knowledge about Ramanand Jj's sect because it was not the subject of my research. May be that the disciples of Nar Hari Das might have established the Nirmohi Akhara but I have not read about it.

No discussions were held before me in any conference about any Akhara in the presence of Shri R. S. Sharma. It is correct that India was attacked by Huns and Muslims in ancient times and some of them went back after looting. I have heard about Shujauddaullah in the history but I have not read that his army included an army of Bairagis. I have not read anything about it. I do not remember that Shujauddaullah's one son's name was Mansur Ali Khan and other Son's name was Sadat Ali Khan. I have not read the book "Historical sketch of District Faizabad", written by P. Carnegie. I have not read the history or the survey about the Temples of Ayodhya authored by P.Carnegie, as their study was not necessary and they are not considered as the source of intimation of about 10th and 11th century. I have not attended any conference of historians in regard to Ram Janmbhoomi and Ayodhya. The description of Ayodhya occurs in ancient scriptures. Ayodhya has been mentioned in Balmiki Ramayan, Puran and Ramopakhyan of Mahabharat etc. Ayodhya finds mention in literary books ,like Raghuvansh

and Uttar Ramcharit. These books belong to Gupta's period or later period. It is correct that Vayu Puran and Vishnu Puran give some material which throws light on the history of Gupta's period. It is believed that Kali Dasji belonged to Gupta's period and I agree with this view.

It is difficult to say that Maharaja Vikarmaditya had been directly mentioned in Vikramorvashiyam written by Kali Das. This is a myth that Vikarmaditya reconstructed Ayodhya and inhabited it and constructed Temples over there. But there is no mention that Sri Ram Temple was constructed with touch stone (Kasauti). By inhabiting, I mean that Ayodhya was inhabited de-novo. The myth given in the book of P. Carnegie were described in 19th century, wherein It has been stated that Temple of Nageshwar Nath was constructed by Vikarmaditya 2000 years ago and Hanumangarhi was reconstructed by Nawab Mansur Ali Khan. I did not make it as a source of my research as this pertained a very later period. It is correct that the description of appearance and costumes of that period is found in "Mrichhkatik". It is correct that the appearance and costumes described therein are similar to appearance and costumes mentioned in "Balmiki Ramayan. Vatsayan's Kamsutra was written several centuries earlier to Shoodrak's "Mrichhkatik". It contained the geographical situation and appearance and costumes of the people of India. I cannot tell that the costumes mentioned in the book Kamsutra is different from the costumes mentioned in Ramayan and Shoodrak's books. The book named "Manjushree Moolkalp" of Mahayan Religion was also written in the Gupta period. Description of some Kings is found in this book and I cannot say whether King Vikarmaditya had been specially described in it or not. It is correct that' Patanjali, the author of Mahabshahya was contemporary of Pushyamitra. Patanjali was not

contemporary of Maukari Rajvansh. It is wrong to say that description of Maukari Rajvansh has been given in the Mahabshahya of Patanjali. The period of Pushyamitra is 200 B.C. I have not seen that the stone slab of Pushyamitra still existed in Ayodhya, I have read epigraphia Indica. I have no knowledge of such a slab in Ayodhya, wherein it has been inscribed that Pushyamitra protected 'Ayodhya from Huns. The situation of Ayodhya has been described in Ayodhya Kand and Uttar Kand of Balmiki Ramayana.

River Saryu has been mentioned in the north of Ayodhya in Uttar Kand. I do not remember at present that Bharat Kund has been mentioned or not towards the south in this Kand. Bhardwaj Ashram has also been mentioned in this Kand but I do not remember whether it is in the south of Ayodhya or not. It is also true that river Ganga is in the south of Bhardwaj Ashram, Prayag has also been mentioned in this kand. Chitrakoot has also been mentioned in Ramayan after moving a little southward. Panchvati has been mentioned in the south and in the end there is description of Kanyakumari and Rameshwaram. Further south of that Lanka is situated. The aforesaid places have been mentioned in Ramayana and their geographical situation continued to be even today. There is no dispute: about the geographical situation of the places described in Balmiki Ramayan. I cannot say definitely about the origin of Saryu river. It is correct that river Saryu is in the north of Ayodhya and this river is known as Ghagra in the east and west of Ayodhya.

There is a full chapter on the importance of Ayodhya in the Skandh Puran. I have never been to Ayodhya and I have also not studied about geographical situation of Ayodhya. I have heard about Rudrayamal Tantra but I have not read it. The name of Ayodhya has been mentioned in Atharva Ved but its geographical situation and its location has not been mentioned therein. That is to say that

Ayodhya is not the name of any place in Atharva Ved. There is myth that in Atharva Ved it has been mentioned that Ayodhya is Devnagari which has nine gates and eight circles. I have not read Vashisht Samhita. It is correct that Ayodhya is known as Saket and Kaushal. I do not remember that Shri Ram had asked Laxman in Ramayan to go to their motherland after conquering Lanka. But it may be possible.

Gita is a part of Mahabharat. A lot of things have been said about religion in Gita. Lord Krishna has said so many things about religion in Gita. But no definition of religion it has been given. It would be wrong to say that Lord Krishna has said nothing about religion in Gita. It is also not correct that except Karmayog no other sermon has been delivered in Gita. It is correct that Krishna told Arjuna that whenever religion would decline, he would himself descend on Earth. It is correct that when Arjuna was hesitant to act even after the message of Karmyog and Krishna showed him that they have already been killed before the war. Thereafter Krishna showed him his Virat swarup. It is correct that the definition of religion has neither been given in Shrutis nor in Smritis. It has not also been given in Vedas. Rishis have not defined it. I do not remember that definition given by Dharmraj to Yaksha and therefore I cannot say whether that holds good even today or not. I do not agree to the definition that religion means walking on the path shown by the leader or saintly persons i.e. great men. I do not consider Ram to be God or his incarnation even after having studied Balmiki Ramayan. I do not consider Ram as a great leader or great man even after reading Ramayan. I do not consider him great Pandit (scholar) also. After reading the story I consider him to be a character. Ram is the main character in the story (plot). In Gita the word Gyani has been used. It is correct that Shri Ram is the

main character. I have studied 'Ramcharitmanas' written by Tulsi Das. There are gaps at difference place between Ramayan written by Tulsi Das and the Ramayan written by Valmiki. Ramcharitmanas of Tulsi Das was written during the period of Akbar. Writing of Ramcharitmanas was started in Ayodhya hence some of its portions were written in Kashi. There is a little difference between the characterisation and geographical situation of Ramcharitmanas and Balmiki Ramayan. In Manas, Ayodhya has been depicted on the bank of Saryu whereas in Balmiki Ramayan it has been portrayed 12 miles away from Saryu. The sentence uttered by Balmiki after witnessing the killing of Kraunch was not uttered on the bank of Saryu but on that: bank of Tamsa. It has not been mentioned in Valmiki Ramayan as to what was situated in the space of one and a half yojan that existed between Ayodhya and Saryu. I read Bhavbhuti's Uttar Ramcharitam long ago. Bhavbhuti is said to belong to 7th Century. I cannot tell as to what was the geographical situation of Ayodhya indicated in Uttar Ramcharit. I will not be able to tell this also that whether this is similar to the one stated in the "Ramcharitmanas" of Tulsi or Balmiki Ramayan. Which book of history is authentic depends upon the book itself and not on the period. It is correct that three types of books are available in history. Some historians wrote books under the authority of the King. while some others wrote books under the directions of the King whereas some others wrote books independently. By King I mean the administrator.

Sri Ram who had been the subject of my article is the same Ram who happens to be main hero of Ramayan. These articles are not before me today. I have not shown Ram as historical personality but as mythical character. I have considered Ram as a supporter of Caste system and paternal society. It is correct that I have accepted him as a

hero of the society who believes in obedience to his father.

I have heard about Hazrat Mohammad Sahib and I know about him. I have not read anything about him but I accept him a founder of 'Islam'. By Islam I mean people who believe in Quran Sharif. Quran Sharif book is not similar to that of Ramayana of Hindus. I do not know who wrote Quran Sharif or whether it is a book of God. I have also not read anything about Hazrat Mohammad Sahib. Sources of knowledge are numerous and reading is not the only source. I have no knowledge of any other source about the Hazrat Mohammad Sahib. The place where Muslims pray is Mosque. If prayer is offered on empty land it cannot be called Mosque but if it is offered in a building it would be a Mosque. I think a Mosque has a special shape. I will not be able to tell correctly about the building of a Mosque. The description of the Mosque as given above by me is based on my general knowledge and my readings. I have not read any Islamic book. I have not read the biography of Hazrat Mohammad Sahib. Founder of a religion is a special person. The path shown by such a person, one cannot tread but one should use his wisdom and discretion to follow the path. I know about Jesus Christ. He was a great man as I have read and heard. Babar was a victor and a ruler. I do not know whether he was a villain or not. I do not accept him as a great hero or even hero. I cannot tell that Babar was the follower of some great man or hero.

In the beginning of 8th Century Mohammad Bin Qasim attacked Sind province. His rule continued for some period but did not last long. I do not know how many years he ruled. It is correct that Mohammad Bin Qasim had mainly come with an intention to loot. He could not establish firmly. Mahmood Gaznavi also attacked India. He demolished temples and went back. Mahmood Gaznavi was

an attacker and a plunderer. I have heard the name of Malik Kafur of Tuglaq dynasty. He was a governor of Tuglaq dynasty. It is possible that he may have demolished a temple near Madurai in South India.

Babar came to India in 1526 and the 1st battle of Panipat was fought. This battle was fought between Babar and Ibrahim Lodhi. I do not remember by which route Babar reached Panipat. Babar fought second battle with Rana Sanga at Khanwa. The battle of Khanwa perhaps took place in 1528. This may be said that Babar was not accepted as a King unless he won the battle of Khanwa. History does not say that Babar ,wanted to go back after winning the battle of Panipat and looting. I have not read anything especially on the subject that Babar prepared his soldiers for a war of religion in the battle of Khanwa and left his soldiers and commander. I have read that Babar came to Avadh region but I cannot say whether he came to Ayodhya or not.

It is said that Lucknow was the capital of Avadh. I have read this in the book written by K. K. Datta and S. C. Sarkar. Sh. S. C. Sarkar is a historian. I do not know how many books Sh. S. C. Sarkar has written on Vairagi movement and Moghul rule. I have not read that Babar or his army passed or not through Ayodhya or near Ayodhya. I have heard of this disputed site as Babri Mosque after listening to the present controversy. I have come to know about this disputed building as Babri Mosque after the building was unblocked. Before that it never came to my common Knowledge or to my kind of research.

I have never read any book regarding Ayodhya and disputed site before 1986. My article on Shri Ram was written after 1986. This article was published in Social Scientist Journal. I do not remember the date of its

publication. It might have been published after December 1992. I had been writing on Vaishnav religion earlier also and I write today also. This is why I have been inspired to write on Sri Ram. I was not inspired by anybody else but I got this inspiration from within. Even after my research, I continued to study about Vaishnav religion and I continue writing even today. It is correct that Ramanujacharya. Ballabhacharya. Nimbark. Madhavacharya. etc. have been the founders of Vaishnav Dharm. I do not know whether Ramanandacharya had been a founder Acharya.

It is correct that Ramanandacharya was the founder of Dvait. It is correct that Ramanandacharya was the devotee of Luxminarayan. Most of these devotees are in the South India. I have not noticed whether there is a difference between the Tilak of Ramanandi Sadhus and Ramanuji Sadhus. I have not read any book other than text books written by S. C. Sarkar and K. K. Datta. I have written my article on Sri Ram in original on the basis of scriptures and literary work of my thesis. It was part of my thesis and so I wrote this article on Sri Ram. I have been writing about the main character of Pauranic stories, from time to time. Before writing article on Sri Ram. I wrote an. article on Narsimha. This article was published in the proceedings of the Indian History Congress in 1972 or later. Narsimha means Narsinmha incarnation. My article on Narsimha incarnation was only historical. Since I have carried out special research on myth and so my articles are based on main character of myth. I show gradual development of the main character of myth through my article. I do not refute or controvert them. I have written an article on Hayagriv besides Vishnu Avtar. I have not written any article on any other character except the above mentioned three incarnations.

There is gradual development in the plot of Narsimha incarnation. It is correct that Ram Katha is comprehensive. I am not inspired by this plot. I am a historian and write from this point of view. I consider the plot of Ram as a source of history. It is correct that there is description of the society in Ram Katha in detail. There is description about administration and about the society but I do not consider it as a complete history but only a source of it. Meaning of habitation and residence temple has been given in Sanskrit dictionary. But later on it meant Devgrih also. That is in today's parlance, temple means Devgrih. Temple has a special shape. It has a Garbh Grih. It has a Parikrama. It has a Shikhar also. It has a Jagmohan also. I have not seen any such temple in any place of pilgrimage. I have only read about it. I have not gone to any temple. I do not agree that religion consists only in having faith in Hindu religion. It is correct that in Hindu religion if somebody has faith at any place then one can perform worship at that place. It is not necessary that a temple must exist there. As far as I know this fact is based only on historian report to the nation as to where Babri Mosque is situated. I have given my statement after having read that report. I have not read any historical book wherein it has been mentioned that there existed a temple. I have heard Babarnama but I have not read it. I have not read Ain-e-Akbari. I have read only in the text book.

I have not read the book Haqui-ke-Shohada' written by Mirzajan. 'Haqui-ke-Shohada' has been mentioned in the report but I cannot say whether it has been mentioned therein that Babar had ordered that mosque be constructed after demolishing the temple. I know that Ain-e-Akbari was written by Abul Fazal. It was written in the 16th century. I have read an article to the effect that Abul Fazal had written that Ram Navami was celebrated. It was celebrated

on Ram Navami, the birthday of Ram. I have not read the book - 'Gungdashta Halat Ayodhya' written by Maulvi Abdul Kalim. I have not heard his name also. I have read the report of Shri B.B. Lal which was brought out in 1975. I do not remember whether he conducted excavation on the west of disputed site. The remains he found there were said to belong to 700 B.C. If the archaeologists say that there was civilization and habitation in 700 B.C. then I accept it. Prof. B.B. Lal is an archaeologist. When this report was prepared, he was Director. Archaeological Survey of India at that time. The Gupta period starts from 320 A.D. I have said in my statement that there was no evidence of any habitation in Ayodhya in 700 B.C. which means that there is no evidence of any habitation or settlement in Ayodhya in the period preceding 700 B.C

Archaeology has not been my subject. My conclusion that there is no evidence on habitation in Ayodhya before 700 B.C. is based on the report of Dr. B.B. Lal. There is no other basis for this, I have read ancient India history from the very beginning. During my research. I did not find it necessary to read the Gazetteer of Faizabad. Lucknow and of Avadh. Whichever conferences I attended, I sat in the Department of Ancient India and no mention of Faizabad Gazetteer came to my notice. I have neither studied any subject wherein it has been stated that Muslims rulers constructed mosque after having demolished temple. Nor have I compiled a book in this regard. I have neither read any book on this subject written by any British writer nor have I read any translation of such a book. I have not tried to see the Gazetteer of Barabanki. I do not know whether Archaeological Survey of India had conducted a survey before Shri B.B. Lal undertook such a survey or not. I have also not read any report in this regard. I participated in conferences/seminars held from time to time in cities like

Delhi, Shimla, Calcutta etc. Indian History Congress organizes these conferences every year and I have attended most of them. I have been attending these conferences since 1964. I mean that I attended them very often. I was conferred the degree of Ph.D. in 1964 and I published it with some changes in 1967.

I do not properly remember as how many times I have attended the conferences from 1964 to 1967. The historians used to read their respective papers and they were discussed in these conferences. I did not present my paper on Shri Ram in any of the conference. I presented my paper on Narsimha in the conference. It might have been presented in the conference held in 1972 or 1973. The article written on Hayagriv was not presented in any conference. I do not remember as to when and how many times I attended the conferences after the lock was opened but I attended the conferences a number of times. I cannot tell the names of the historians who attended the conferences but their list is published in the proceedings. After the lock was opened, whenever I attended the conference, this subject was not discussed before me. I do not remember as to which conference I attended after the incident of December, 92. After the disputed structure was demolished, this subject was discussed a number of times in the conference and resolutions were passed. When resolution was passed, many historians, besides me, were present, namely, Shri R. S. Sharma, Shri Satish Chandra, Shri Irfan Habib, Iktadar alam etc. I can not say whether Suraj Bhan Saheb was present in the conference or not when this resolution was passed. Shri Athar Ali of Aligarh University was present when the said resolution was passed. A resolution to the effect that the historical monuments should be protected was also passed in that conference. They should not be demolished and efforts

should be made to protect them. Demolition of disputed structure was also criticized in the said resolution. As far as I remember the historical monuments were mentioned in that resolution and I am not aware whether discussion to the effect that the law dealing with the protection of historical monuments should include religious places also was held or not. Shri R. S. Sharma has been in Delhi University and prior to that he was in Patna. I did my Ph.D. in Patna under his guidance. He is my teacher. It is wrong to say that Shri R. S. Sharma published an article on behalf of the Sunni Central Board. In my view, he published an impartial report and a copy of which was sent to Central Government. I have read that report. I do not know whether that report was sent to the Government of India or it was demanded by them. May be that Govt. of India constituted a Committee - consisting of historians of both Hindus and Muslim communities for giving a report on the subject. The report brought out by Shri R. S. Sharma has not been a subject of discussion in any of the conferences attended by me. I read this report after it was published in 1991. I do not remember whether I wrote my article on Shri Ram before or after the publication of this report. Meaning that the article was written on Ram's development. The title of this article was 'Ram the legend'. I do not agree that I have been influenced by the myth of Ram before writing this article. I do not agree that this article is a satire on society and not an article. Historians do not write satires. This is not a criticism of the Society. But it is the history, I have tried to place before Society the historical perspective of Ram Katha in my article. I cannot say whether consciousness of Ram has increased among people after reading my article or not. I have been fascinated by Ram and Vaishnavdharm as well. The aim of my writing this article has been simply historical and nothing else. I participated in the conference held in Calcutta in 2001 but

Prof. R. S. Sharma did not participate in it. The Asiatic Society had called me in that conference to speak on Maurya Age. I have wrongly stated in my above statement that my article was published in "Actaorientalia" whereas it was actually published in "Indologica Tinnancia". This is a Journal of International Association of Sanskrit Studies. A number of my article have been published. These articles are on different topics. My articles do not pertain to this disputed structure. My book on "Caste" contained articles on various aspects of castes right from Vedic age to Arya Samaj movement of 19th century. I have not found any description wherein it has been stated that after 1206 there was a religious conversion in India. I do not know about Laxman Tila. I have not undertaken any special study on the history of Lucknow. I have not read that two mosques, which were very old and constructed in 1271 and 1368 respectively, were demolished in China. It is correct that my statement is partly based on my own personal knowledge and partly on my reading of reports of others. A number of temples were demolished in India during the rule of Muslims and even earlier also. It is wrong to say that I am giving false evidence at the instance of Prof. R.S. Sharma.

(Cross-examination concluded by R.L. Verma, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 3 of Nirmohi Akhara).

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-
S. Jaiswal
20.2.2001

Typed by the stenographer in open court as dictated by us .In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 22.02.2001.

Sd/-
20.2.2001

Dated : 22.02.2001

(In continuation of 20.2.200 I the statement on oath of Prof. Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. 18 begins)

(Cross examination on behalf of Dharma Das, defendant No. 13 by Shri Ved Prakash. Advocate).

The founder of Arya Samaj was Swami Dayanand. It is correct that he framed ten rules for Arya Samaj but I do not remember them now. It is correct that the first rule is Sab Saytya Vidya which means that all those things or objects which are known by Vidya (Knowledge) trace their origin to God - but I do not agree with this rule. His second rule pertains to the names of God and I do not agree with this also. It is a fact that the third rule of Arya Samaj propounds that the Vedas are books dealing the knowledge (Vidya) of all truth. Reading of and listening to Vedas is the main duty of Aryas. But I do not agree to this also. Fourth rule proclaims that one should always be ready to accept truth and give up untruth and I accept this, the fifth rule says that we should do everything according to Dharm i.e. after taking into account all aspects of truth and untruth in our acts and I agree with this also. The sixth rule says that doing good to others is the aim of the Society i.e. one should strive for 'physical, spiritual and social improvement and I agree with this also. I agree with the seventh rule also which states that "we should deal with all others affectionately in accordance with Dharma. I agree with the eighth rule also which says that 'we should denounce ignorance (Avidya) and encourage knowledge (vidya)'. The ninth rule says that 'one should not be satisfied only with his own progress but should have keen interest in the progress of all others in Society' and I agree with this also.

I agree with the tenth rule also which states that everybody should consider himself to be dependent for the compliance of the rule meant for the welfare of the whole society and independent for compliance of every benevolent rule.

It is correct that the word 'Dharm' is singular and not plural. But it is not fully correct to say that Dharm does not concern with the system of worship. I accept that the synonym of Dharm is not found in English. Urdu and Hindi languages. It is not correct that all great men introduced a system of worship. All systems of worship are not sect or faith. Panchratra system of worship pertains to Vaishnav sect. I do not remember other special systems of worship which are considered to be sect or faith. Islam is a Majhab. It is Dharam. Dharm is called Majhab also i.e. Dharm means Majhab also. I have said in my statement above that the synonym of Dharm is not available in any other language and I have now said that the meaning of Dharm is Majhab also - both these statements are correct. I have not read anything on Islam. I have heard that before Islam, idol worship was prevalent in Mecca but I have not read it. I cannot say that Islam was established with the view to destroying the system of idol worship. I did not consider it necessary to study the principles of Islam before giving my evidence.

It is correct that Maharshi Dayanand wrote 'Satyarth Prakash'. I had read this book in my childhood long ago. I cannot say at present correctly about what has been written in the 14th Chapter of this book.

(The learned pleader invited the attention of the witness on this issue to the 14th Chapter of the book 'Satyarth Prakash' of Swamy Dayanand and seeing it the witness stated that the writer would further throw light on the issue of Muslim faith but I do not remember as to what

has been written in the book in this regard. I had read this book in my childhood out of sheer curiosity and I cannot say whether I agreed to that or not. It is correct that as I do not have faith in God, it can particularly be said that I do not have any relationship with Arya Samaj. It is not correct to say that only communists do not have faith in God. There are many people in the world. who are not communists but even then they do not have faith in God. It is not correct to say that all those people who are with us or who have any contacts with us have no faith in God.

Discussion on the disputed structure was held at the Centre for Historical Studies, where I was working. Later on, we brought out a pamphlet jointly in a published form. We had probably gathered there for the discussions in the year 1985-86 or 1987. I do not remember the exact date. Shri S. Gopal, Miss Romilla Thapar, myself, Shri K. N. Pannikar. Shri Harivansh Mukhiya. Prof. Champak Lakshmi etc. participated in this discussion. All these were Professors. It is difficult to say now who initiated the discussion first of all in this gathering but this was a kind of general discussion wherein everyone participated. It is correct that everyone gathered there, expressed his/her views. I cannot say that any body gathered there had seen disputed structure or not. I also did not find it necessary or show any inquisitiveness to know whether any body had seen the disputed structure or not because we were confronted with a bigger question of presenting history in a wrong perspective. I did not have the curiosity to see the structure because the disputed structure pertained to the period later than the period of our special study. It is wrong to say that I said that our views did not carry any weight in this regard. I. myself had said that the question pertained to birth place of Ram. It is correct that the period of construction at a particular place is determined on the

basis of the views of a historian or archaeologist. I cannot say exactly in how many sittings the said discussions were held. During discussions we had some Specialists of medieval period in our midst who were referring to books while discussing things but there was no report of an archaeologist before us.

I do not remember whether any of our members in the meeting suggested that the disputed structure should either be inspected or photographed. The period of disputed structure was also discussed but I do not remember now the details of discussions. We discussed as to what else was constructed there but I do not remember the details thereof. We thought of expressing our views mainly on how history was being distorted. We were of the view that the first distortion which was being brought in history was that a particular place was being indicated as Ram's birth place, which is not a historical fact. Second distortion was that it was being said on the basis of hearsays that Vikarmaditya constructed temple at that place. Our colleagues who were Specialists of medieval period, were of the view that the opinion of Miss Bewerese in this regard was not correct and was based on stories which were related later on. I have not read the book of Bewerese and I will not be able to tell whether it has been mentioned in the book or not that the temple existed there. Only after going through the report, I shall be able to tell only after seeing the report that the disputed structure did not have any religious and cultural importance for the Muslims. I do not remember now whether there was any discussion on this topic or not. I have not seen any mosque from historical point of view.

I have not expressed any historical view about any other mosque besides the disputed structure. I will not be able to tell in yes or no that whether it would be justified or

not if the pillars erected at some places depicted the pictures of Gods and Goddesses and the Muslims forcibly took possession of them and tried to construct mosque over it. The Witness further stated that taking possession forcibly would be wrong. If the possession has been taken forcibly the views of Hindus would be hurt. I have read in the Historian Report to the Nation the mention of pillars at the disputed structure. As far as I remember. I had read that the pillars belonged to the different Centuries and not to one particular period. I do not remember which Centuries those pillars belonged to. The report mentioned that some pictures were carved on those pillars. I do not remember now whose pictures were carved on them and what was written in that report in this regard.

I know Professor Suraj Bhan. We do not doubt his ability. He is a famous archaeologist. I know his evidence was recorded in this case.

It is correct that Mohammed Saheb was against idol-worship. But I cannot say that whether he fought more than 100 wars or not to found Islam. May be that he might have instructed Muslims to accept only what has been written in Quran but I have not read any such thing.

I accept that Babar came from abroad. It is correct that he was a follower of Islam. He might have been against idol-worship.

I have heard the name of Somnath temple. It is a historical fact that Mohammad Gaznavi demolished Somnath temple. It is also a fact that he was a follower of Islam. He was against idol-worship.

It is also a fact and historical truth that the Muslims

demolished a number of temples in medieval period but I consider it to be half truth that non-acceptance of idol-worship were behind their feeling of demolishing the temples. What I mean by half truth is that they demolished temples just to plunder and loot. I cannot express my view as a historian whether their acts were right or wrong.

I have not seen the birth place of my parents and, therefore, I cannot say whether I shall be pleased to see it or not. It is correct that a person cannot tell about his birth place himself but his ancestors tell him about the birth place.

(The learned pleader drew the attention of the witness in this case to the description given in picture No.55 on page No.69 of the statement of P.W.-16. Shri Suraj Bhan) wherein he has stated that the age of the said pillar might be from 9th Century to 11th and 12th Century. He has said this and I shall accept his view.

If he has said that the "Ghatpallav" was carved out on the pillar and there is picture of a person over it and it may be correct. I can not say anything about what Shri Suraj Bhan has said with regard to the carving and picture on other pillars. I have heard that there should be no pictures of human beings or birds and animals on a mosque inside and outside of it but I have not read this thing. I have not heard that there was a picture of Varah God or pig on the disputed structure.

The existence of temples in India has been mentioned in literature in 2nd and 3rd Century B.C. but the remains that have been found belonged to Gupta period. No document has been found which may indicate as to what existed at the disputed site before Babri Masjid. By document, I mean

authentic document. I heard about the Babri mosque only when it was published in News Papers and not before that. I knew nothing about it. The use of Babri Mosque words came to my notice only when the lock was opened and the news was published in News Papers. I did not read about Babri mosque even thereafter. I did not investigate anything about it. I came here because I was asked to give evidence in this case and before that I had no idea as to why I was being called.

It is totally wrong to say that I knew before hand that there was temple at the disputed site and the mosque was constructed after demolishing the temple. Babri Mosque Action Committee' people did not see me in this regard.

I have no personal knowledge that whether Shri R. S. Sharma, who is my teacher, saw the disputed site or not, but I believe he might have seen it. I cannot say whether Prof. Sharma believes in God or not. Prof. Sharma is influenced by communism. Perhaps 'People's Publishing House' is the Publishing House of the Communist Party. J. N.U. report prepared by us was perhaps prepared earlier than the report of Shri R. S. Sharma. I do not remember whether my report was also published by 'People's Publishing House' or not. It is wrong to say that I have come to give evidence under the influence of 'Babri Mosque Action Committee'.

(Cross examination by Shri Ved Prakash, Advocate on behalf of Shri Dharm Das, defendant No.13 concluded).

(Cross examination by Shri Veereshwar Dwivedi. Advocate on behalf of Shri Umesh Chandra Pande defendant No. 22).

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

The translation of my book 'Origin and Development of Vaishnavism', in Hindi is correct and has been authenticated by me. The 'ism' in "Vaishnavism" which occurs at the end of the title of my book means both the 'V ad' and the 'Dharm'. In Hindi translation I thought it proper to use Vaishnav Dharm only. I agree with the definition of Dharm that 'whatever is adopted is Dharm'.

Question : With which part of the definition you do not agree?

Answer : Because this definition in my view is not complete, I consider it half definition. That is why I agree with this definition but I do not consider it as complete definition.

In my view this definition will be complete only if a number of things are added on it. One of the shortcomings in it is that it does not reflect the spirit of religion. Religion changes according to place, time and community and this definition does not include that. As a historian, I believe that the process of change has been running perennially. My research proves that the religion basically goes on changing. Religions are numerous and so their origins were also numerous. In my view, Dharm is no singular it can be plural. It can be plural according to context. I have rightly said earlier that all religions are singular and not plural. I have found such religions during the course of my research and search of knowledge wherein unadoptable things have been adopted. In ancient Vedic religion animal sacrifice has been described which I consider to be unadoptable.

Religion which speaks of animal sacrifice can, according to me, be kept under the definition of unadoptable religions. I do not know whether Islam speaks of animal sacrifice or not. Muslims celebrate Bakra Id festival. There is animal sacrifice in it. I consider animal sacrifice as unadoptable. Faith reflects one's thought process. Dharm is more comprehensive word, It is correct there may be different faiths in one religion. Panth Represents a sect or a community whereas Dharm is comprehensive term. Panth has Certain followers whereas faith can be individualistic also. There may be different Panths and Sects in a religion.

I find difference between religion and concept also. Concept means accepting a particular idea and faith or to contemplate it. But this is one part of the religion. I can accept 'Avadharana' as concept in English according to its context. In English, Avadharana can be called belief also. I do not remember other words at present. I consider idol-worship both as religion and concept.

It is correct that a person can be called a Hindu, whether he has faith in God or Dvaitvad or Vishishta Dvaitvad or 33 crore Gods and Goddess or he does not have any faith in God. Besides this, I do not remember any class on emotional stage. I consider all the above stated classes based on both concept and religion. The above stated four classes indicated by me are based on concept and behaviour. Vyavhar in other words can also be described as conduct and in English practice would be more proper word.

It is correct that people have been explaining the words-practice, belief, concept etc. from time to time. Those who explained the words practice, concept etc. had their followers also. It can be said that they gradually

developed a tradition. English translation of the word 'Parampara' is tradition. It is correct that the people who explained the word concept etc. they were known as the hero (Nayak) of their followers. It can be said that the hero who had larger following was called great hero (Mahanayak). In the religious field in India Ramanujacharya and Shankaracharya have been great heroes (Mahanayaks) who had large following. In India, Ram is the hero of the Story of Ramayana. I accept Ramayana as the Story of Ram. Ram has been called Synonymous of Vishnu. This concept would have developed in 1st or 2nd century A.D. I am satisfied with the concept that the Ram was accepted as an incarnation of Vishnu in 1st and 2nd century A.D. I did not find the proof whether Ram was worshipped at that time or not. I accept that "the popularity of Ram Katha and his oral status made Ram of Ikshwaku Dynasty as Bodhisatwa or most appropriate character for the role of Vishnu incarnation." Ram Katha is a meeting place of all the places of pilgrimage.

I do not remember the genesis of the word 'Truth'.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-
S.Jaiswal
22.02.2001

Typed by Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further Cross-examination be present tomorrow on 23.02.2001.

Sd/-
22.02.2001

Dated : 23.02.2001

(In continuation of 22.02.2001, statement on oath of Prof. Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. 18 continued).

The places connected with the events of Ram's life are considered pilgrimages. I cannot say whether the 'Tirth' has come from the root 'tri'. I do not know whether in Hindi there is 'Ref Ra' and 'paden ra". I do not know whether such words are used in English and Sanskrit languages.

The meaning of 'Yagna' may be to worship. I do not know what the word meaning of 'Yagna' is. I do not know whether the meaning of 'Yagna' is abandonment/ sacrifice or not.

Prayer means demanding something and Worship means adoration. Archana means offering something. Pooja, Archana and Prarthana do not completely mean the same thing. These words are not exactly the synonyms of one another. It is correct that prayer is offered to a person or power who is capable of providing relief. It is not entirely correct to say the qualities are worshipped. Prayer is offered even otherwise also. It is correct that demerits are not worshipped. It is also correct that persons devoid of merits are not worshipped. It is right that historians use the letters B.C.E. (Before Christian Era) and C.E. (Christian Era) with reference to the periods of history. The period of my research has been 200 B.C.E. to 500 C.E. My topic was Vaishnav Dharm. I did not try to know the etymology of the words 'Yagna', 'Dharm' and 'Tirth' as I did not consider it necessary. It is correct that I have a little knowledge of Sanskrit. I can understand something by reading original texts of Sanskrit. I studied Sanskrit text along with their

translated texts. During the course of my research, I found the description relating to Ayodhya in Raghuvansh, Ramayana, Bhagwat Puran and Vishnu Puran. I read the original texts of these scriptures. It is definite that I have read the original text of these scriptures. It is definite that I read the original text and understood them and I reached the conclusion after going through the original texts that a person having even little knowledge of Sanskrit can understand the meaning of shlokas of some extent.

Etymologically speaking the word 'Manavata' has been derived from the word 'Manu'. I have studied Manusmriti also. It is correct that Manu tried to establish the Class System on the basis of birth (Janmana Varna Vyavastha). I do not remember in which chapter of Manusmriti I read about class system on the basis of births (Janmana Varna Vyavastha). It is correct that Manu has stated somewhere in Manusmriti that a man is born as a 'Shoodra' by birth and gets elevated to different classes in accordance with his actions. Manu has also writtedn about conduct and behaviour of human beings in Manusmriti. He has prescribed the conduct and behaviour of human beings. I do not agree with the views of Manu with regard to conduct and behaviour. But I am definitely a humanitarian person.

I have mentioned in my statement a report titled 'To the Nation', brought out by historians. It is correct that this report was written by my teacher, Shri R.S. Sharma, Shri Athar Ali, Dr. D.N. Jha and Shri Suraj Bhan. The aforesaid report was submitted voluntarily to the nation by the aforesaid four historians. I had read that report. I can not say whether the aforesaid historians considered themselves to be impartial historians on the basis of the principle of Petitio Principii or not but it is correct that they submitted

the said report considering themselves to be independent historians. It is correct that the conclusion drawn on the basis of the said report is that Ram was not historical person. The said report also concludes that Ram temple did not exist on the disputed site. I do not know whether the report also concludes that a mosque existed at that place or not but I know only this much that the conclusion drawn from the report is that there purely existed a mosque tin the disputed site. I do not agree with the suggestion that all the aforesaid four historians were prejudiced even before writing the report.

I probably joined Patna University in my capacity as a research student first of all in 1959. Prof. R. S. Sharma was the head of history Department at that time. I was conferred Ph.D. in 1964. Ph.D. means 'Doctor of Philosophy' but I do not know its full form in Latin.

I came to J.N.U.. Delhi in 1971. I had published my book "The Origin and Development of Vaishnavism", in 1967. Its revised and enlarged version was published by me in 1980-81. The translated, amended and extended version of this book was published in 1996. An appendix was added in the translated version of the Hindi edition and an appendix 'A' was taken out from the enlarged edition of English of 1980-81 and the translated Hindi version was published in 1996. "Hercules and Dionysis" mentioned by me under caption' A' of appendix' A' were Greek Gods who were described by Megasthnese in his book. Greek Scholar Megasthnese had come to India as an ambassador of Greek administration which held its sway over Iran and Afghanistan. I do not believe that Magasthnese considered these two Greek Gods, viz.. 'Hercules and Dionysos' equivalent to Indian Gods, namely. Krishna and Shiva. Magasthnese did not mention Krishna and Shiva at all and

so there is no question of opposing the said comparative approach in this regard. Magasthenese did not name Indra also and did not consider him as equivalent to Hercules and, therefore, question does not arise of any comparison in this regard.

In appendix' A' to 1980-81 edition of my book in English. I have compared Krishna to Greek God Hercules and Baldev to Greek God Dionysis. The period of worship of Greek Gods Herculse and Dionysos was 6th Century B.C. It is correct that worship is a cult which grows gradually. It can be said that some person and power comes into existence first and is worshipped later on. As there was no academic importance of appendix' A' published in 1980-81 edition, the said appendix was omitted from the translated Hindi version of 1996 edition. It is correct that Krishna was the incarnation of Vishnu according to the belief of Vaishnavites. It is also correct that according to my view Sankarshan was one of the ten incarnations of Vishnu. It is wrong to say that I omitted appendix' A' from Hindi version out of prejudice so that Hindi speaking people may not come to know about my comparative method. It is also wrong to say that appendix' A' has been omitted from Hindi version because the views expressed in the aforesaid appendix do not match with my views expressed in my other Hindi books. I have myself made it clear that appendix' A' has been omitted simply because it was a review of some English book. It is correct to say that a new appendix titled "Ram Katha Ka Aitihāsik Vikas" was added to the book translated in Hindi and published in 1996

The new added appendix to the Hindi version of the book as 'Ram Katha Ka Aitihāsik Vikas' is appendix- 'A'. Jain Ramayans have been described in this appendix and

this does not occur in other Hindi books. Besides this, this appendix also mentions Ram Katha described in Bhagwat Puran. This appendix also refers to Bauddh scriptures. It is correct that I have used Bauddh scriptures in my other Hindi books also but the description which was left out has been mentioned in the said appendix. It is correct that I have described 'Dashrath Jatak' in my Hindi book. As the story of 'Dashrath Jatak' had to be supported with other sources, Dashrath Jatak has been described afresh in this appendix. It is not correct to say that the mention of Sita as the sister of Laxman has not been made in earlier book as has been given in appendix - 'A'. Similarly it has also been mentioned in appendix - 'A' in accordance with earlier description that Ram was the son of Dashrath born of his eldest queen and he was the King of Varanasi. Similarly, mention has been made in both the places that Sita was married to Ram.

I have mentioned Adbhut Ramayan in appendix - 'A' of Hindi version. This was a book, written in Kashmir. It is in Sanskrit language. The name of writer is not known. I consider it to be an authentic book written in the 9th century. The basis of considering it as authentic is that this book was written in 9th century.

It is correct that I consider all the books written in 9th century as authentic. It has been deduced on the basis of the research undertaken by research scholars that Adbhut Ramayan has been accepted as the work of 9th century. Considering it as authentic for one aspect of Ram Katha. I have quoted it in my book. It is correct that at page No.240 of appendix - 'A' of my book "Vaishnav Oharm Ka Udbhav aur Vikas". I have written as follows :- "According to Adbhut Ramayan written in Kashmir, the blood of Rishis and Muni was collected by Ravan in a pitcher and Mandodari drank

that blood and then gave birth to Sita", I perhaps wrote appendix - ' A ' of the Hindi edition of my book in 1991-92. I considered it necessary to describe the above mentioned events of birth and marriage of Sita in my book "Vaishnav Dharm Ka Udbhav aur Vikas". It would be right to say that I came to know about the description given in appendix - A. ' pertaining to Ram Katha during my research undertaken after 1967.

The word myth used by me in my statement is a synonym of English word mythology, it is correct that English word mythology is a combination of myth and logy, Myth means mythic and logy means science. Sometimes logy in Hindi becomes Synonym of Shastra. In my view mythology is not synonym of Dharm. I have no faith in God according to my own discretion. I do not accept the existence of God. I have no faith in the existence of English God and Muslim Khuda. I according to my wisdom do not believe in the existence of Khuda, God and Ishwar and consider them non-entity. On this basis I do not accept the messenger of Khuda and Prophet. Similarly I do not accept the Son of God also. In principle I do not accept Quran Sharif also as a book of God. I consider it to be an Imagination that Quran Sharif comprise the words of Allahtala.

Question : What do you consider those who propagate such myths?

Answer : I can not tell.

The concept that Holy Christ was the son of God of the is nothing but an imagination. I do not know by what name such a person, who propagates this concept, should be called.

Question : By what name would you like to call a person who consider Ram as an imaginary person and propagates as such?

Answer : In the present context who hold such views on the basis of authenticity are historians.

I have no knowledge of epigraphy. I do not know numismatics also. I do not know archaeology also. I am neither archaeologist nor numismatist, nor epigraphist. I do not possess special knowledge of architecture. It is also correct that I have very little knowledge about medieval history of India. The references I have given in my book with regard to architecture, epigraphy, numismatics and archaeology are based on other books and reports.

Besides studying Shri Suraj Bhan's report on archaeology, I have also studied the report published by the Archaeological survey of India which pertained to my subject. My subject was Vaishnav Dharm. My research-pertained to that I do not remember as to which archaeology pertaining to Vaishnav Dharm was referred to by Prof. Suraj Bhan in his report. The report of Archaeological Survey of India is brought out periodically. I have read about ruins of temples found in Gupta period in the report of the Archaeological Survey of India. I have not read about the ruins of any temple related Vaishnav Dharm in the report of Archaeological Survey of India. The ruins that I have read about in the report of the Archaeological Survey of India were other than those of Ayodhya. For example, I had read about the ruins of Bhitargaon. Bhitri Ghazipur District and Devgarh Jhansi. There is a brick temple of Vishnu in Bhitargaon. It is correct that some remains of temples have been found in Bhitari District Ghazipur. Stone inscription was also found there. It is also correct that Sarang Vishnu has been mentioned in that

inscription. This inscription is considered to belong to the period of Skand Gupta. Gupta Samvat (Calendar year) was introduced in Gupta period also. I do not remember as to which Gupta Calendar year the inscription found in Bhitri Ghazipur belong to. It can not also be recollected as to which Christian era the said inscription belonged to. This inscription is on a Suphia Shila. I have read the book Pratima Natak. The author of this book is poet Bhas. It is wrong to say that this book contains the description of Vishnu temple in Ayodhya. This book is in Sanskrit language. The period of this book is 3rd Century A.D.

It is correct that the King Dhan Dev of Shung dynasty had put up a stone inscription at Ranopali in Ayodhya in memory of his father Faju Dev. There is no mention that King Dhan Dev got Kevan temple constructed over there. I do not remember whether King Dhan Dev mentioned Vishnu on the inscription in Ranopali or not. He might have mentioned it but I do not remember. The inscription of Ranopali belonged to 1st Century B.C. as far as I remember. It is correct that this inscription of Ranopali has been mentioned in some books. I do not remember whether the word Kaushladhipen has been mentioned in the said inscription. I have heard the name of Dr. Shri Ram Goel. Dr. Shri Ram Goel might have, in his book, 'Compilation of Ancient Indian Documents' Vol. I described the said inscription of Ranopali. I have heard the word Goptar. This place is situated In Ayodhya. It is correct that the said place has been mentioned in 'Raghubansh' the poetic work of Kali Das. It is correct that Lord Ram disappeared from the place known as 'Goptar' according to the views of Vaishnavites. It is also correct that river Saryu flows from this place. It is also correct that the description of Ram's birth has been given in Raghuvansham of Kali Das. I have not studied the

Narsimha Puran but I have read the inscription of Narsimhapuran given by the scholar, Shri R.C. Hazra. Shri Hazra indicated eight or ninth Century A.D. as the period of Narsimhapuran. I can not say with certainty that Shri Hazra fixed the period of Narasimhapuran as sixth or seventh Century of Christian Era. In my view, Shri Hazra has not indicated the existence of 10 temples in Ayodhya in his description of Narasimhapuran. I do not remember whether he has indicated the existence of one or two temples. I have not read the book 'Gaun Vadu Baho' written by poet Vakpat Raj. It is correct that the book Gaun Vadu in Sanskrit is a translation of Gaun Baho. I have not read this book. I do not know whether it contains the mention of the Town of Harischandra. It is correct that Harischandra is connected to the lineage of Lord Ram and is considered his ancestor. I do not know whether Ram is called Keshav also. I have read Matsyapuram but I do not recollect whether the method of constructing temples has been described in it. It can be right to say that the method of constructing temples might have been mentioned in Matsyapuram. I have studied Vishnu Dhamotarpuram a little. It is correct to say that it contains description regarding Ayodhya and also regarding iconography.

I have read complete Bhagwat Puran and also some portions of Skandh Puran. It is correct that the Bhagwat Puran and Skandh Puran contain the description of existence of Ayodhya on the bank of River Saryu but I do not remember that Padma Puran also contains such description. It is correct that some Bauddh Scriptures describe the existence of Ayodhya on the bank of River Saryu. Perhaps Anamak Jatak is such a Bauddh scripture which describes the existence of Ayodhya on the bank of River Saryu but I do not remember it correctly. No other Bauddh scripture has come to my notice which has

described the existence of Ayodhya on the Bank of Saryu

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

S. Jaiswal

23.02.2001

Typed by the Stenographer in open court as dictated by us . In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 19.03.2001.

Sd/-

23.2.2001

Dated: 19.03.2001

(In continuation of 23.02.2001, statement on oath of Prof. Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. 18 begins)

It is true that I have written in my book that Ram was accorded recognition as incarnation of Vishnu in the preliminary Centuries of Christian Era. By preliminary centuries I mean first and second century A.D. I have used the word cult adequately and I understand it. In my view. the definition of the word cult is that it means the prayer or the innovation of a particular thing or person. Some times the word cult includes the worship of a particular principle i.e. the faith in that principle. It is correct that the word culture has been derived form the word cult i.e. these words are inter-connected. It is a fact that if an act is performed regularly and continuously, it takes the form of cult. It is right to say that Ram was recognised as incarnation of Vishnu in the first and second century A.D. but before that he existed as a Hero of Ram Katha. I

understand the word gospel- Christians use this word very often. I do not know exactly whether by the word gospel WC mean the word which occurs in the first four books of 'New Testament' of Jesus Christ. I can not tell exactly but it is my presumption that these four books contain the story pertains to the life of Jesus Christ. I do not know the meaning of Hadees in Islam. I know about the Jatak stories of Bauddh faith. One of them is known as Dashrath Jatak which I have described in detail in my book. It was related by the disciples of Mahatma Budh himself. It is wrong to say that I have accepted these stories as gospel truth. The story of Ram has been given in Dashrath Jatak. I know what has been stated is that there was a city named Banaras in Bauddh period. Banaras or Varanasi is the same city. I can not tell exactly when Banaras became Varanasi. There was no city known as Banaras during the prevalence of the period of Bauddh Dharma. Before the advent of Bauddh religion(Dharma), the story of Ram was already there. The original copy of Dashrath Jatak is in Pali. Its English translation contains the description of Banaras city and the King of that place has been described as Dashrath and the story concludes as follows:-

“Years sixty times a hundred, and ten thousand more,
all told,
Reigned strong-armed Rama on his neck the lucky
triple fold.”

The Master having ended this discourse, declared the Truths, and identified the Birth: (now at the conclusion of the Truths, the land-owner was established in the fruit of the First Path:). “At that time the kind Sudclhodana was king Dashratha. Mahamaya was the mother, Rahula's mother was Sita, Ananda was Bharata, and I myself was Rama- Pandita.”

In my view this translation is correct. It is correct that according to this story Mahatma Budh had considered himself to be the incarnation of Ram.

I have considered Dashrath Jatak authentic as a source of history. I have accepted stories of Ram also authentic as a source of history. Dashrath Jatak and stories pertaining to Ram are my primary sources.

In my view humanity is an abstract noun in English. The word 'Bhavukta' (sentimentality) has been derived from the word 'Bhav' (sentiment). I do not accept the principle of Bhavukta [sentimentality]. It would not be correct to say that I have written my book 'Vaishnav Dharm Ka Udbhav, Vikas' in a sentimental mood. I have not written that Lord Buddha expressed himself as an incarnation of Ram in Appendix ' A ' which I have added to my book. I have described Ram as Bodhi Sattva. I do not accept Mahatma Buddha as God. I do not have faith in incarnation also. It can not be said that because I do not accept God or incarnation, I have not mentioned in Appendix ' A' that Mahatma Buddh was the incarnation of Ram. I have further stated myself that I have deduced from this story that Ram has been accepted as the Bodhi Sattva. While writing a book I refer to the various such books the names of whose writers are not known to me. I consider such books also as an authentic source of history. The authenticity of such books depends on the analysis of their language and contents. I draw historical conclusions about such books on this basis. I have accepted Adbhut Ramayan as a source on the basis of its language and contents.

There are authentic sources with regard to the existence of Buddha and so I have accepted it. The

existence of Ram is only in the form of a story and therefore I have accepted it as such. I have never been to Faizabad or Ayodhya. I have never seen the disputed structure also. Mahatma Buddh was born at Lumbini Gram in Kapilvastu. I have not gone to that place also. Kapilvastu exists even today but I do not know the name of that city. It might be called some village. Besides Jatak Stories, there are Tripitak scriptures to acquaint oneself with Baudh Dharma and several other books have also been written on this, topic thereafter. Tripitak was not written originally in the Chinese language but it was written in the Pali language. I have not read the whole of Tripitak but have read it partly. A part of Tripitak is 'Dirgh-Nikay' which I have read. Tripitak means three baskets. First Tripitak is known as Abhidhamm Pitak, Second is known as Vinay Pitak and the third I do not remember. These Tripitaks were also not written by Mahatma Buddh but were written by his disciples later on. I have read a number of stories about Ram also which were written afterwards. I have considered equally authentic the stories written about Buddha and about Ram also afterwards. I have studied the stories of Ram in Dashrath Jatak. Balmiki Ramayan, Tulsi Ramayan, Jain Ramayan etc. I have read the Ramayana of Vimal Suri and the Ram Katha of Gunabhadra. These are not only stories but are the sources of history. In spite of having read all these stories of Ram, I am not convinced about the existence of Ram.

It is not correct to say that I have not understood these stories properly because their language and contents are not correct.

It is wrong to say that I am making a statement on this subject out of prejudice.

I know this that Mohammed Saheb was a historical personality. There is doubt whether Holy Christ was historical personality or not. I accept the existence of

Islamic cult and Christian cult. People who have been following the teachings and conduct of Holy Christ till today are considered the followers of Christian Cult. Similarly the people who have been following the teachings and Conduct of Mohammed Saheb are considered the followers of Islamic Cult. I understand the difference between Vaishnav Cult and Shaiva Cult. Both of these form part of Hindu religion. Ram is known as the greatest man upholding human dignity (Maryada Purushottam). It is correct that we are taught to follow the Conduct of Ram. Holy Christ has been pronounced as the son of God. Prophet Mohammed has been termed as the divine messenger. Ram has been termed as the incarnation of God. I do not consider these three views as correct. I did not read the History of Islam before reading about prophet Mohammed and also the History of (Christianity before reading about Christ. I have not read the books in this regards wherein it has been slated that the ancestors of Mohammed Saheb were mentioned among the ancestors of Holy Christ.

I have been studying about ancient religion and the society as my subject since 1960. I have written an article on Shri Ram which has now become part of a book. There is no other article as a separate. I stated in the beginning of my statement that I wrote some articles on Ram. I said this because one of my articles is still in the process of being published. The publisher of my book in English were M/s Munshi Ram Manohar Lal publisher of Delhi. I have not heard the name of Kanhaiya Lal Shrivastav, the Historian of Banaras Hindu University. I have heard the name of Dr. Hiralal Singh, He was the Professor of BHU. It is correct that I have stated that I have nowhere read that Babri Mosque was constructed after demolishing Ram Temple. I have not heard the name of Dr. Aziz Ahmad, the historian.

The Advocate of cross examiner Shri Dwivedi read a portion of page 117 of the book "The position of Hindu

under the Delhi Sultanat - 1526" authored by Kanhaiya Lal Shrivastav and filed a photocopy of the said page of the book as paper No. C2/192. [The witness after having read it said that she had not read it but she had discussed about it. I do not agree with the opinion expressed by Dr. Aziz Ahmad, the historian in this book. The basis of my disagreement is not archaeological. But she again stated that it is archaeological and not epigraphical and numismatical]. She again said it is epigraphical also. Besides this, the basis of disagreement is as follows:- The conclusion of Dr. Aziz is based on the hearsays mentioned in the Gazetteer only. This is the reason of my disagreement. I have not read the book of Dr. Aziz Ahmad but it was discussed in the Department. I have not described the said discussion any where in my book. This was discussed in our department by the specialists of Medieval period of our department when a pamphlet on abuses of history was being prepared in our department. It is correct that I accepted the view expressed in that discussion but I have neither read any book nor have I written any thing on that subject. *Epigraphia Indica* is a journal of Archaeological Survey of India, which publishes authentic document. This journal brings out write ups on documents which are authentic.

Out of the 10 incarnations which I have mentioned in my book, one is Narsimha incarnation which preceded Ram incarnation. There was one Sankarshan Balram incarnation. This incarnation and Krishna incarnation followed Ram incarnation. Vaman incarnation preceded Ram incarnation. According to myths, Sankarshan (Balram) incarnation preceded the advent of Kaliyug. Ram incarnation had taken place about 15 Lakh years before Sankarshan (Balram) incarnation.

I have written an article on Narsimha incarnation also. I have not mentioned the period of Narsimha incarnation in

that article but only indicated as to when it has been mentioned. It is partly correct that our opinions are based on traditions. But this is wrong to say that if traditions change, the opinions also change. Traditions are not perennial but it is correct that some traditions persist while others do not. It is correct that after sometime these traditions become the faith of a particular class.

It is correct that I have stated in this court earlier that 24 Vyuhs of Vishnu have been mentioned. It is also correct that Vishnu has been described as Narayan Vishnu also. "Panchratra" is a sect of Vaishnavites which had faith in 24 Vyuhs of Vishnu. I have mentioned in my book four Vyuhs of Vishnu through Panchratra and have mentioned 24 Vyuhs in my statement and both these things are correct. In the beginning four vyus were accepted but the later codes (Sanhitas) mentioned 24 Vyuhs. These four vyus did not become 24 from 1981 to 2001 but this change occurred after Gupta period i.e. much before 1981 (The learned advocate cross-examining drew the attention to the book -- the origin and Development of Vaishnavism" - 200 B.C. to 500 A.D. written by the witness). On seeing the book the witness said this book of mine was published in 1981. I have not mentioned 24 Vyuhs in that book because one does not find proof of it after Gupta period. It is correct that these four Vyuhs were conceptualised from 200 B.C. to 500 A.D. I did not consider to mention this thing in my book because these four vyuhs became 24 vyuhs in course of time. As far as I remember the appendix - ' A ' of my Hindi book "Vaishnav Dharm Ka Udbhav Aur Vikas" - 200 B.C. to 500 B.C. was written in eighties. The English Edition of this book was revised and published in 1981. As Appendix - ' A ' of the Hindi book was not written upto 1981, it could not be included in the revised English Edition. Appendix - 'A' contains Some additional sources which were not in the original book and so Appendix. - ' A ' has been added to the

Hindi book. It is wrong to say that I was inspired by politics to add Appendix – 'A' to my book. It is wrong to say that I have done this because of my disenchantment with any political party. It is not correct to say that the concluding sentence of Appendix - 'A'. "But the endeavour of our Bharatiya Janta Party of making Ram as unitary symbol of Hindu Nationalism has been inspired by politics rather than by religion" has been written out in any prejudice by me. I have myself stated that it is only an attempt to put history in its proper perspective. It is correct that Bharatiya Janta Party had not come into existence till 500 A.D. But I considered it necessary to write that sentence as Historian. I have myself stated that the aforesaid sentence is the translation of a portion of that article and occurs only in that Appendix and not in the original book. As there was no context, I have not mentioned parties which had no prejudice. It is wrong to say that the mention of 24 Vyuhs was not relevant in my book, the article was written by me and Appendix - 'A' is its translation. The article was perhaps written in later eighties. I do not remember the exact date. Uttar Pradesh might have been under Shri Mulayam Singh's Govt. at that time. In my view written literature also comes under the sources of History. Oral literature is also a source of History. Archaeological source is an additional source. There are various other sources also. The writing of Indian History started with Harappan age i.e, from 3000 B.C. We can not say definitely about the script or the language of that time as it has not been deciphered. Seals have been found of that time which bear the script on the basis of which it can be said that writing has been started from that time. The symbols and the line on those seals lead one to the conclusion that something has been written on them. Although it can not be deciphered, several archeologists, such as. I Mahadevan, Asko Parpola tried to decipher the script on those seals. I

read the name of N. Jha in newspapers but he is not a historian. Shri S.R. Rao who is an Archaeologist, also tried to decipher them. After Harappan age some documents were found of 3rd and 4th Century B.C. which were deciphered by I Mahadeven. They were in Brahmi Script and Prakrit language. There are Ashokan Documents were found which are in Prakrit language and the script of these documents is Brahmi. Kharoshthi and Aramic. In these documents we find Ashokan edicts. The stone inscriptions found before the time of Ashoka pertained to Jain caves and these inscriptions were in such a bad conditions that only one or two words could be deciphered from them. Stone inscriptions have also been found in Kaushambi. These have been deciphered by people. These documents belong to the period of Ashoka and are in Brahmi script and Prakrit language. In my view it is not correct to say that the inscription of Kaushambi relates to Ram Katha. I have heard the name of Shri Ajay Mitra Shastri who is a Historian and an Epigraphist. Shri Ajay Mitra Shastri deciphered many documents and mentioned them in books. I have heard the name of Shri B. C. Shukla and I have not read his book "The Earliest Inscription of Ram Worship". I have not heard the name of this book. I have read Shri Ajay Mitra Shastri's book on Varah Mihir. There is no other description of any document in that book. It is not correct to say that I have not read any book pertaining to documents or inscriptions. I have read the book "Select Inscriptions" written by Shri D.C. Sarkar. This book deals with documents and inscriptions. This book contains documents ranging from 3rd Century B.C. to 10th Century A.D. There are inscriptions also in this book but I do not know the details of those inscriptions. These inscriptions were important and relevant with regard to origin and development of Vaishnav Dharm. I have mentioned them in my book. The witness after having seen her book, which is

in English stated that the foot Note - 5 on page 186 of her book mentions the documents of Sarkar's book and not the inscription. The document mentioned in foot note No.2 on page 189 of the same book is the inscription. This inscription tells about Garud Dhvaj which occurs in honour of Vasudev. This belongs to second Century B.C. I have mentioned Vasudev Bhagwat several times in my book. He was the presiding deity of Bhagwat Sect. Mahatma Buddha or his disciples or the Rulers of that time did not use the word Garud in Buddh scriptures. There is no coin or Dhvaj of Buddha's life time wherein Garud has been portrayed. In my view his disciples did not inscribe Garud on any stone, Cloth or coin. As far as I know Ashok or any other ruler having faith in Baudh Dharm, has not inscribed Garud on any stone, cloth, coin or flag. The inscription or document of Sarkar Saheb describing Garud as mentioned in my book pertain to Vaishnav Dharm. Sarkar Saheb has stated that Vasudev is God of Gods. In other words he is the presiding deity. This document pertains to the period of Shung Raja Bhag Bhadra. Shung period was second century B.C. It is correct that Vasudev was held in high esteem in the 2nd century B.C. It is correct that the tradition of the worship of Vasudev would have been in vogue even earlier also and would have been depicted later on. I have heard the name of Taxila. It is correct that there was University over there in ancient times. I can not say whether this was the first University of the World or not. I can not tell this also that Taxila University existed in 700 B.C. and was a centre of education. I do not have any proof to show that students from all over the world came to this University for study. There was no discussion in our department on this topic. Since I have not read the ancient history of other countries, I will not be able to tell whether there was any centre of education in any other country before Taxila University. I know about Nalanda University. It belonged to 4th or 5th

century A.D. It would be wrong to say that the period of Nalanda University was 4th century B.C. The people connected with Taxila University knew the language but it can not be said with certainty whether they knew the script also. That is why I may not tell whether knowledge was imparted orally or in writing in this University. Nalanda University imparted knowledge both orally and in writing. Before Nalanda Gurukul tradition was prevalent and knowledge was imparted both in writing and orally. Gurukul tradition has been in vogue since 1000 B.C. I have tried to know about the language and the script which was prevalent in Gurukul and I have studied about it. I have read the books "Vedic Age" and "Age of Imperial" only on this subject. Both of these books have been edited by Shri R.C. Majumdar and Shri A.D. Pusalkar and several distinguished Historians have contributed articles for these books. I have read this book before: writing my own book.

I have read Narsimha Puran, Bhagwat Puran and Vishnu Puran. I have studied Vedas also in order to know about ancient History of India. I have not read in any Puran that "Place" would be worshiped in Kaliyug. I have read the portions of Rigveda. Atharv Veda and Yajurveda and a little portion of Sam Ved.

I have read that portion of Atharv Veda which describes Ayodhya. I consider these Vedas as religious scriptures. But I do not consider them as Dharm Shastra. In Bauddha Dharm there is a pitak Suttpitak in Tripitak. Suttpitak is a religious book which I do not consider as Dharm Shastra or Dhuarmsutra. Suttpitak is available in Pali language. In Pali the word 'Sutt' has been used for 'Sutra' The Sutras of Bauddh Dharm have been given the Suttpitak. Vinaypitak is not concerned with life of Mahatma Buddh but is related to his words. It is wrong to say that Ahbidhamm Pitak is related to Bauddh Sanghils but it is correct to say that it relates to Bauddh Dharm. It is wrong

to say that Vinaypitak. Suttpitak and Abbidhamm come one after the other respectively. According to me Suttpitak proceeds Vinaypitak which is followed by Abbidhamm pitak. It is wrong to say that my this statement that Sutra is not the compilation of Sutta Pitk is false. Vedas are religious scriptures and there is no code of conduct in them. Although Ved Samhitas are there. Samhita means collection. Rigveda is a collection of Richas. By and large the Rigveda comprises the eulogy of Gods. It contains eulogy of various Gods such as Indra, Agni, Son, Varun, Vayu etc. (do not agree that the sources of human energies such as Agni, Vayu etc. should be worshipped. In order of preference Rigveda comes first which is followed by Yajurveda then comes Sam Veda and Athana Veda comes in the last. This is traditional order of preference and not the historic one. In the historical sequence Rigveda is followed by Atharv Veda which in turn is followed by Yajurveda and Sam Ved comes in the last. The Richas given in the Vedas have been written by human beings. Each of the Richas given in Rigveda has been written by different writers. The first Richa relates to the worship of Agni and the name of the writer has not been given. The writer of Varun Richa is also not known. I do not know the writers of Richas pertaining to Vayu and Bhoomi.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suvira Jaiswal

19.03.2001

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 20.03.2001.

Sd/-

19.3.2001

Dated : 20.03.2001

(In continuation of 19.03.2001, statement on oath of Prof. Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. 18 begins)

I did my M.A. in 1953. I got my degree of Ph.D. in 1964. The topic of my thesis in P.Hd. was 'Origin and Development of Vaishnavism from 200 B.C. to 500 A.D: After Ph.D. the first edition of my first book on this topic was published in 1957. I was promoted to the post of Professor in 1984. It is a fact that till 1984 besides this book, no other book was published by me. But some of my articles were published. My examiner for Ph. D. was Shri A.L. Basham. Dr. R.S. Sharma was the Head of my Department at that time. Dr. R.S. Sharma also got the Degree of Ph.D. under the guidance of Shri A.L. Basam. It is not correct to say that after Dr. R.S. Sharma shifted to Delhi. I also came to Delhi. The fact is that I came to Delhi before him. It is also wrong to say that afterwards he came to this University where I was already teaching. Prof. Sharma was the Head of Department in Delhi University. Delhi University is an affiliating and residential University. I have heard the name of Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra. He has given evidence in this case earlier. I know that Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra is the Reader in Delhi University and I do not know in which college he is teaching. Miss Romila Thapar. Shri K.L. Pannikaar and Dr. S. Gopal were with me in the Jawahar Lal Nehru University. Sarva Palli is the part of Dr. Gopal's name and not epithet. It is wrong to suggest that we had formed a team out of prejudice and published pamphlets and documents. It is correct that all articles were not published in book form but were brought out in the form of pamphlets for propagation. This was done because issues relating to History were being discussed. I have not written any thing about the History of Kashmir I do

not know if others have written on this topic. Possibly Dr. Gopal might have written on this topic. Dr. Gopal used to write on such topics. As Dr. Gopal is an expert on contemporary history, we can draw the inference that he might have written on this topic. I have not written any thing about the History of Hyderabad. I have not written any thing on dismantling statues in Afghanistan so far and I have not collected any material on this topic. It is correct to say that History is being destroyed in Afghanistan. I have written article on class system of contemporary History. I have been bringing out such articles from eighties. It is correct to say that the class system in my view is a problem of contemporary History.

I do not consider Manu as a person of contemporary History. But I consider him relevant. It will be wrong to say that I am making a false statement on this topic in this edition.

The second edition of the Hindi translation of my book "Vaishnav Dharm Ka Udbhav Aur Vikas" was published in 1996. This is entirely amended and enlarged edition of the first edition of my book. The material obtained from up-to-date researches in this field has been utilized.

Sh. Ajay Mitra Shastri hails from Nagpur. He was the head of the department of Ancient History in Nagpur University. It is a fact that he is considered as a very knowledgeable person in epigraphics and numismatics. I have heard the name of Sh. B. C. Shukla. I have not seen the earliest inscriptions of Ram. I have not read any of his articles on this topic. I do not know that any article or stone inscriptions pertaining to the worship of Shri Ram was found in Kaushambi. I have no knowledge of this so far. As I do not know anything about it, I will not be able to tell

whether any document or stone inscription was found in Kaushambi wherein Shri Ram has been quoted as Ram Narayan. I know that Indian Archaeological Society is an institution which brings out journals from time to time wherein articles of renowned historians are published. The learned pleader drew the attention of the witness to paper number 118-C-160 filed in original Suit No. 5/89 and read out para-3 and footnote 7 and the witness read it herself also and said that she accepted that Ram was considered as the incarnation of Narayan in 2nd century.

The writer has written in this article that the inscription could not be deciphered fully but it seemed that it belonged to the middle of the second century. I have not seen this article. I have not written any thing about this in my book published in 1996. It is correct that as a historian I had no knowledge of this document till 1996. It is also correct to say that I did not know any thing about this document till I read it. I go through the documents which are related to my work and are published in the journal brought out by Indian Archaeological Society. It is correct to say that I confine myself to my work only. It is not right to say that this article was of no use to me.

The two terms I have used in my book are Ram Katha and Ram puja and out of them Ram Katha preceded Ram puja. According to me, Ram puja started from Gupta period where as Ram Katha started in 4th century B.C. My belief is based on Dashrath Jatak and Balmiki Ramayan. It is not correct to say that Balmiki described Sita as the sister of Ram in his Ramayan. Sita has been shown as the wife of Ram in Balmiki Ramayana. It is correct that Balmiki described Sita as the daughter of Janak in his Ramayana. Jains have several Ramayans. According to some historians the first Ramayan of Jains was written in first

century A.D. whereas some other say that it was written in 4th Century A.D. It is not correct that Jain Dharm came into prominence, after 24th Tirthankar. In my view Jain Dharm came into light from the time of 23rd Tirthankar who was named Parshwa Nath. Possibly he might have lived some 50 or 100 years before the 24th Tirthankar. Bauddh literature was compiled after 100 years of the death of Mahatma Budh. It is correct that Mahavir Jain and Mahatma Buddh were contemporary.

Question: Is first Jain Ramayan and Bauddh literature contemporary?

Answer: Buddh literature had started earlier and Jain Ramayan was written after wards.

The name of the father of 24th Tirthankar Mahavir was Siddhartha who was not a King but was a Chief of a Republic. Similarly, Mahatma Buddh also was the son of a Chief of a Republic. It is correct that both Buddha and Jain enjoyed the patronage of Kings from time to time. In my view, Vaishnav Dharn did not precede Jain and Buddha Dharam.

There were a number of religions in India before Bauddh and Jain Dharam. Vedic dharm was the most famous among them and God were worshipped in several ways in this religion. There were a number of Gods who were worshipped. Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh were prominent among them. The worshippers of Vishnu were neither called Vaishnav nor Shaiv nor Smarta. They were not addressed by a particular name.

No Vishnu Hari Temple has been found so far according to archaeological investigation but Vishnu Hari temple has been described in Ayodhya Mahatmya. Ayodhya

Mahatmya is part of Skand Puran. It is correct that geographical situation of Ayodhya has been described in Ayodhya Mahatmya. No stone inscription has been found in Ayodhya with regard to Vishnu Hari temple. It would be wrong to say that I am hiding the truth deliberately on this topic. I have myself stated that the so called inscription which is reported to have been found there is very doubtful. By so called I mean that the inscription is there but what is suspected is that whether the inscription was found in Vishnu Hari temple. The learned pleader drew the attention of the witness to Page No. 62 to 66 of Paper No. 254C-I filed in original Suit No. 5/89. After having seen and read this the witness stated that this started with the prayer of Shiva and went up to the period of Govind Chand. It tells about the Vishnu Hari temple which had a golden Kalash.

Birth place has been mentioned in the interpolated portion of Ayodhya Mahatmya. In my view it is interpolated portion because while describing Saryu, birth place is mentioned all of a sudden. It is correct that besides birth place, nothing else has been interpolated. It is wrong to say that I am making a false statement on this subject. The learned pleader drew the attention of the witness to Paper No.107C-1/75 filed in original Suit No. 5/89 and the witness after having read Page 73 answered that Shlok No. 13,14 and 15 described the benefits after taking bath in Saryu river. Shlok No. 16 throws light on the situation of Vighneshwar. Shlok No. 17 describes the importance of seeing Vighneshwar with reverence and the benefits flowing there from. Shlok No. 18 throws light on the situation of Ram Janambhoomi from Vighneshwar. Shlok No. 19 throws light on direction of Janmsthan from Vighneshwar, Vashistha and Lomas. Shlok No. 20 describes the benefits of seeing Vighneshwar and these Rishis with reverence. Shlok No.21 describes the benefits

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10866-10867 OF 2010

IN THE MATTER OF:

MOHD. SADDIQ (D) THROUGH LRS.

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

MAHANT SURESH DAS & ORS. ETC.

...RESPONDENTS

STATEMENTS OF P.Ws

P A P E R B O O K

**VOLUME-XXIII
(PAGES 5501-5750)**

FOR INDEX KINDLY SEE INSIDE

**KAMLENDRA MISHRA
ADVOCATE FOR THE RESPONDENT/STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH**

I N D E X

VOLUME-XXIII **(PAGES 5501-5750)**

Sr. No.	Particulars	Pages
59.	A true translated copy of the statement of PW-18 Prof. Suvira Jaiswal.	5501-5565
60	A true translated copy of the statement of PW-19 Maulana Atiq Ahmed	5566-5629
61	A true translated copy of the statement of PW-20 Prof. Shirin Musavi Continued in Volume-XXIV	5630-5750

of seeing (them with reverence) after taking bath on the day of Navami. Shlok No. 22, 23, 24 and 25 describe the benefits of bathing, worship and staying in Ashram.

It is correct to say that after having read it I reached the conclusion that the birth place has been described in any interpolated portion. It is not correct to say that I have reached to this conclusion out of prejudice. It is also not right to say that because of this I have not considered it proper to mention Ayodhya Mahatmya in my book. As Ayodhya Mahatmya was written much later I did not consider it necessary to mention it in my book. Ayodhya Mahatmya was written before 1981. It is correct that I published my book in 1981. I had started writing it as my research thesis in 1962 and its first edition was brought out in 1967 and 2nd edition was published in 1981. I had come to know this fact in 1960 that Ayodhya Mahatmya forms part of Skand Puran. It is correct that I did not consider it necessary to mention Ayodhya Mahatmya critically in my book. Since it was " work of much later years vis-a-vis my research work, I have not thought it proper to mention it. It is not correct to say that my aforesaid statement to the effect that I came to know about Ayodhya Mahatmya in 1960 was wrong. My this statement is also correct that the said work was written much after my research work. It is also correct that I did not consider it proper to mention Ayodhya Mahatmya in my amended and enlarged edition. It is also right that I did not find it appropriate to add any appendix in this regard in my Hindi book. It is also correct that I considered it necessary to write the last sentence of appendix - ' A ', although it did not belong to the period of my research.

Babri Masjid came into existence after the period of my research. I have not mentioned it in my book as to when

Babri Masjid came into existence. I did not consider it necessary. As far as I know I have not mentioned Babri Masjid in my book. I considered it necessary to mention it in my statement that there was no temple at the place where Babri Masjid existed. I had not done any investigation with regard to Babri Masjid before writing my book. I have neither gone to that place nor have I measured it. My aforesaid statement to the effect that there was no temple at the place where Babri Masjid existed is my own personal view. It is correct to say that I am making this statement on oath about Babri Masjid without any investigation and not on the basis of my knowledge but on the basis of my point of view. It would be wrong to suggest that my this statement is also prejudiced.

It is correct that the word Ayodhya occurred in Atharva Ved. The word Ayodhya has been used in the context of a city. In my view it is imaginary. I have not done any research work on Atharva Ved so far but I had used some of its portions in my book. I have done research on those portions of Atharva Ved which I have used in my book.

The period of Atharv Ved is 1000 B.C. While describing Ayodhya in Atharva Ved, Nav Dwar has been mentioned which is not supported by archaeology. And therefore I am in agreement with those scholars who hold that the description of Ayodhya is imaginary. In my view there was habitation in present Ayodhya before 700 B.C. I have studied archaeological write-ups in this regard. As I am not a field archaeologist, I have drawn my conclusions after studying archaeological writings. I studied archaeology by studying archaeologists reports. I did not study the subject of archaeological. In the field but at home and in the University. It is correct that I have read it in the

books that some times there were populated settlements and afterwards they turned into jungles and again populated settlements cropped up over there and this process continues. It is also correct to say that settlements get destroyed by earth quakes, rivers change their course, hills change into river beds and vice-versa. I have read about Saraswati valley project. Earlier there was no river, afterwards there was a river which dried up later. On the basis of the archaeological report produced by Prof. B.B. Lal I stated that there was no settlement in Ayodhya before 700 B.C. It means that there is proof that the settlement existed after 700 B.C. and not before that. The said report of Shri B. B. Lal was published. I do not know whether Shri B.B. Lal said that he could not complete his report in this regard because of investigation work but this he has not said in his report.

In the word "Dhirodatta" used by me in my book, Dhir means serious and Udatt means compassionate. This word expresses the qualities of Hero. By Hero I mean a Hero in poetry or in an article. It is correct that there are heroes in societies also. I consider Shri Ram, as a character only. This is partly correct that he combined in himself all the qualities of man. It is also correct that I have described Ram as an imaginary character in my book. He is not a historic character. It is not always necessary that a person who has been depicted in imagination might have existed before but portrayed in different forms. But some times it happens like that I consider all incarnations except Sri Ram as imaginary. Because no rational evidence is available in this regard. In my view if archaeological and written evidence conforms to the prevailing circumstances, it will prove whether the material available is imaginary or not. It is not correct that if no written or archaeological evidence is available about a person's forefather, he would be

termed an imaginary person. In such situations decision will be taken not on the basis of traditions but on the basis of physical facts. I have described Ram of Ikshwaku lineage in my book By Ikshwaku lineage I mean the people born in that family. Thus I consider Ram as a person.

It would be wrong to say that he is no more an imaginary character as such. While studying Dashrath Jatak I found that Ram was the son of Dashrath. But inspite of that I have reach to this conclusion that Ram is an imaginary character.

As a historian I have not heard about the Kapad Dwar of Jaipur. May be that some picture drawn on a cloth might have been found on kapad dwar in Jaipur which is said to belonging to 17th century. I have not heard the name of Dr. R. Nath, a historian. I can not also say that he wrote more than one- book.

The learned advocate drew the attention of the witness to paper No. 107C-I/ 193 filed in original suit No. 5/89 in this regard. After reading Sr. No 179 of this paper the witness said that the picture drawn on the cloth of Kapad dwar depicts Ayodhya, birth place and a number of other places also. May be that the picture shown on 107C-1197 might be the picture of birth place depicted on Kapad dwar. Dr. R. Nath might have written some article in this connection but I have not read it.

The learned advocate drew the attention of the witness to page No.5 of paper No. 118C-I/36 filed in original suit No. 5/89. I have not heard the name of Dr. Yaspal Goyal mentioned on this page.

Dr. R. Nath held that this picture belonged to 1717 A.D. but I have not conducted any research on this topic

and so I can not express my view on it. By this picture I mean the picture which is the above picture of Kapar dwar. I have not read any book with regard to Ram Janambhoomi temple or the picture related thereto. There was population in Ayodhya from 700 B.C. and it has been known by the name of Ayodhya. It is also correct that the present Ayodhya is the same old Ayodhya. I know that the worship of Ram has been going on in Ayodhya traditionally. It is correct that the followers of Sri Ram have been celebrating his birth day on the Navami of Shukla Paksh {Waxing Moon Fort Night} of the month of Chaitra. I have heard the name of Guptar among the places of pilgrimage of Ayodhya. The followers of Ram consider this as a place of disappearance of Ram and have been bathing and worshipping over there. According to my information which is based on Ram Katha. Ram was born in Ayodhya. According to my research there are a number of places in Ayodhya which claim to be the birth place of Ram. I cannot name or indicate their locations I did not consider it necessary to investigate. But I have definitely arrived at the conclusion that there was no temple at the place where Babri Masjid existed.

The basis of my conclusion were those proofs which showed that there was a temple before Babri Masjid. But because these proof were doubtful, I did not accept them and concluded that there was no Ram temple on that place before Babri Masjid. I accepted this that there was Babri Masjid. I have not studied about the history of Babri Masjid. On page No. 24 of my statement I have stated that - "I have heard the name of Malik Kafoor of Tughlak dynasty. I had said by mistake that Malik Kafoor belonged to Tughlak dynasty." Further ahead I stated that Malik Kafoor was the Governor of Tughlak dynasty and this is also wrong. Malik Kafoor was the Army chief of Alauddin Khilji. Abul Fazal wrote Aine Akbari. I have not read this book - neither in

English nor in Hindi.. This was written at the time of Akbar. Akbar ruled from 1556 to 1605 A.D. "Aine Akbari" describes the social political and economic conditions of that time. By social I mean religious conditions also. It is correct that Abul Fazal wrote that the festival of Ram Navami was celebrated at that time also. I can not tell about the place where Babri Masjid existed or about its shape or about the material with which it was built. I have not read about this. Because Babri Masjid belonged to historical age and is supported by historical proofs. I accepted it as Babri Masjid by historical age I mean the period from which written and definite proofs are available. The period before that age can not be called historical but it is called prehistoric age.

As there are no written historical proofs available with regard to prehistoric age, it can not be called historical period. In prehistoric age there were human beings and the creatures living on earth. In water and in the air. I accept their existence, although these are no written proofs available in this regard. But this is not based on imagination.

I know about Upveda also. I have some knowledge of the philosophy propounded in the Vedas and UpVedas. No name has been given to philosophy. I have heard the name of Vedant Darshan. I found this Vedant in the Upanishads. It is correct that if the word "Upanishads " is split it would be spelt as " Upa + Nih + sad " which means to sit down nearer. It would be wrong to say that Upanishad means acquiring knowledge by sitting down nearer to ancient sages (Adi Rishis). They can not be called Adi Rishis. There were Rishis even earlier. It is not that those Rishis imparted knowledge to their disciples by making them sit down. Earlier Rishis are those who could comprehend and expound the meaning of Veda Mantras and they are known

as Drishtas (Seers). Richas have been narrated in Vedas. There is a belief that these Richas descended by themselves. I can not say about Quran Sharif whether it descended by itself. I can not say whether such belief exists in Muslims also. There is a belief that the education imparted by the Rishis to their pupils was called Shruti and what was learnt by heart by the pupils was called Smriti.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suvira Jaiswal

20.3.2001

Typed by Stenographer in open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 21.03.2001.

Sd/-

20.3.2001

Dated:21.03.2001

(In continuation of 20.03.2001, the statement on oath of Prof. Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. 18 begins)

I might have mentioned in my book the Aryan Society, Vedic Society and Cultural Society but I do not remember at present. I know about these societies. Incidentally, all these three societies are one and the same society, but they have been described by different words in different context. I have used the term Aryan Society where the Society of Aryans has to be shown separately from Non-Aryan Society. I have used the term Vedic Society, where I meant those people who follow Vedic traditions. I have not used the term Cultural Society in my book. Aryan tradition, Vedic tradition and Cultural tradition - are one and the same tradition. There was the same religious and ritualistic tradition in all these three societies but later on it went on changing. All the three societies are one and the same and can be called contemporary. One of my articles was published in 'Indologica Troenisha'. I have described all these societies in that article and I have mentioned them within inverted commas, i.e. I have quoted these words. I have quoted these words from M.N. Srinivas who is an anthropologist. I have not noted this thing in the footnote that I have used the words of M.N. Srinivas. Because these words are very popular, I thought it proper to quote them. I put both 'Aryan' and 'Vedic' terms together chronologically. I place Cultural Society some centuries later in chronological order: I place the society of Aryans in fifteenth and sixteenth century B.C. I put Cultural Society in eleven century B.C. which is known as post Vedic period. Vedic period starts from fifteenth century B.C. and continued up to seventh century B.C. In spite of the above mentioned facts I consider these societies as

contemporaries. The study of ancient Indian History is called Indology. It is correct that the western scholars criticised the history of ancient India from 1840 to 19th century because they wanted to encourage Christianity and influence India. It is also correct that the western scholars wrote a number of books and articles in this regard criticising history of ancient India. One of western scholars also tried to link up Krishna Janmashtmi with Christian festival. The learned advocate cross-examining drew the attention on this subject to page number 1, 2 and 3 of the preface of the book "Vaishnav Dharma Ka Udbhav Aur Vikas" written by the witness and filed the Photostat copy of it which was numbered C-521\193\3. The witness said that this was the preface of her book and she considered it necessary to quote the matter written in it. But I do not agree with the opinions of the scholars I have quoted. As a historian I can not tell since when the festival of Janmashtmi the birthday of Shri Krishna, the incarnation of Vishnu is being celebrated. I considered it necessary to investigate in regard to "Vaishnav Dharma Ka Udbhav Aur Vikas", thoroughly but I did not find any proof in this regard. It is correct that Krishna was born in Mathura on the day of Ashtmi of Krishna Paksh (waning moon fortnight) of the month of Bhado. I know this fact from childhood that the festival of Janmashtmi is celebrated on the birthday of Shri Krishna. I do not remember whether I had talked with my parents in this regard and tried to know from them whether the festival of Janmashtmi was celebrated during their times also. The beginning of Christianity is considered to have taken place from 1st Century A.D. i.e. from the time of Jesus Christ. I have read this in books. I have not read much on this subject whether Holy Christ was born in Bethlehem. I know this that Christians celebrate this festival on 25th December traditionally. There is lot of controversy among the scholars on this subject. But I do

not want to express my opinion on this topic.

It is correct that Shri Ram was born on the day of Navami of Chaitra Shukla Paksh and the festival is celebrated on the day of Ram Navami traditionally.

It is also correct that the followers of Vaishnav Dharma take bath in Saryu river and go for darshan of Shri Ram in Ayodhya on the day of Ram Navami traditionally. It is wrong to say that I do not attach any importance to these traditions as a historian. The fact is that I attach importance to all these things.

At the time of writing my book I studied and conducted research as a historian and went through all written archaeological documents and all kinds of sources. I studied Ouran and Smritis, Scriptures of Bauddha and Jain Dharma and other religious books also. I studied written literature and documents also. In literature, I read drama of Poet Bhas. The period of his work ranges from 1st century B.C. to 3rd century A.D. I have read Raghuvansh of Kalidas which is in Sanskrit. Raghuvansh does not fall within the category of Puran. Both of these books describe Ayodhya. The third book I read in literature is Mahabhashya of Patanjali. I have read some of portion of it. It is considered to belong to second century B.C. It does not contain the description of Ram's Ayodhya. With regard to the portions of Patanjali Mahabhashya which I have not read, I am certain that there was no description of Ram's Ayodhya in them. Because I had seen the 'word index' thereof.

Patanjali has expounded in this book, the book written by Panani. And it is because this' that I saw the index in the 'hope that I might possibly come across the description of Ram's Ayodhya in it. It is correct that I consider it

necessary to acquire knowledge for my research work by going through the word index. Besides this, if I have read anything additional, I do not remember it now. It would be wrong to say that the books that I don't remember would not be important. I did not study Ramcharit Manas for the research work pertaining to this book. But I have read it of my own sweet will. I have used Valmiki Ramayan for my research work also and I have read it. There is description of Ram's Ayodhya in it.

I know Dr. R.S. Sharma and I have dedicated my book in English to him. I did my research work under his guidance. I maintained contact with him as ancient historian. He has written a book titled "Urban Decay in India. He has given list of excavated sites in this book. The list contains the description of Ayodhya also. According to the chart given by Shri Sharma in this book, it has been shown that the urban civilization in Ayodhya was on the decline from 700 to 1000 A.D. He has shown the urban civilization of Ayodhya in this chart as if it belonged to an earlier period in general.

This urban civilization in general has been shown from 200 B.C. I have heard the name of Dr. B.B. Lal. His full name is Dr. Brajwasi LaL. I have also heard the name of Shri A.K. Narayan also who has been a professor in B.H.U. I also know that these two persons have conducted excavations near the disputed site in Ayodhya. I do not know at what distance they conducted excavations from the disputed site or they carried out this work just near the disputed site. Vaishnav Dharma was prevalent in Ayodhya also. It is also correct that this prevalence of Vaishnav Dharma has been there for a pretty long time. As my research work was completed in 1964 and Shri Narayan and Shri Lal conducted the excavation much later and so I

had not read about it. When I prepared the amended and enlarged addition of my book, then I considered; it necessary to read the report of excavation work conducted by Shri Narayan and Shri Lal. But I could not find anything of my use in that. That is why, I did not consider it necessary to quote that report in my book. Christianity started from 1st century A.D. I agree with this view that there was population in Ayodhya in 700 B.C. It is also definite that Vaishnav Dharma is older than the advent of Christ, i.e. Vishnu was worshipped before Christ. By worship I mean prayer or invocation of God. Prayer is linked to the one to whom the prayer is offered. It is also correct that only adorable is adored.

It is correct to say that Vishnu was adorable by one community. But I do not consider those people to be follower of Vaishnav Dharma because they called themselves Bhagwat at that time. Later on Vaishnav word was used. Islam followed Vaishnav Dharma. I have heard that there is a tradition in Muslims that they offer Namaz in the direction of KABA. I cannot call this tradition as religion because I have neither thought about it nor have I read about it. But I can keep this tradition in the category of historical tradition. It is correct that I consider this tradition as a historic fact. I consider RAM as a character of a story and so I cannot put him in historical category. I have not seen the photo of Mohammed Sahib till today. I consider him as a historical personage.

It is difficult to say that Brahman scriptures and Jain scriptures considered Saket and Ayodhya as one and the same place. It is correct to say that Bhava Bhuti considered Saket and Ayodhya as one and the same place in his book. This is also correct to say that the sources of Jain Dharma discloses that Saket and Ayodhya are one and the same place. I know that 24th Thirthankar. Mahavir had been to

Ayodhya. There had been no Thirthankar of Jain Dharma after the 24th Thirthankar.

I don't remember at present whether before Mahavirji, several earlier Thirthankars of Jain Dharma such as Rishabh Dev, Ajit Nath, Abhinandan Nath, Sumant Nath and Anant Nath were born or not in Ayodhya. It is correct to say that Ayodhya was known as KOSHAL at one time. It is also correct to say that KOSHAL was a great Janpad and Varanasi was part of Mahakaushal at that time. I do not know that Ayodhya is known as a city of temples. I know that Ayodhya is also known as a Sapta Hari also i.e. there are temples of Sapta Hari in Ayodhya. I do not remember all the names of Sapta Hari but I do remember some names. Vishnu Hari and Chakra Hari are among them and the rest of the names I do not remember. I heard the name of Dharma Hari and there might be Bilwahari also. I have heard the name of Guptahari. It is not correct to say that all the above names are different forms of RAM. May be that when RAM disappeared, his disappearing from is known as Guptahari. It is also correct to say that the place where RAM disappeared is known as Guptarghat.

One who wields Sarang Dhanush is called Sarang Dhar Dhanurdhari. It is correct to say that RAM is worshipped as a Dhanurdhari and is called as Sarang Dhar. It is correct to say that the ruler of KAUSHAL was called the king of KAUSHAL. It is also correct that Lord RAM has been quoted as KAUSHAL Naresh at several places. It is correct to say that the places connected with the birth of RAM have been referred to as Kunds. May be that where RAM used to go for acquiring knowledge, was called Vidya Kund. I do not remember but may be ,that the place where RAM directed Bharat to rule Ayodhya is known as Bharat Kund. It has been described in Ramayan that at one point

of time RAM had left Ayodhya for south. It is correct that Prayag is situated on the south of Ayodhya. It is correct to say that it has been described in Ramayan that the place which was crossed by RAM at the time of crossing Ganga at Prayag is known as place of pilgrimage. It is also correct to say that Lord Ram stayed in Bhardwaj Ashram after crossing Ganga and that place is known as a place of pilgrimage. It is also correct to say that while going southwards from Bhardwaj Ashram, Lord Ram stayed in Sati Ansuiya Ashram and that place is also known as a place of pilgrimage. This has also been described in Ramayan that Shri RAM attacked Lanka after crossing the ocean in the south. The place where he crossed the sea is called Setubandh Rameshwaram and it is a place of pilgrimage. It is correct to say that all the places or pilgrimage mentioned above exist from centuries traditionally. The people who visit this places are known as pilgrims. It is correct to say that all these pilgrims are vaishnavites who consider RAM as incarnation of Vishnu. I consider the said tradition, which has been there for centuries, as a subject of historical analysis I put it in the category of history.

In my view the oldest mention of Ram Katha was in Dashrath Jatak. I cannot say definitely as to which century Adbhut Ramayan belonged. This is the work of medieval age. The period of medieval age is considered to be between 7th A.D. to 18th A.D. At the most Adbhut Ramayan can be an article of a book of 12th century A.D. It is correct to say that I considered it necessary to quote Adbhut Ramayan in my book as the work of 12th century. I have given this quotation in my hook with regard to development of Ram Katha. In spite of the fact that I did not know the name of the author of Adbhut Ramayan, I considered it necessary to mention Adbhut Ramayan in the appendix of

my Hindi book because it is source of history. It is wrong to say that I mentioned the Adbhut Ramayan in the appendix of my book out of prejudice and with a view to hurting the feelings of the followers of Hindu Dharma and for benefiting the followers of special category of people. Adbhut Ramayan is also considered a religious scripture. It is accepted as a book of Vaishnav Dharma. It is not correct to say that I have mentioned Adbhut Ramayan in the appendix of my book as I was influenced by its historical importance but I have mentioned it as I realized its importance of the development of the Ram Katha. I accept its historical importance of the incident described in Adbhut Ramayan that Sita was the daughter of Ravan because this does not find mention in Adbhut Ramayan only but it has been mentioned in other books also. Sita has been described as a daughter of Ravan and Mandodari in the Jain Ramayan of Guna Bhadra. Sita has been described as the daughter of Ravan and Mandodri in Adbhut Ramayan also. It is correct to say that Adbhut Ramayan describes that Ravan in his rage killed Rishis and collected their blood in a pitcher and buried it under the earth, which was dug up by Raja Janak while ploughing the field and this is how Sita was born. It is correct that Mandodari has not been described in the above incident anywhere. I acknowledging it an addition say that Sita was born from Ravan and Mandodari i.e. he was in the same heritage. I have come to name about this incident during the period of my research work. I did not consider it necessary to discuss this above incident of Adbhut Ramayan with any other historian. I tried to know the author of Adbhut Ramayan but it paid no result. I don't have faith in the historicity in the aforesaid incident. It is wrong to say that in spite of the fact that I did not have faith in the historicity of the said incident of Adbhut Ramayan and did not know anything about the author of the book, I have described the said incident in my book only for publicity.

Several historians mentioned the said incident and highlighted its historical importance. The renowned Sanskrit scholar Dr. V. Raghavan has written an article on the said incident and mentioned it a number of places in his other articles.

I do not remember the name of Dr. Raghavan's book at present. The name of his book was probably "Ramayan to Asia" and was published by Sahitya Akdami. It is correct to say that while describing the aforesaid incident in regard to Sita's birth in appendix: 'A' of my book. I have not given Dr. V. Raghavan's name in the footnote. May be that I might have mentioned the name of Dr. V. Raghvan in some other context. It is correct to say that the aforesaid incident has been given on the page 240 of my book "Vaishnav Dharm Ka Udhbhav Evam Vikas ", but the name of Dr. Raghvan has not been given in the footnote. But his reference has been given with regard to another incident while quoting him.

I did not find any historical proofs about Ram Mandir or Ramjanma mandir during the period of my research i.e. from 200 B.C'. to 500 A.D. It is correct to say that during the period of my said research I read all documents and books pertaining to that period but I did not read the documents and the books pertaining to subsequent period. It would be right to say that I read the books of that period superficially and not in depth I know the names of such documents and books. For example, I read the documents of Kalchuri Kings. Besides that, I did not read any other document or book. The period of Kalchuri Kings ranged between 1000 A.D. to 13th and 14th century A.D. And the said Kings ruled over Madhya Pradesh or some areas in the south.

Besides this, I do not remember whether I read or not something more. The documents I read superficially were read by me with the hope that I might come across with something about Ram Mandir. It is not correct to say that I did not read documents and books found in Uttar Pradesh with a view to obtaining information about Ram Mandir. As a historian I have heard the name of Harsh Vardhan. It is correct that the successor of Harsh Vardhan was Yashovardhan. The book named Gaur Baho was written during his reign I have not read the said book, I do not remember definitely the period of 'Yashovardhan's rule. The period of Harsh Vardhan was during the 7th century. Yashovardhan ruled after about 30-40 years of Harsh Vardhan but I don't remember exactly the period of his rule. It may be that the existence of Vishnu Hari Mandir in Ayodhya has been described in the book Gaur Baho. I am not aware that mention has been made of any incarnation of Vishnu other than RAM in the history in Ayodhya. Shri RAM is the only incarnation of Vishnu in Ayodhya who has been described in history. It is correct to say that travelogue i.e. the description of pilgrimage has great importance in history. I have heard the name of Arskin who visited India in 1826.

I have not heard the name of Leden. I have also not heard the name of Lucas King. I have not heard the name of F.G, Tavlاد. I have not heard the name of Shri Tifen Threller. I have also not heard the name of Inquital To Vairo. I do not remember the names of the pilgrims who visited India besides Huensang and Fahien. I have not studied who visited India besides the aforesaid' both Chinese travellers in the subsequent centuries. By subsequent centuries I mean the period after 12th century. I have not studied the history of the period subsequent to 12th century. But as a historian I can tell, that Babar built

Babri Masjid in Ayodhya in the 16th century. I cannot say whether Babar was present or not in Ayodhya at the time of construction of the Masjid. It is wrong to say that I am making the aforesaid statement wrongly out of prejudice. It is wrong to say that I along with some historians formed a team and with a view to hurting the feelings of Hindus and benefiting another community published some pamphlets and books out of prejudice.

[Cross examination concluded by Shri Vireshwar Dwivedi advocate on behalf of Shri Umesh Chandra Pandey defendant No. 22.]

[Cross examination on behalf of Paramhans Ramchandra Das. defendant No.2 by Shri M.M. Pandey. advocate]

Historical age is basically divided in three parts such as ancient history period, medieval history period and modern history period. The ancient history period is roughly considered from the beginning to 1200 A.D. with reference to India. The pre-medieval period is placed in ancient medieval period and is placed between 700 A.D. to 1200 A.D. The remaining medieval period is placed between 1200 A.D. and 1800 A.D. The modern period starts after 1800 A.D. Now it is believed that ancient period is limited 700 A.D. My area of study is ancient period and pre-medieval period. I do not know much about the contents of the particulars of subject matter of this suit. But I know this much that the controversy is about Babri Masjid. In my view this suit is in regard to the right of Babri Masjid and I have come here as a witness on that subject. I know that Babri Masjid does not exist at present. This dispute of Babri Masjid pertains to modern age. By modern age: I mean the period subsequent to 1800 A.D. In my view there is no

dispute in this case as to who constructed the Babri Masjid. It is correct that the people of one party to this case consider this place as Janma Bhoomi of their adored lord. This disputed site is situated in Ayodhya. I have seen the map of Ayodhya cursorily. But I cannot say as to where the disputed site in Ayodhya is exactly situated. I do not know whether disputed site is situated in Kot Ram Chandra. I did not try to acquire the knowledge about the revenue records of the disputed site nor try to know it. Whatever information I have been able to get about the disputed site, I obtained it on the basis of newspaper reports or the reports brought out by the historians.

By the report of the historians I mean the "historian report to the nation". This is the same report which was produced by Shri Suraj Bhan and Dr. R.S. Sharma. Shri D.N. Jha, historian and Shri Athar Ali historian also contributed to this report. I also brought out a pamphlet with some colleagues on the subject of "political misuse of Babri Masjid Ram Janma Bhoomi dispute". This pamphlet was published in 1989 in collaboration with Ms. Romila Thapar and others. After this pamphlet another pamphlet titled "report to the nation" was published. This pamphlet was prepared by me on the basis of newspaper reports and after discussing with medieval expert in our department.

When the pamphlet was published in 1989, I was not aware that this dispute is going on in the court. I know that the Ram Janma Bhoomi in Ayodhya was opened on the order of the court and I came to know of it through the medium of newspaper reports. I got the information that a dispute was pending in the court for a long time and order was given to open the lock. I did not consider it necessary to know about this dispute at the time of bringing out the pamphlet or after the publication of the article titled,

'Report to the Nation'. In my view it is not the political misuse of history if some views are expressed during the pendency of a dispute in the court. I have not read anything special about Babri Masjid so I cannot tell as to when Babri Masjid came into existence. I cannot tell as to what existed at that place before Babri Masjid came into existence.

I have read some portions of Skand Puran in original. Whatever I have read, I found the description of Ram Janambhoomi in Ayodhya Mahatmya. In end of Vaishnav Khand of Skand Puran there is description of Ram's birth place in Ayodhya Mahatmya and so it appears that this is an interpolated portion. It is correct that the Vaishnav Khand is in the middle of Skand Puran I have read Balmiki Ramayana but there is no description in the existence of Vishnu Hari Mandir in Ayodhya in it. The learned pleader drew the attention of the witness to page no. 192 of paper No. 261 C/ 1 filed in original suit No. 89 and the witness after having read it said that in Shlok No.3 & 4, there is description of Vishnu temple and not Vishnu Hari temple. It is correct that these Shlokas contain the description of Vishnu temple. There is mention of Shri Ram's date of birth and birth place in Balmiki Ramayana. It has been mentioned in Balmiki Ramayana that Shri Ram was born in the house of the king of Ikshwaku lineage and his childhood was spent in Ayodhya. The period of Balmiki Ramayana is considered to be from 3rd century B.C. to 2nd century B.C. There is one Ayodhya Kand also in Balmiki Ramayana. The Ayodhya Kand mentioned in it is considered to be the work of 2nd century B.C. I think there are 7 Kands in Balmiki Ramayana.

In my view Ram Mandir has not been mentioned anywhere in Balmiki Ramayan but it does contain the mention of Ram's birth and Janambhoomi. According to

Balmiki Ramayan, river Saryu flows in the north of Ayodhya. I have heard the name of the book Rudrayamal which is a Tantrik book. I have not read about Ram's birth in Rudrayamal book as I have not read the book. I am not aware whether in Rudrayamal Ram's birth. Janambhoomi etc. have been shown with their locations in Ayodhya. This book belongs to medieval age and as I have not read it. I can not say whether there is any mention about Ayodhya in that book.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suvira Jaiswal

21.3.2001

Typed by stenographer in open court as dictated by us
. In continuation for further Cross-examination be present
on 22.03.2001.

Sd/-

21.3.2001

Dated :22-3-2001

[In continuation of 21.03.2001 statement on oath of
Suvira Jaiswal P.W18. continued]

Tantric books are a kind of religious books wherein Goddess is attached greater importance. In my view Rudrayamal falls in this category although. I have neither read it nor seen it. I got this information from the 'History of Sanskrit Literature'. It has been mentioned in History of 'Dharam Shashtra' also written by shri P.V kane. I may not be able to tell in which book Rudrayamal has been described as Tantric book. I have read somewhere that it is a Tantric book but I do not remember where I have read it. As I have not read Rudrayamal. I shall not be able to tell whether it is correct to say that it is a Tanlric book but it is presumed that the name of the book is 'Rudrayamal'. I do not know whether Rudrayamal contains the description of geographical situation of Ayodhya, location of Bhoomi, its actual distance and other details about Maryada Purushottam Ram etc. May be that Rudrayamal might contain the details regarding Vishnu Hari mandir, Sapta Hari mandir and important places of pilgrimage in Ayodhya. As I did not know about this book, I did not make any use of it in my research work. I don't have any knowledge in this regard.

I do not remember at present but Raghuvansh Maha Kavya might have given details about king Aditi, lord Ram, his lineage birth etc. It is correct that there are details about Ram's birth maternity ward and beating of drums and sounding of trumpets etc. by gods before the birth of Ram in that epic. It is also correct that there is description of Putrayesthti yajna in that epic. There is description about the birth of Lav- Kush and the establishment of Kushavasti

and Shravas!i in the later Khand. This Shravasti has been described as Savatthi in Bauddha Dharma. Whether there is mention of establishing Ayodhya by Kush in this epic or not. I do not remember at present but it might be so. It is correct that there is description of Guptar ghat and disappearance of lord Ram in this epic. Raghuvansh Mahakavya is the work of Gupta period. It is the work of great poet Kalidas. It might have been written between 400 and 500 A.D. I have read Pratima Natak written by Bhas. It is correct that it also contains description of Ayodhya. There is mention of Vishnu temple in it. I know about Narsimha Puran. It is considered to be a work of 7th or 8th century and not of 6th century. I have not read whether there is description about Chinese pilgrim. Huensang. Narsimha Puran contains the description about Ayodhya and Vishnu temple. I know about Matsya, Puran. It is correct that there is description in Matsya Puran that Raja Rati Dev in his dream saw the shape of Ayodhya, its location etc. in the stomach of a fish. I know about Vishnu Puran and Vishnu Dhannottar Puran. It is correct that there is description of Vishnu mandir in Ayodhya in this Puran. I have read about Vrihad Dharm Puran. It might have also given description about Ram's birth, location Ayodhya etc. but I have not read it.

I have read Skand Puran. It is correct that it contains description about the composition of Balmiki Ramayan and its various references. May be that Skand Puran might have stated that salvation could be achieved by studying Balmiki Ramayan and worshipping lord Ram but I do not remember it. I have read Balmiki Ramayan. It is not correct that Balmiki Ramayan is the first written work of prehistoric age. In my view there is no written literature in prehistoric age. It is correct that Balmiki Ramayan is the first ever epic of the followers of Hindu religion, i.e., it is the first ever

epic of Vaishnavites.

Adikavya means the first ever epic. It can be both in written and oral. In my view Balmiki Ramayan might have been there in both the forms, written and oral. I do not know whether Shri K.S. Ramashastri wrote "Studies in Ramayan", which was published around 1940. Vyas is known as the author of Mahabharat. It is correct that there is description of Balmiki Ramayan and Maharshi Balmiki in Mahabharat. I have not read the book. "Ramayan Tatparya Deepika". I can not also say as to when it was composed. I have read Agni Puran also. It mentions that Ayodhya is situated on the bank of Saryu but I do not remember whether Ram Mandir has been mentioned or not. May be that Agni Puran might have mentioned Maharshi Balmiki and Balmiki Ramayan at several places. I have read Garud Puran also. It also contains description of Balmiki Ramayan, Ayodhya and the bank of Saryu at several places. I do not remember whether the religious Purans or the religious books I have gone through contain the description of Sapta Tirth. Sapta Tirth means seven places of pilgrimage. I have not enumerated all the seven places of pilgrimage. Vaishnavites consider Ayodhya, Mathura, Maya. Kashi, Kanchi. Avantika. Puri, Dwarawati etc. as places of pilgrimage. Vaishnavites might consider all these places as Sapta Tirth. It is correct that the Vaishnavites consider all these places as Sapta Tirth. It is correct that the Vaishnavites consider Sapta Tirths as places facilitating salvation.

[The advocate of the cross examiner drew the attention of the witness on this issue to Shlok No.7 in the first Sarg of Ayodhya Kand and page No.177 of paper NO. 261 c-I/I filed in original suit No.5/89]

The witness after having read it answered that the Shlok contains the description of another incarnation of lord Vishnu as Ram on this earth.

In continuation, the witness after having read Shlok No. 921 of 27th Sarg of page No. 86 of paper No. 261/C-1/2 said that it is correct that in these Shloks Trijata Rakshasi saw in her dream lord Ram. Sita and Laxman and their Valiance. In Shlok No. 20 Ram has been described as valiant as Vishnu i.e. this Shlok proclaims Ram valiant as Vishnu and subsequent Shloks describe the death of Ravan.

The learned Advocate of the cross examiner drew the attention of the witness to Yuddh Kand Sarg- 111 on page No.542 of paper No.261-c-1/2. The witness read Shlok No. 11 to 16 and said that it is correct that Shloks describe Vishnu wielding Shankh, Chakra. and Gada and it has also been stated that Lord Vishnu has descended in the form of a human being.

After having read Shlok No. 6.11. and 31 of Sarg 117 of this book NO.562 the witness said that in Shlok No.6 Maryada Purushottam Sri Ram has been mentioned in the form of Vishnu. In Shlok No. 11 he has been shown as Ram son of Dashrath. In Shlok No. 14 Lord Ram has been considered as immortal Parbrahm. He has been described Chaturbhuj also. In Shlok No. 31 he has been described as Puran Purushottam. After having read Shlok No. 21 and 22 in Sarg 8th on page 618 of Uttar Kand of this book the witness said that Lord Ram has been shown at war with Rakshsas in the form of Vishnu. The attention of the witness was drawn to Shlok No.9 to 13 of Sarg 51 of in Uttar Kand on page No. 728 of this book. The witness said that the curse of Durvasa ji has been mentioned in It.

In my view Vishnu is considered as the wielder of Shankh, Chakra, Gada and Padm. Ram has been accepted as an incarnation of Vishnu in all the Kands of Balmiki Ramayan.

I have read "Ramcharitmanas". Tulsidas had started writing Ramcharitmanas in 1574 A.D. Babar had attacked India earlier than that. Babar ruled from 1526 A.D. to 1530 A.D. Ayodhya has been described in "Ramcharitmanas" also and Balmiki Ramayan has also been mentioned therein. It is correct that Ramcharitmanas contains the description of river Saryu in the north of Ayodhya, birth of Ram, his Janambhoomi, and his activities in Ayodhya. It is also correct that lord Ram has been accepted as an incarnation of Vishnu in Ramcharitmanas.

In my view it would be wrong to say that these Purans were written before Gupta period i.e. what ever Purans are available now are considered to belong to Gupta period or thereafter. Mahabharat was written before purans. The period of composing purans ranges from 400 A.D. to 1900 A.D. I can tell about some Purans as to when they were written. I can not tell about the period of writing all the Purans definitely. The period of writing of Balmiki Ramayan and that of Mahabharat is contemporaneous-neither later nor earlier. It is considered that Ved Vyas composed Mahabharat but in my view Vedvyas is an Imaginary person.

In my view Mahabharat was composed definitely but it was not composed by one person. It was a work of several poets. The names of those poets are not known. Their number can not be indicated-whether they are one hundred or one thousand. I have got this information from the books of history. The 'History of Indian Literature' written by

Winternitz states that Mahabharat was not written by one person. Besides this, V.S. Sukthankar who wrote critical Edition of Mahabharat also held this view in his book "On the Meaning of Mahabharat". It is an Indian publication. Possibly it was published around 1960.

I have read Manusmriti. It is correct that it contains the description of class system. It also contains the description of judicial system and penal system. In class system Manu divided the society in four classes and the work of each class has been specified. Marriage system has also been described in Manusmriti. I consider Manusmriti as the work of 1st or 2nd century. I consider it as an authentic source of history. It is correct that Puran, Mahabharat and Ramayan are the authentic sources of history. By Ramayan I mean Balmiki Ramayan.

I consider Vedas authentic for history. These are also the sources of history. Period of writing or composing them is considered from 1500 B.C. to 800 B.C. Period of writing means the period of writing them only but not by their creation. In my view they were perhaps written in script around 10th century and not before that. I am not aware who wrote them in script. I have heard the name of Haynes Baker. He wrote a book on Ayodhya which was published in 1986.

I have read the description of Ayodhya and disputed land in this book but I do not agree with his view. I agree with some of his views. Especially what he has written about disputed land, I do not agree with that. I agree with the historical description of Ayodhya given by Mr. Haynes Baker in his book. I also agree with the geographical situation which Mr. Haynes Baker has described in his book. It is correct that the Pamphlet brought out by me and my colleagues in 1989 (which was titled as 'Political Misuse of History, does not make any mention of Haynes Baker's

book and the views expressed in that book. Till then I had not read the book of Haynes Baker. I have read the report given by Professor B.B. Lal and about the excavation work done by him in Ayodhya. It is correct that he conducted this excavation work in 1975. At that time he was Director General of Archaeological Survey of India. His report was published in Archaeological review brought out by Archaeological Survey of India. It was published in 1975-77 issue. I agree with this report of Professor B.B. Lal. It is correct that Professor Lal had conducted excavation at several places near the disputed site in Ayodhya but I do not know the area of the place he excavated. I know that professor B.B. Lal published a number of articles on this subject but I do not agree with his views. The reports which were brought out after the report of Professor Lal speak of the Pillars of bricks, but I do not agree with the views expressed by Professor B.B.Lal regarding the pillars of bricks erected at the disputed site. I do not remember the number of those pillars but they were quite in large number. As far as I remember, Professor B.B. Lal described them as the pillars on which the foundation of some temple was laid. I do not agree with this view. I agree with this opinion of Professor Lal that if the platform found on the disputed site is excavated, some more authentic evidences could be found. I agree with the view expressed by Professor B.B. Lal in his first report where in he has mentioned about four successive layers found after excavation and existence of populated settlement over there on that basis. My disagreement with Professor Lal about the pillars is based on the views and the reports of other archaeologists.

On this subject I have read the book of Shri D. Mandal, who is an archaeologist. I had talked to my colleague. Professor Ratnakar in this regard and I had read the articles "I" Professor Suraj Bhan, D.Mandal and all

these people expressed their views on the report of Professor B.B. Lal. D. Mandal, Prof. Ratnakar and Suraj Bhan did not do any excavation work in Ayodhya. I have read the 'Report to the Nation', which was brought out by Prof. R.S. Sharma and his three colleagues. This report mentions the article of Dr. Swaraj Prakash Gupta and this article written or Published by Dr. Swarj Prakash Gupta has been refuted in the said report. I have not read the said article. It is not that I found the report of the aforesaid four historians convincing and so I did not read the article of Dr. Gupta. I know Dr. Swaraj Prakash Gupta. He is presently the chairman of Indian Archaeological Society. I can not say whether he is a field Archaeologist or not but he is an archaeologist. I had read in some article that Dr. Gupta had done excavation work in Ayodhya but the article raised the point that if it was so, why his name was not mentioned earlier in the report. But I do not know any thing about it.

I have heard the name of Sir Mortimer Wheeler. It is correct that he is recognised as a great archaeologist of the world. He was a field archaeologist and prizes are also given in his name for conducting excellent excavation works. Dr. Swaraj Prakash Gupta might have got some prize in this regard but I do not know about it. Dr. Gupta had his education in Allahabad but in my view he is not considered a good historian and archaeologist. It is correct that Maulana Azad Memorial Gold Medal is awarded for the good work in field archaeology. Dr. Gupta might have got Maulana Azad Memorial Gold Medal in field archaeology but I have no knowledge about it. It is correct that when Dr. Gupta and I studied in Allahabad. an excavation was undertaken in Kaushambi. All students had to participate in that excavation and Shri Gupta might have taken part in that but I do not know. It is correct that excavation work was undertaken at Gilfu in Rajasthan in 1959-60. It is also

correct that renowned archaeologists conducted that excavation. I do not know whether Dr. Swaraj Gupta took part or not in that excavation. It is correct that an institution named 'Institute of Archaeology' exists in Delhi since 1959. The school of Archaeology is also part of this institution. Field Archaeology is taught in this institution. I have no information whether Dr. Swaraj Prakash Gupta studied in this institution and topped in its examination.

It is correct that Indian Archaeologist Society of India is an institution of archaeologists. I know that Dr. Swaraj Prakash Gupta is the chairman of this institution. I have heard the name of Indian council of historical Research also. This is an institution of the Govt. of India. It is correct that the institution is meant for historians and archaeologists. I know Prof. G. R. Grover also. I know him as a historian. He is at present the chairman of Indian council of Historical Research. I have heard the name of Dr. T.P. Verma also but I do not know much about him. He is perhaps a historian. But I have neither read any of his works nor do I know anything about him. I know Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri. He is an epigraphist and a numismatist. I consider him a historian. I have heard that Prof. Swaraj Prakash Gupta, B.R. Grover, T.P. Verma and Ajay Mitra Shastri wrote a book or an article relating to disputed site but I have not read it. I have read that immediately after the disputed structure was demolished, a conference of archaeologists and historians was organised in Ayodhya. I do not know who participated in that. I have heard the name of Prof. K.V. Raman. I consider him a historian. I consider Shri A. Sundara, S. M. V. Swami, Dr. S. R. Rao and Prof. R. N. Mehta as historians and archaeologists. I know Prof. R. C. Agrawal, Prof. Former Director, Department of Archaeology, Prof. B. P. Sinha, Prof. P.P. Verma, Prof. K. S. Lal, Head of the Department of Ancient

History, Prof. Devendra Swamp, Prof. Y.V. Sharma, former Director, Department of Archaeology, Delhi and Prof. K.P. Nautiyal. I know them as historians and archaeologists. Followers of Jain Dharm also wrote some books. Originally their books were written in Prakrit language. It is correct that there is description about Ayodhya in those books also. Ayodhya has been addressed as Ayoha, Vinita, Kushala, Saket, Janma Bhoomi, Ramapuri etc. in those books. These books of Jain Dharm, which are in Prakrit language and contain description about Ayodhya and Ramayan belong to 3rd or 4th Century. We know about these religious books. These books describe the situation of Ayodhya. It would not be correct to say that these books mention about Vaishnavites and their worship. I have read the article, "Communal History and Rama" written by Prof. R. S. Sharma. This article was published in 90-92. I do not remember whether Prof. Sharma refuted the existence of Mirbaki in the said article. I know something about Mirbaki. I have, not heard the name of Baki Tashkandi. Mirbaki and Baki Tash Kandi might be one and the same person in history but I am not aware of it. I have no knowledge about the book 'Archaeology of Babri Masjid and Babar', written by Smt. Surendra Kaur and Sher Singh.

I lived in Delhi for many years i.e. from May, 1971 to August, 1999. There is Qutub Minar in Delhi, which has a historical importance. I have seen it. There is one stone inscription about which I have read in books. I have not read that the inscription stated that Qutub Minar was constructed after demolishing 27 Hindu and Jain temples. I have wrongly called it stone inscription and what I meant to say was the inscription on Meharauli iron pillar. I have not seen any stone inscription on Qutub Minar and I do not know any thing about it. Qlltub Minar was constructed at the time of Qutubuddin Aibak. I do not know the year of its

construction precisely but it was constructed after 1206. In my view, it was constructed within ten years from 1206. It would be wrong to say that it might have been constructed in 1192 or 1193. I have not heard the name of Qutubul Islam Masjid in Delhi. I have not read Babarnama. I have not read the book 'Saheefe Chihal Nasir'. I have also not read the book, 'Adike Shohada'. I may not be able to tell whether these books pertain to disputed site. It is correct that mosques were constructed after demolishing Hindu temples during Moghul rule. It has been described in history but I have not studied about it in particular. I have heard the name Max Mueller. He has written some books. It is correct that he has written admiringly about Bhagwad Gita and Vedas in some of his books. It is also correct that Max Mueller has accepted Bhagwad Gita, Vedas and Purans as sources of history. I agree with his view. I have heard the name of Einstein. He was a scientist. He propounded the theory of Relativity. I have read that he had faith in God. It is correct that he was a theist. Theist means a person who has faith in God. Atheist means a person who does not have faith in God. I agree with the Cross-examination given in the 'Report to the Nation' produced by 4 historians and so I accept it as authentic. It would not be correct to say that as I have neither gone to the disputed site nor have I studied about it and even then I am making false statement under some special influence.

[Cross-examination concluded by Shri M. M. Pandey on behalf of Paramhans Ramchandra Das. Defendant No.2]

Cross examination by Shri Hari Shankar Jain, Advocate on behalf of Hindu Mahasabha. Defendant No.1 0 and Shri Rameshchandra Tripathi, Defendant no. 17.

It is correct that I am an expert of ancient history. It is

also correct that I have come to this court to record my witness as an expert of ancient history. Expertise in history is acquired by conducting research on written documents. My expertise is based on my research on written sources.

An expert in history draws his or her conclusion after collecting material on the subject of his research and after thoroughly studying the available material. Mudra Shastra is called Numismatics in English. Calligraphy is called 'Lipi Vidha' in Hindi.

Utkhanan Shastra is known as Archaeology. It is known as Puratatwik Shastra also. Numismatics describes how coins were made, what their weight is, to which period they belong to and what historical conclusion can be drawn there from. All these things are studied in Numismatics. The period is determined after considering the size, shape and form of the ancient coin, the picture engraved on it and the place where it has been found. It is easier to find out its period if some thing is written on it. The name of the metal and chemical analysis thereof help in determining the period. It would be correct to say that if some coin is found, first of all its period is determined after analysis and then it is ascertained as to which dynasty ruled at that time. The same method is adopted if some script is found inscribed on the coin. The script found on the stone inscription is also dealt with in the same manner. All these sources which I have stated above, i.e. Numismatics, calligraphy, Archaeology etc. are utilised as sources in order to find out history. I have described materials such as coins, archaeological finds, documents etc. in my research work.

With regard to material pertaining to coins etc., I have utilised the book, 'Bayana Hoard' written by A.S. Altekar. I do not know the date of its publication precisely but it was

perhaps published in the decade starting from 1950. I do not know the place where it was published but it was published in India only. This does not only write about ancient coins. It gives description about the coins found in Bayana which belong to Gupta Period. Bayana is a place in Rajasthan. Besides this, I also had utilised the catalogue of some coins. I utilised the catalogue published by L.N. It was perhaps published around 1938. I do not remember what other material I studied. These coins tell us about the rulers and the place where they ruled. These rulers include the Gupta Kings. Some names of the republics have also been given. By republics I mean the places where power was in the hands of a special category of rulers. It is correct to say that the picture engraved on coins also reveal the religion prevalent at that time. The seals of Gupta Kings tell us about Bhagwat Dharm. i.e. Vaishnav Dharm. The pictures pertaining to Vaishnav Dharm inscribed on coins tell us about Vaishnav Dharm. For example, we find Chakra Purush engraved on some coins, on the some other coins we find the pictures of Gaj Lakshmi, while on some others we find conch - all these prove these coins pertain to Vaishnav Dharm. The coins of Kumar Gupta's period are found engraved with Narsimha on them. This also proves that they are related to Vaishnav Dharm. The inscriptions are in Brahmi script. Narsimha is considered to be the incarnation of Vishnu in Gupta period. It is believed that majority of people worshipped Vishnu during the Gupta period but it is difficult to tell about the exact number of Vishnu worshippers. 6 or 7 incarnations of Vishnu were accorded recognition during Gupta period but it is also believed that there were innumerable incarnations of Vishnu which include Matsya, Varah, Narsimha, Parashu Ram, Ram Chandra, Shri Krishna. etc. By Shri Ram Chandra I mean the son of Dashrath who was born in Ayodhya. It is correct to say that by the time of Gupta

period this belief had become prevalent that lord Ram was the incarnation of Vishnu. It is correct that the historian, before expressing his disagreement on a subject, investigates the matter, studies it and then gives his opinion. It is correct to say that wherever I have expressed my opinion in my statement, by that I mean my well deduced conclusion. The opinion mentioned by me in my statement is based on my research work and my study of ancient scriptures. My statement that no authentic description of Ram's birth place in Ayodhya is available is based on this Cross-examination that no particular place has been mentioned as Ram's birth place. i.e., no particular spot has been mentioned in any ancient book in this regard. By particular spot I mean some special place and not any city or district. It is correct to say that Balmiki Ramayana was written before Gupta period. There is a chapter of Ayodhya Kand in Balmiki Ramayana.

It is correct to say that there is description of Shri Ram's birth in Ayodhya Kand or Balmiki Ramayana. It is also correct to say that the said Ramayana describes about the population, the king, boundary of the state and the people of Ayodhya. Details have also been given that there were good crops and food grains were produced in abundance in Ayodhya and there was an atmosphere of prosperity. It would not always be correct to say that the historian will always believe more on oldest sources of history than on the later sources of history. Sometimes, contemporary sources are biased and so they are not reliable in spite of being oldest. Sometimes, the oldest sources are most imaginary and so are not acceptable. There is controversy about the meaning of oldest sources also. Doubt can be raised about the oldest sources as to how old they could be. Besides this, there could be reason about disagreement over oldest sources of history but I do

not remember at present. It is correct to say that the historians are also prejudiced sometimes about the oldest sources of history. It is also correct to say that a historian can express his disagreement out of ill will. It is also correct to hold that the causes of this ill will can be political also. The reason for disagreement can stem from attachment to some particular ideology. There may be economic and social reasons also behind disagreement.

I have heard the name of Karl Marx and have heard about his ideology also. History mentions two ideologies in Marxism - one Leninism and the other Maoism. I do not accept any of these two ideologies. It is correct that I accept the ideology of Marxism but not the ideologies of Leninism and Maoism. There are several historians who have been influenced by ideology of the Marxism. Prof. Ram Sharan Sharma and Irfan Habib are among such historians. I have heard the name of Romila Thapar also. It is not correct to say that she is the follower of Marxism. It is not correct to say that Marxism is deadly against religion. I have read Das Capital of Karl Marx to some extent. It is correct to say that according to Das Capital Marxism is deadly against religious fanaticism. It states that religion is as intoxicating as opium.

In my view the present conditions of the country influence all the ideologies including my own ideology. I had done research work on Ram Janambhoomi before 1967 but I did not get any proof for it. I had not done any investigation for searching the site of Ram Janambhoomi before 1967. The witness again said that she had done research work or finding out the site of Ram Janambhoomi before 1967 but from 1967 to 1977 I have not undertaken any investigation or research. During the decade starting from 1980 I conducted research work for locating Ram

Janambhoomi. It is correct to say that I had not done any investigation or research work on the site of Ram Janambhoomi since 1990. The research done by me between 1980 and 1990 has not been published.

I studied books written on places of pilgrimage for searching the site of Ram Janambhoomi. None of my research works or articles has been published with regard to the site of Ram Janambhoomi. I have read about the excavation work undertaken by John Marshall with regard to Harappa and Taxila, besides the book written by Prof. B.B. Lal on excavation works. I have also read the articles published in Indian Archaeological review from time to time.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suvira Jaiswal

22.3.2001

Typed by stenographer in open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 23.03.2001.

Sd/-

22.3.2001

Dated :01.05.2001

[In continuation of 22.03.2001. the statement on oath of Smt. Suvira Jaiswal P.W.18 begins] .

[Shri Puttu Lal Mishra continued cross examination on behalf of Jain Saheb]

By the age of ancient Indian history I mean 3000 B.C.

to 7th century. The subsequent period from 8th century to 12th century is known as pre-Medieval period which is linked to ancient Indian age. I have studied the history of ancient Indian age and pre-medieval age also. My syllabus for M.A comprised the history of ancient age and pre-medieval age. The subject of my research work was only part of ancient Indian history and this period ranged from 200 B.C. to 550 A.D. In my view Vaishnavism emanated from Gupta period. I do not believe that Vaishnavism means worship of Vishnu. Lord Vishnu has great importance in the prevalence and origin of Vaishnavism. First of all Vishnu was worshipped by Vaishnavites. By Vishnu I mean the same lord Vishnu who is mentioned alongwith Brahma and Mahesh. On the basis of documentary and literary sources the first incarnation of Vishnu is described as Krishna. According to documentary sources there is no mention of any other incarnation of Vishnu before Krishna. Matsya and Varah incarnations are considered to have taken place in Kushan age. The period of Kushan age is considered to be 1st A.D. to 3rd A.D. The opinion expressed by me about Matsya and Varah incarnations is based on literary sources. The literature sources mentioned by me from 1st A.D. to 3rd A.D. pertain to Mahabharat. I do not remember any other definite literary basis besides Mahabharat at present. The facts stated by me about Krishna are based on documentary and literary sources. The above mentioned facts support the history. According to documentary sources, Shri Krishna was worshipped as an incarnation of Vishnu but the documents do not throw light on chronology. The period of Shri Krishna is chronologically considered to be 3200 B.C. to 3102 B.C. But there is controversy about it and the age shown as the age of Krishna is the last stage of Dwapar age. In my view, Kaliyug starts from 3201 B.C. which was the age or Mahabharat period. In my view the age of Shri

Krishna was the age of Mahabharat. I do not consider any period as the period of Mahabharat. According to history and according to my own assessment there is nothing like Mahabharat age or Mahabharaat period. There was Harappan age in India from 3200 B.C. to 3102 B.C. and no body knows which kings ruled during that period. Historically the rule of Pandavas cannot be disclosed. From 3200 B.C. to 3201 B.C. there was no existence of Delhi in historical map or India. Hastinapur was also non-existent. There was no Dwarika. Shri Krishna, who is considered to be the incarnation of Vishnu was born in Mathura mythologically. There is no historical basis available in this regard.

Mythological basis is also the religious and a literary basis. According to mythological and religious literature. Krishna was considered to be born on the day of Ashtmi of Krishna Paksha of Bhadra Mas. It is correct that the birthday of Krishna is celebrated from ancient times but it is not correct to say that it is celebrated from time immemorial. I do not remember as to which source has first of all described Janmashtmi but I presume that Janmashtmi continued to be celebrated almost from Gupta period. It is correct that having considered Krishna as an incarnation, people started naming their children after his name i.e. they keeps different name of Krishna. In Dwapar age there was no incarnation of Vishnu other than Krishna. Chronologically, the present time comes under Kaliyug. No incarnation of Vishnu has so far established in Kaliyug. Dwapar yug was preceded by Treta yug. Treta yug must have started about 30.00000 years ago. Ram, the son of Dashrath is considered to be an incarnation of Vishnu in Treta yug. Ramchandra ji was born in Ayodhya city. According to Indian Pachang calendar, the day of Navami of Shukla Paksh of Chaitra Mas is the birth day of Shri

Ramchandra ji. It is correct that birth day: of Ram is also celebrated with the same enthusiasm and zeal with which the birth day of Shri Krishna is celebrated by people. Worship is performed in Ayodhya. Lakhs of people gather in Ayodhya on this occasion. Shri Ram got so much recognition as incarnation of Vishnu that people christened their children on the name of Ram.

It is correct that the name of Shri Ram is prevalent through out India. It is correct that the chronologically the age of Ram is Known as Ramayan Kal also. It is not correct to say that besides India. Ram is worshipped in other countries such as Java. Sumatra, Indonesia, Thailand, Borneo etc. but Ram Katha is popular there also. It is correct that Ram Lila is performed in these countries even to day and it is also correct that children are named after Ram. It is correct to say that a number of cities and places have been named after Ram in India as well as various other countries. A place named Ramkot is in Ayodhya. There is a belief that Shri Ram was born in the same Ramkot Mohalla and the place is considered pious and fit for worship. I do not know whether any city in Afghanistan is named as Ramgul. There are cities by the name of Ramgarh and Rampur in Bangladesh. There may be names of several cities add places similar to Ram all over the world but it is not necessary that they have been named after Ram. I do not consider Sanatan Dharm as the oldest of all religions and in my view the religion of tribes is the oldest of all the religions. In history, assessment of religion is made on the basis of mode or worship and the accepted deity. Some tribes worshipped the sun while some others worshipped a particular mountain and different tribes worshipped different gods. Aryan tribes worshipped Vishnu. The practice of worshipping at a particular place after constructing it for this purpose might have come into vogue

in 5th or 6th century B.C.. Although there is no definite proof available in this regard, possibly this might have been prevalent in Harappan civilization.

The places of worship constructed in the form of buildings were known as Devalaya, Devkul, Prasar and Devgriha and the word Mandir was not used at that time. It was perhaps in 16th or 17th century that Devalaya came to be known as Mandir. The word Mandir has been used in Hindi and not in Sanskrit. I can not say definitely but perhaps in Ramcharitmanas the word- Mandir might have been used as Devalaya.

The places of worship in Christianity are known as churches. I can not tell as to when the history of churches started. It is correct that the place of worship in Islam is known as Masjid. In my view the Masjid came into existence in history first of all in the 7th century.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd /-

Suvira Jaiswal

1.5.2001

Typed by stenographer in open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 2.05.2001.

Sd/-

1.5.2001

Dated :03.05.2001

(In continuation of 01.05.2001, statement on oath of Smt. Suvira Jaiswal P.W. 18 begins)

In my view there is no difference between Vaishnavism and Vaishnav Dharm. By Vaishnavism I mean faith and Vaishnav religion. The word Dharm has been derived from "DHRI" in Sanskrit. The origin of the word Dharm considered to have taken place in 1500 B.C. The word "Dharm" has been used in Rigved. The period of composing of Rigved is considered to be 1500 B.C. to 1000 B.C. The exact synonym of the word Dharm is not available in any other language. The word Dharm comprises code of conduct, ethics and all good things prevalent in society. There were several religions of tribes before Vaishnav Dharm. All these religions were known by the names of those tribes such as Arya Dharm, Anarya Dharm, Shabar Jan-Jati Dharm and Kirat Jan-Jati Dharm. Besides these four Dharms, there were Bhil Jan-Jati Dharm and Gond Jan-Jati Dharm also. All these aforesaid Dharms originated earlier than Vaishnav Dharm. Vaishnav Dharm originated in Gupta period i.e. around 300 and 400 A.D. Arya Dharm can be said to have originated in 1500 B.C. or even earlier. The mode of worship of Aryans comprised Yajna. In my view there was no caste system among Aryans in the beginning. The caste system developed in post-vedic age. The post-vedic age is considered to be from 1000 B.C. to 600 B.C. There was no idol worship in Arya religion. No image was also worshipped in Arya Dharm. Anarya Dharm means the religion, followers of which are not Aryas. The system of worship of Anaryas was just the opposite of Aryas but it can not called to be totally at variance. Arya Dharm worshipped the elements of nature with Vedic Richas whereas Anaryas worshipped these elements by uttering

something. The followers of Anarya Dharm did not consider Indra as God. The followers of Arya Dharm and Anarya Dharm both sacrificed animals but system of sacrifice differed. The priests of the followers of Arya Dharm were Brahmans who performed worship. This was not the case with Anaryas. I can not tell more about it at present. Arya Dharm emanated from the four Vedas. Vedas and Arya Dharm originated simultaneously. Vedic Dharm and Arya Dharm is one and the same thing. Vedic Dharm or Arya Dharm spread from Punjab in India to some parts of Afghanistan and North and Western parts of India in 1500. B.C. Anarya Dharm spread in all comers of the world wherever there were human beings. There is difference between Vaishnav Dharm and Arya Dharm. By Arya Dharm I mean Vedic Dharm. Yajnas were given prominence in it whereas worship was given prominence in Vaishnav Dharm. The followers of Vaishnav Dharm accept all the four Vedas. It is not totally correct that the followers of Vaishnav Dharm are the followers of Arya Dharm only. It is not also correct to say that the followers of Vaishnav Dharm accept most of the systems of Arya Dharm. The followers of Vaishnav Dharm do not accept the system of animal sacrifice of Arya Dharm. Besides this the followers of Vaishnav Dharm worship Vishnu in idol form which was not in vogue in Arya Dharm. These are the main differences. Besides this, there is basic similarity in both of them. It is not correct to say that after the advent of Vaishnav Dharm all the followers of Arya Dharm got merged in Vaishnav Dharm. In my view the followers of Arya Dharm are perhaps negligible in number. It is also not correct to say that with the development of Vaishnav Dharm, the Arya Samaj was fully taken over by Vaishnav Dharm. It is also not correct that with the development of Vaishnav Dharm the number of the followers of Arya Dharm has decreased and the number of the followers of Vaishnav Dharm has increased. Anarya

Dharmas are still continuing. By Anarya Dharmas I mean all those Dharmas which were followed by people other than Aryas and also all those Dharmas which were outside the ambit of Arya Dharmas.

Question : Whether the following statement given above by you is correct or wrong?

"There were several religions of tribes before Vaishnav Dharm. All those religions were known by the names of those tribes such as, Arya Dharm, Anarya Dharm, Sabar Jan-Jati Dharm and Kirat Jan-Jati Dharm. Besides these four Dharmas. there were Bhil Jan-Jati Dharm and Gond Jan-Jati Dharm also."

Answer : My above mentioned statement is correct but this does not reflect my view fully. Because there was no Anarya Jan Jati. What I have stated further is just to exemplify my point as. Sahar, Gond. etc.

Question : Is Anarya Dharm any Dharm or not?

Answer : Anarya Dharm is a negative noun. i.e. all Dharmas other than Arya Dharmas are called Anarya Dharmas.

Question : Whether there is anything like Anarya Dharm?

Answer : There is no particular Dharm as Anarya Dharm. All those Dharmas other than Arya Dharmas are Anarya Dharmas.

Special : By Anarya Dharm I mean that there is no specific Anarya Dharm.

Question:Whether any non-specific Anarya Dharm has

continuously been in existence?

Answer : I do not understand this question.

[The court made the witness understand the question and then the witness answered]

Anarya Dharm of some tribes have been continuing as non-specific. That is Anarya Dharm is not a special Dharm but it includes all Dharms other than Arya Dharm and among them some tribal Dharm are still continuing.

Anarya Dharm does not include Bauddh Dharm. It does not include Jain Dharm also. I can not say definitely whether Parsi Dharm comes under Anarya Dharm or not. Islam does not literally come under Anarya Dharm (the witness again said) Islam comes under Anarya Dharm. Christianity also comes under the category of Anarya Dharm. The founder of Jain and Bauddh Dharm called themselves Aryas and therefore both of these religions fall under the category of Arya Dharm. (The witness herself said) Arya Dharm is not monolithic.

I do not mean to say that the followers of Vedic Dharm and Arya Dharm belong to one and the same race. It is correct that the branches of the followers of Vedic Dharm and Arya Dharm have spread to different places in the world. It is wrong to say that in case all the followers of Vedic Dharm and Arya Dharm or the people falling under their category are kept in one group, then all of them will be called Hindus. Use of the word Hindu came into vogue from 10th or 11th Century. When the word Hindu originated at that time the people living in the east of Sindhu Valley were called Hindus. In the beginning the word Hindu was a geographical word but later on it did not remain so. Afterwards it symbolised a religion. It was in 141h -151h

Century that it came to represent a religion i.e. the word Hindu had become Hindu religion in 14th -15th Century. It would not be correct to say that the people who were called Hindus geographically came to be known as the followers of Hindu Dharm in 14th -15th Century. The people who adopted Islam in 14th - 15th Century went out of the ambit of Hindu Dharm. Similarly who adopted Christianity also separated them from Hindu Dhann. By and large, it can be said that all those people who were geographically Hindu and did not adopt any other religion i.e., they did not adopt Islam and Christianity, came to be known as the followers of Hindu religion.

I have studied some of the books of Bauddh Dharm such as, Dhirgh Nikay, Buddh Charit. Jatak literature. I might have studied some more Bauddh literature also but I do not remember the names of those books now. The names of those Bauddh books which I have utilised for my books, 'The Origin and Development of Vaishnavism' are as follows: Jatak Sahitya, Dirgh Nikay, portions of Tripitak Sahitya, Buddh Charit of Ashwaghosh etc. I have mentioned all such books in the Bibliography of my book. The names of Bauddh Tripitaks are: Suttapitak, Abhidhamm Pitak and Vinay Pitak. These Pitaks have been compiled by the disciples of Buddha. Ram and Ramayan have been mentioned only in Jatak Sahitya among Bauddh Sahitya. Besides this, it has been mentioned in Avdan Shatak also. Ram and Ramayan also find mention in books like Abhidharm Vibhasha and Kalpna Manditika. Old stories have been narrated in Jatak Sahitya. Abhidharm Vibhasha is a commentary. Some other books are commentaries. Kund Jatak Sahitya in Pali in whichever books I have read. Kalpna Manditika and Ahhidharm Vibhasha are in Sanskrit. I have seen only some portions of these books. I do not know Pali language fully but I can understand it a little. I

can understand Sanskrit more than Pali. It is correct that I have stated that I have a very smattering knowledge of Sanskrit.

The description given of Shri Ram Katha in Jatak Sahitya is different from that given in Balmiki Ramayan. I do not know about any other literature in Bauddha Sahitya wherein Ram Katha has been written differently from that given in Balmiki Ramayan i.e., the difference occurs in Jatak Sahitya only.

The period of writing Jatak Sahitya is considered to be from 300 B.C. to 200 A.D. Buddha has been called the author of Jatak Sahitya but it is not so in reality. No such name has been found in history that could be called the author of Jatak Sahitya. There is no possibility that Jatak Sahitya might have been written later than the period stated above by me. Balmiki Ramayan does not precede the complete Jatak Sahitya. The period of composing Balmiki Ramayan is considered to be from 300 B.C. to 1st Century A.D. It is impossible for me to tell as to which portion of Balmiki Ramayan was composed earlier than Jatak Katha. The original Balmiki Ramayan is considered to comprise only 5 Kands. viz.. Ayodhya Kand. Kishkindha Kand, Sundar Kand, Yuddha Kand and I do not remember the name of the 5th Kand at present. But Bal Kand and Uttarkand are considered to have been composed afterwards. Barring Bal Kand and Uttarkand, all other Kands of Balmiki Ramayan form part of the original Ramayan. It is not correct to say the original Ramayan was composed earlier than Jatak Katha. The internal analysis of Jatak Katha reveals that it is an earlier version of the Ram Katha of Balmiki Ramayan.

It would be wrong to say that if the 5 Kands of Balmiki

Ramayan are read then we would feel that Balmiki Ramayan was an earlier work than the Jatak Katha. It is also not correct to hold that I am determining the period of Balmiki Ramayan by Jatak Katha. The analysis of Jatak Katha done by me is my only source on the basis of which I have stated that the Ram Katha given in Jatak Katha is older than Balmiki Ramayan. It is correct to say that there is no other erstwhile literary or historical source available in this regard besides my analysis source. It is correct that Maharishi Balmiki means poet Balmiki was born and he wrote Balmiki Ramayan. It is also correct on the contrary, that no body knows anything about the author of Jatak Katha. It is correct that I have attached more importance in this context to the Jatak Katha, the author of which is not known at all and have not given that much importance to the literature, the author of which is well known.

The Ram Katha which has been described differently in the stories of Bauddha Jataks is not available only in Dashrath Jatak but is available in Vesantar Jatak also. In my view, besides this, there is no difference in Ram Katha in any other Jatak. There is no difference in Ram Katha occurring in Dashrath Jatak and Vesantar Jatak. The Ram Kaha given in Dashrath Jatak is not described fully in Vesantar Jatak but its mention has been made therein incidentally.

Ram Katha of Jain Ram.ayan is also different from that of Balmiki Ramayan. Jain Ramayan pertaining to Ram Katha is known as Uttar Puran. Uttar Puran is the name of full book. Gun Bhadra is the author of this book and it is the work of 9th Century. There are several Jain Ramayans, such as, Pomyacharya Ramayan written by Vimalsuri. Padma Puran written by Ravishen and Ramayan written by Harishen (I do not remember the name of the book at

present). The Pomyacharya Ramayan written by Vimalsuri is considered to be the work of 2nd to 4th Century and similarly the Ramayan written by Ravishen is considered to be the work of 6th Century. I do not remember the period of Ramayan written by Harishen. Pomyacharya Ramayan is the work of the period subsequent to the period of Dashrath Jatak. In Pomyacharya Dashrath has been portrayed as the King of Ayodhya and in Dashrath Jatak he has been shown as the King of Varanasi. Pomacharya Ramayan contains the description about abduction of Sita and Killing of Ravan but Dashrath Jatak does not contain such a description. Padma Puran also mainly follows Pomcharya particularly. I have not studied much of the Ramayan written by Harishen and so I do not remember it at present. The Ramayan written by Gun Bhadra belonged to 9th Century. Dashrath has been shown as the King of Varanasi in Uttar Puran also and later on his capital has been shown as shifted to Ayodhya. Similarly Sita has been shown as the daughter of Mandodari in Uttar Puran. I do not consider the Ram Katha described in Pomcharya and Padma Puran as historical. i.e., the proof of history. Similarly, I do not accept Buddh Jatak stories as historical truth means historical facts. In my view, Bauddh Jatak and Jain Ramayan are not the sources of history in regard to Shri Ram and are all myths. The historian uses myths in writing history. By myths I mean stories. It is wrong to say that the myth gives us only the knowledge of the development of the subject but it also acquaints us with the origin of the subject. Jain Ramayan proves that Balmiki Ramayan had become very popular by that time and the Jainis wanted to use Ram Katha in their own way. Similarly, Balmiki Ramayan had become popular by the time of Bauddh Jataks. Bauddh Jataks belonged to different centuries. The earlier Bauddh Jataks described Shri Ram Katha independently but later Jataks were influenced by Balmiki Ramayan. In my view no historical

proof is available about Ram Katha. It is correct that proof exists about the worship of Shri Ram as the incarnation of God. Shri Ram has been considered as the incarnation of Vishnu from 200 A.D. The first proof of worshipping Shri Ram as incarnation is available in Gupta period. It would be wrong to say that Shri Ram began to be worshipped in Gupta period in all parts of Gupta Kingdom. The document found from a site in Vindhya Pradesh shows that Vakatak Maharani Prabhawati Gupta, who was the daughter of Chandra Gupta. I worshipped Ramgiri Swami and this was the first proof of the worship of Ram, the son of Dashrath. It is correct that by the time of Gupta 'Period Lord Ram began to be worshipped as an incarnation of Vishnu. It, is also correct that the kings of Gupta period were the followers of Vaishnav Dharm. It is correct that in the beginning of Gupta period this belief had become common that Shri Ram was born in Ayodhya. I have given a map in my book. The attention of the witness was drawn in this regard to the map given in her book. "Origin and Development of Vaishnavism", on seeing which the witness said that the map shown as correct and the photostat copy produced by the Advocate of the learned advocate cross-examining, on which paper No. 194C-2 has been recorded was correct. It is correct to say that in early century of Christian era, Shri Ram had become famous as an incarnation of Vishnu was based on the popularity of the hero of Balmiki. The recognition of Shri Ram as the incarnation of Vishnu continues till the present, right from the time when he was recognized as an incarnation of Vishnu and continues to be adored by the Hindus.

It is correct that the city of Ayodhya had become famous in the beginning of the Gupta period. It is correct to say that the Ayodhya of Gupta period is the same which is situated in Faizabad District today. It is also correct to say

that the disputed structure existed in the same Ayodhya. It is also correct to say that the Gupta kings worshipped Vishnu and His incarnations. I do not get any definite proof whether the kings of the Gupta period worshipped or not Shri Ram, the incarnation of Vishnu. A document has been found at a place known as Bhitri Ghazipur which disclosed that Gupta kings worshipped Sharngin God but it could not be decided whether Sharngin was Vishnu Himself or His incarnation, Shri Ram Sharngin means the one who holds bow and Sanrg is the bow of Vishnu. I have not seen Vishnu's idol, holding bow in any temple. It is not correct that I have not read in any book of history or any authentic book the description of Vishnu holding bow. Vishnu has been described as the one who holds Sanrg bow in Dhanurved .I do not remember whether Vishnu has been shown in the form of as an archer in any authentic book wherein some temple might have been described. I have not depicted Vishnu as an archer in my book. "Origin and Development of Vaishnavism". Vishnu has not been shown as an archer in any temple. I have not mentioned Dhanurved in my book. Besides my book, I have not written any article thereafter till today wherein Vishnu has been shown in the form of as an archer in any temple. It is correct to say that in all the idols of Shri Ram, which are popularly available till today, he has been shown as an archer. I have not given this map in Paper No. 194-C/2 in the Hindi version of my book. "Origin and Development of Vaishnavism". This Hindi version might have been brought out in 1995-96 but I do not remember correctly. This map was not given by the publisher in Hindi version of the book. I did not notice this thing at the time of the publication of the book and came to know about it later on but I did not take any corrective action even thereafter. It is wrong to say that when English version of my book was published, I was the follower of communist ideology but by the time the

Hindi version of the book came out. I had sold myself to Babari Masjid Action Committee. It is also wrong to say that I held the view that as Hindi version will fetch larger readership and so I removed the map from the Hindi version and added appendix- A to it. I have not given personal attention to Hindi version and the publisher might have paid due attention. It is not correct to say that because of this the publisher had the right to add or delete any page.

In my view Christian era started from Vikram Samvat 57. I can not tell the date of birth of Christ. By abbreviations B.C .E. used by me in my book and in my statement I mean 'before Vikram Samvat 57'. In my view B.C. is a chronological calculating formula. I do not know the full form of it. I do not know the full form of A.D. also. I have used B.C. and A.D. in my statement and in my book and have not used the word Samvat. It is not correct to say that Samvat is more authentic than A.D. and B.C. I can not say whether Samvat is the oldest among world calendars. I do not remember at present which the oldest calendar is. There was some chronological calculation system in Egypt also but I do not remember correctly. It is correct that the Egyptian Calendar was not more popular. Vikram Samvat is authentic and popular in India only and not in the world. I can not tell as to which calendar was older and more popular than Vikram Samvat in the world. The Christian Era started from Samvat 57 and the basis of it is the popular calendar i.e. if it is 2001 A.D. today. it is Samvat 2058 and it on this basis that I calculated it and said that Christian Era started from Samvat 57. To me it became self evident that the Christian Era started from Samvat 57 and there was no need to apply my mind. It would be wrong to say that in December 2001. Vikram Samvat would be 2058. In my view in December 2001, Vikram Samvat would be 2059.

As a historian I have not tried to fix Christian Era and Vikram Samvat. I do not know when Christian Era started. There is controversy among scholars in this regard. I agree that it has not so far been decided as what was the date of birth of Lord Christ .

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suvira Jaiswal

03.05.2001

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further Cross-examination be present on 4.05.2001.

Sd/-

3.5.2001

Dated : 4-5-2001

[In continuation of 3.05.2001 the statement on oath of Smt. Suvira Jaiswal, P.W. -18 begins):

The appendix-' A' was added to the Hindi edition of my book because I had studied and conducted research in this regard. The contents of appendix-' A ' are not different from the English version of my book but I have added something to it. Whatever I have written in English version, I have analysed the matter further and extended it with proof; in appendix-' A '. Under the new proofs, I have analysed Dashrath Jatak, synthesised it with the erstwhile circumstances, and mentioned some new sources also. Among. new sources, I have mentioned the .Jain Ramayan of Gun Bhadra in the Hindi edition which was not given in the English edition. I do not remember other sources mentioned by me. There was no political reason behind writing appendix-' A '. I have definitely expressed my views in appendix-'A' of Hindi version as to how the Hindu organisations have used this subject. By Hindu organizations I mean those Hindus persons who have been making political use of their devotion to Rama. I treat Bharatiya Janata Party and Vishwa Hindu Parishad as Hindu Organizations. Rastriya Swayam Sewak Sangh also comes under this category. Besides this, I do not remember other names in this context. It is correct that I have mentioned only Bhartiya Janta Party in appendix-'A'. I have not mentioned the other two Hindu organizations, namely Vishwa Hindu Parishad and Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh. I have not mentioned them in my book because I have made only a symbolic mention. It is not correct to say that according to my book only Hindu organization are defaulting and Muslim organizations are quite all right. I have not mentioned any Muslim organization or any fanatic

Muslim organizations in appendix-'A ' because I was discussing about devotion to Ram Bhakti . This was not the subject matter of appendix-'A ' of my book and so I did not mention any Muslim organization or any fanatic Muslim organization opposed to Ram. This is entirely correct that my aim was to oppose Hindu nationalism. A little truth in this was that how religious matters were being distorted politically. According to appendix-' A ' Lord Shri Ram continues to be adored for a long time. It is correct that some devotees of Ram wish to present him as symbol of this country. It is also correct that in my view Shri Ram can not become a symbol of this country. Babar and his descendents can not also be the symbol of this country. I have used the word 'Hindu Rashtravad' in appendix-'A'. By Hindu Rashtravad I mean such persons who ignore the interests of Dalits and minorities i.e. the interests of minority community. I am not aware of 'Muslim Nationalism' as a popular term. The term 'Islamic State' is popular. I do not know whether this country was a Islamic country till the death of Aurangzeb. i.e. upto 1760. Muslim rule started in 1526

Question : What type of rule was there in India from 1526 to 1760, i.e. whether it was a Islamic State, Hindu Nationalism or Secular State or any other type of rule?

Answer : None of these three types of rule was there at that time. It was a feudal system.

There were both Muslim and Hindu feudal system in India. India has never been a Hindu or Vedic Rashtra. Vedic India was limited to north- west and was influenced by Arya Dharm. The map given in the English version of my book (Paper No, 194-C-2) depicts India from 200 B.C. to 500 A.D. In 200 B.C. north India was governed by Shungs.

There were Kingdoms of Gupta, Vakatak, Chol etc. dynasties in 500 A.D. The kings of this period, i.e. 200 B.C. to 500 A.D. were influenced by Vaishnavism. It is correct that according to the map given by me in this book complete India comprised today's Pakistan, Afghanistan. Java. Sumatra, Sri Lanka, Burma, Bangladesh and some portion of China. On the right side downwards in the map I have mentioned that the places where coins, seals etc, were found had the influence of Vaishnavism. It is also correct to say the Vaishnavism was not limited to these places only but it held its sway over even much larger area. I do not know as to which was the first Islamic state in the world. At present the Islamic states are: Iran, Iraq. Afghanistan, Pakistan. Arab Emirates. Saudi Arabia etc. I have not studied much as to how the conditions of non-Islamic people in Islamic states were. I have not studied about any other country except India and so I can not tell about the conditions of non-Islamic people in other Muslim countries or whether they have got equal rights or not. I have stated rightly in appendix-' A' of the Hindi version of my book as follows:

"Consecration of Ram as a complete incarnation of Vishnu was full of important religions and philosophic connotations, which found expression in various forms of Ram related symbolism. For example, on one plane. Ram was a complete man who behaved like an ideal of man. But on author plane he was a God-supernatural and all pervasive simultaneously. He had no beginning and no end".

There is some difference between the Ram Katha written in some Bauddh literature and that occurring in Balmiki Ramayan but there is no basic difference. It is not correct to say that the Ram Katha given in Balmiki

Ramayan and has been described in other books also, besides Bauddh literature is basically the same. There is basic difference between the Ram Katha of Balmiki Ramayan and that of Jain Ramayans. In Jain Ramayans the character of Ravan has been depicted as very good. Only one weakness has been shown in him and that is his lust for Sita. In Jain Ramayans, 8000 queens of Shri Ram besides Sita have been described at some places. It has been shown that Ravan was killed by Laxman. Soorpankha has been described as Chandranakha. Similarly, there is difference in various other incidents also. I have read the aforesaid things in Pamyacharya Ramayan of Vimalsuri. Similarly, I have read these things in Padm Charit or Padm Puran of Ravishen. These things have been described in Uttar Ramayan of Gun Bhadra. I have not described all the aforesaid book as mentioned in Jain Ramayans. I have written only this that character of Ravan has been depicted good according to Jain Ramayans. In my book I have pointed out the basic differences that have been highlighted in Jain Ramayans. Some basic differences have been pointed while some others have not been pointed out in my book. It is correct that I have not mentioned the aforesaid basic differences in my book and have only pointed out that Ravan's character has been depicted good.

It is totally wrong to say that the facts mentioned by me about the basic difference of Ram Katha described in Jain Ramayans do not occur in Jain Ramayans. I have myself read the differences which I have pointed above. [The witness was shown the Hindi and English version of her book on this topic]. After seeing the book the witness said that she might have written in her book that the character of Ravan has been shown good in Jain Ramayans. She further stated that this is a well known fact that whosoever reads Jain Ramayans understand that the

character of Ravan has been depicted good. Both these facts stated by me are correct that it has been written in Jain Ramayans that Ravan was a good person and that afterwards it was stated by me that even if it was not written but one gets the impression after reading the book that Ravan was a good person. There is no difference between these two statements. In the bibliography of my book Padm Puran Ramayan of Ravirshen has been mentioned but Paumacharya of Vimalsuri has been left out. The Ramayan of Gun Bhadra has not been mentioned in my English book because there is no appendix - 'A' in the English version. After having seen page-143 of her English book the witness said that she has mentioned the Ramayan of Gun Bhadra in this book. Her aforesaid statement that she had not mentioned the Ramayan of Gun Bhadra was wrong because she did not remember it.

The Padm Puran I have mentioned on page-84 of my book in English is not the Padam Puran of Ravishren but is a Brahman Dharm book. The Paumacharya Ramayan mentioned by me on page-23 of my this book is the Paumacharya of Vimalsuri. The Paumacharya mentioned by me on page-89 of this book is also the Paumcharya written by Vimalsuri. I have mentioned Jain Ramayans in my book on pages-23, 89 and 141. Besides this, I do not know where I have mentioned Jain Ramayans in my book. I can not tell this because I do not remember the whole book. Roughly I can say that besides this I have not mentioned Jain Ramayans anywhere else. I have mentioned some facts from Mahabharat in my book. I have taken those things from the Critical Edition of Mahabharat which was edited by V.S. Sukhtankar and other colleagues and was published from Poona and was read by me. It was published in several volumes from 1927 to 1966. I do not remember the number of volumes correctly but perhaps it is

in 10 volumes. Besides this, I had seen the Kumbh Koram edition of Mahabharat. It was published in several volumes from 1905 to 1910. Its editors are T .R. Krishnacharya and I.R. Vyasacharya. Besides this mention has also been made of Mahabharat edited by Ramchandra Shastri Kunjwadekar New Delhi, 1979. In addition to this, I have used the English translation of Mahabharat by P.C. Roy in my book. It was published between 1972 to 1975. I have mentioned these Mahabharats only and not others. Besides them, I have mentioned two edition of Ramayan in my book and they are one is Balmiki Ramayan published by Gita Press. Gorakhpur and edited by Janaki Das Sharma. It was published in Samvat 2017. The second book I have used is the English translation of Ramayan done by R.T.H. Griffith and published from London in 1870. Besides this. I have not used any other Ramayan in my book. I have read Balmiki Ramayan which is in Sanskrit and was written around 300 B.C. I have a copy of Balmiki Ramayan with me. The aforesaid Balmiki Ramayan brought out by Gita Press Gorakhpur is the translation or the same Balmiki Ramayan of 300 B.C. and contains its simultaneous translation along with its Sanskrit text. I have not read Encyclopedia Britannica. I have heard about it. The appendix -' A' of Hindi book was published as an article in English and the Photostat copy of which was filed by the advocate of the Cross Examine and on seeing which the witness said that it is the same which has been numbered as paper No. C-2/195.

It is correct to say that whether we talk of Baudh Scriptures, Jain Scriptures, Balmiki Ramayan or any other book, the substance of all of them is that Ayodhya was a city where Shri Ram ruled. It is wrong to say that although I know that 99% people have accepted Ram as God from time immemorial, I tried to distort history through my

article. It is wrong to say that I have written such things in my article under the influence of some Islamic fanatics or by receiving money from abroad. It is wrong to say that I received money in dollars from abroad for my writings and I wrote false things in my book out of sheer greed.

[Cross examination concluded by Shri Hari Shankar Jain. Advocate on behalf of Defendant No. 10 Hindu Mahasabha and Defendant No. 17 Shri Ramesh Chandra.]

[Cross examination on behalf of Shri Rajendra Singh S/o Shri Gopal Singh Visharad plaintiff. Suit no. 1189 by Shri Pullu Lal Mishra. Advocate.]

{On behalf of the plaintiff Shri Puttu Lal Mishra adopted the Cross-examination advanced by the earlier defendants.}

[Cross examination on behalf of plaintiffs in Suit no. 5/89 by Shri Vireshwar Dwivedi, Advocate.]

In my view the word 'Arya' has been used both for religion and society. But I have not seen 'Dravin' being used for Dharm. As a historian I have not seen 'Hun' also being used with regard to Dharm. By Anarya Dharm. I mean all those religions which do not accept Arya Dharma such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam. All these are Anarya Dharmas.

I consider stories as myths. By myths I mean imaginary things. New testament is a holy book of Christians. This book describes the incidents of the life of Jesus Christ.

In my view Jesus Christ has not himself written any

book of religion for Christian. It is correct that whatever has been described about Christianity ~as come out in the form of stories. Mahatma Buddh also did not write any book on Bauddha Dharm. It is treated that the dispels of Mahatma Buddh narrated stories describing the incidents of Buddha's life lime and in this way Bauddh Dharm was propagated. I do not know whether Mohammed Saheb wrote any religious book or not or whether he was literate or not. I do not know in which year or period was Holy Quran written. In my view religion is based on faith. The faith is based on the character and conduct of the hero whether he is Mohammed Saheb or Holy Christ or Shri Ram. Shruti means what is heard, Smriti means what is learnt by heart what is heard is what is related it may be in the form of story. I do not consider Christianity religion as imaginary.

In my view, if Mohammed Sahab related the Holy Quran and people wrote it in some script after learning it by heart, then it may literally fall in the category of Smriti. I do not keep Islam in the category of myths. I do not consider Christianity also as myth. I consider Ram Katha as imaginary but I do not consider devotion to Ram as imaginary. It is correct that devotion to Ram is based on Ram Katha. The word Jatak is both in Pali as well as in Sanskrit also. It would not be correct to hold that 'Jatak' is apbhransh of the word 'Vachak'. Jatak does not mean mendicant. Its literal meaning in my view is the story (If bi11h. As far as I know the word Jatak means that only. Jatak Katha has been related by Bauddh Bhikshus. But these things have been related orally by the Buddha himself in Jataks. The Tripitaks referred to by me were, written by Bauddha Bhikshus and not by any single person. I have talked about Nikayas and they have also been written by Bauddha Bhikshus. I do not hold that Christians, Muslims. Jews, Bauddhs and Hindus are all hero-

worshippers. It is partly correct that in Hinduism knowledge i.e. discretion has been given importance. It is correct that Gayatri Mantra is considered as basic Mantra in Hindu Dharm. It is correct that prayer is offered to omnipotent God with this Mantra to inspire one's mind to take a righteous path. It is correct that Hindu religion is the only religion which allows the use of discretion in following one's religion. But I can not say about other religions whether they permit this latitude or not.

It is correct to say to a great extent that because of this attitude different Rishis used their discretion or wisdom and composed Samhitas. Some people also misused their discretion and presented facts before society in distorted form. I can not say these people changed from time to time. It is correct that the Rishis who used their discretion or wisdom use sometime called seers, sometime saints, sometimes Rishis and sometime Guru. In ancient times, if somebody attained special knowledge, he was either called Guru or Acharya and not Kulpati. Those who were called Gurus in ancient times are now called Professors. If somebody acquires some specialized knowledge in any subject, he is conferred the degree of Ph.D. or D.Litt. Convent is that place where education is imparted by Nuns. Gurukul was that place where education was imparted by Gurus. It would be totally wrong to say that I have misused my discretion out of my greed for publicity and propagation. It is wrong to say that I have written false things in my book. It would also be wrong to hold that I added appendix- 'A' in my Hindi book out of my greed for publicity and propagation. Whatever I have written in appendix- 'A', I had described all those things in brief in my original book. I have given a detailed description of all that in appendix- 'A'. It is wrong to suggest that I added appendix- 'A' in my Hindi book out of some greed or prejudice. I did not give it

in my English book because it was not written till then. It is correct that afterwards when I wrote it, I got it published in English journal and the same material was translated into Hindi.

I wrote this article in English for publicity and propagation. I have been influenced by Marxism and this ideology can be seen in my English book, in my article in English, in appendix- 'A ' in my Hindi book and in my all other books. As I espouse the ideology of Marxism, I do not believe in religion. whether it is Islam, Judaism, Christianity and Hinduism. I believe in the existence of these religious books but not in the religions mentioned in them. It is not correct to say that I consider the contents of all these religious books as imaginary. I have not read New Testament, Holy Quran, Bible, Taurat, Jaboor and so there is no question of its acceptance or non-acceptance. I have not read any critical edition of any of these scriptures. I have read Bhagwad Gita. I have Read it in its original Sanskrit text. I do not consider the content of Gita as myth but I consider it as an ideology. I consider the exponent of this ideology as imaginary i.e. the person who propounded this ideology is imaginary.

I accept the existence of Balmiki the author of Ramayan. I accept its contents also. I accept the personalities of the characters depicted in Balmiki Ramayan but I doubt their historicity.

I acknowledge the historicity of Mohammed Saheb. I accept whatever has been written in the text book of history in this regard. The name of the book is "The Age of Imperial Kannauj" edited by R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pushalkar. This book was perhaps published in the decade of 1960. I have read the book edited on this subject and not

any original book. I have expressed my views on the basis of that edited book. The edited book and the original book fall in different categories. I have read the original book of Mahabharat. Vyas Ji is known as its so called author. I have read the book published in the name of Shri Vyas. The period of this Mahabharat which I have read is considered to be between 300 B.C. to 400 B.C. roughly. This book of Mahabharat was published. Shri Vyas might not have given it for publication. It has been published by Bhandarkar Research Institute of Poona. This book was published between 1927 to 1966 and thereafter also. Shri Vyas Ji may not have himself gone to the publisher because he is not a historical person. It would be wrong to suggest that somebody might have impersonated to get this book published. Although I know that this book was published pseudonymously. I accept it as a source of history. It is correct that there may be other books also which might have got published pseudonymously but I accept their historicity. I learnt it in my teaching career that such books can be accepted as source of history. I studied this in my class of history but Dr. R. S. Sharma did not tell me all this. It was part of my study in B.A. and M.A. I was taught this by Shri Govind Chandra Pande, who was in Allahabad University. Shri Govind Chandra Pande wrote a number of books and the name of one of his books is 'Origin of Buddhism'. This book was written before my research. Arya was not a race. In my view Dravid was also not a race. It is not correct that there is difference of language only between Dravid and Arya. It is also wrong to say that the language of both was one and the same. Besides language, there was difference in their customs and traditions and their Gods and Goddesses were also different. There was difference in their system of worship and devotion and their life-style. Both had different tradition also. Gods of Aryans were different. It is correct that

various Aryan Gods include Sankarshan Ram, Parshu Ram, Krishna and Ram. It is correct that these gods continue to be worshipped traditionally till today uninterruptedly.

[Cross-examination concluded by Shri Vireshwar Dwivedi, Advocate on behalf of plaintiffs in Suit No. 5/1989]. Cross-examination concluded on behalf of all defendants. Witness is discharged.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suvira Jaiswal

4-05-2001

Typed by stenographer in open court as dictated by
us.

Sd/-

4.5.2002