

Criticisms from Hinduism

FROM DR. ATUL AGHAMKAR – DIRECTOR OF MISSIOLOGY SOUTH ASIA INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED CHRISTIAN STUDIES, BANGALORE, INDIA:

Hindus [have] found it difficult to understand and accept Christianity as a [Western] foreign missionary religion. To a Hindu Christianity defiles a moral human standard. Hindus see no need for conversion from their long ancestral heritage. Therefore, Hindus not only resist Christian conversion, but oppose it. Dr. Aghamkar explains the historical attitude Hindus have traditionally held about Christianity and its missionaries:

“There are historical reasons for this perception. Saldanha, in his article, *Hindu Sensitivities Towards Conversion* says, “The roots of this opposition to conversion reach back into the mission history of the colonial era and have to do with the manner in which Christianity was introduced in India. The missionaries were identified with the beef-eating, alcohol-drinking foreigners” (1981:4-5). These foreigners, largely the Portuguese and the British, were in India basically for purposes of trade. Their lifestyle was rarely up to Christian standards. When the Hindus found that these white traders call themselves Christians, they perceived all Christians in the same manner. It is not surprising that the missionaries and their converts soon came to be called *Firangis* and *Mlenchhas*, contemptuous terms connoting barbarians and irreligious persons (Saldanha 1981:5). Such terms exhibited a certain attitude toward Christianity. Honestly speaking, the religions of India consider proselytization to be meaningless and absurd, rather a vulgarity of the hollow men of empty consciences (Pillai 1979:167). This is how most Hindus perceive Christian converts. Thus, Hindus normally keep themselves aloof from such a religion.”

Dr. Atul Aghamkar goes on to cite several other renown Hindu scholars and gurus such as Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshub Chander Sen, Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa, Swami Vivekananda, Swami Dayanand Sarasvati, and Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, among others. His article can be found [here](#).

FROM RAM SWARUP AGARWAL – FOUNDER OF *Voice of India* AND HINDU ACTIVIST, AUTHOR, and REVIVALIST:

In a 1996 interview about the Hindu Renaissance and how Europe should follow, Ram Swarup said:

Pagan renaissance is overdue. It is necessary for Europe to heal its psyche. Under Christianity, Europe learned to reject its ancestors, its past, which cannot be good for its future also. Europe became sick because it tore apart from its own heritage, it had to deny its very roots. If Europe is to be healed spiritually, it must recover its spiritual past--at least, it should not hold it in such dishonor.... For self-recovery, these countries have to revive their old gods. But this is a task which cannot be done mechanically. They have to recapture the consciousness which expressed itself in the language of many gods...

They should write a history of Europe from the Pagan point of view, which would show how profoundly persecuted Paganism was. They should compile a directory of Pagan temples destroyed, Pagan groves and sacred spots desecrated. European Pagans should also revive some of these sites as their places of pilgrimage. — [Hinduism Today, July 1999](#)

FROM SARVEPALLI RADHAKRISHNAN – A DISTINGUISHED PHILOSOPHER and STATESMAN OF INDIA, VICE-PRESIDENT and PRESIDENT OF INDIA:

Unfortunately, Christian religion inherited the Semitic creed of the ‘jealous God’ in the view of Christ as ‘the only begotten son of God’ so could not brook any rival near the throne. When Europe accepted the Christian religion, in spite of its own broad humanism, it accepted the fierce intolerance which is the natural result of belief in ‘the truth once for all delivered to the saints.’

FROM H. H. CHATTAMPI SWAMIKAL – A HINDU SAGE and SOCIAL REFORMER WROTE “KRISTUMATA CHEDANAM” (*Hindu Critique of Christianity*):

Chattampi Swamikal spent many years tutored and mentored under a Christian priest and a Muslim caliph learning extensively both the Christian Old and New Testaments and the Quran. Regarding Christianity, he wrote:

Jesus Christ... does not possess divinity at all. Josephus was the historian who recorded the events as they took place during Jesus' life time in European continent. If Jesus actually lived at that time and had astounded the public through miracles like bringing the dead back to life, would Josephus omit to record these facts in his work? Perhaps he didn't come to know of these facts. Even then, would he fail to notice the transformation of day into night at the time of crucifixion of Christ? Even if he had so failed, would he fail to remember the Earthquake that took place at the time of crucifixion? Besides, why the year, month and date of birth of Jesus were left out to be specified in the Bible? Nor does the Bible contain the date of crucifixion, which is an occurrence more important than his birth. Based on the appearance of a new star at the time of his birth, it should be possible to determine the time of his birth. None of the astronomers from places like India, China, Persia and Europe have recorded the appearance of such a star. Therefore, it cannot be said conclusively that a person named Jesus [as narrated in the Gospels] ever lived.

Assuming that Jesus actually lived, was anything especially noticeable in him from birth unlike normal children? Was he born without being conceived in the womb of a woman? Was his birth marked by any world famous miracle? Were there any miracles not so famous? Was he born, unlike ordinary children, with extra heads or hands? Did he get up and walk as soon as he was born and start preaching? Did he grow up without any hunger, thirst, sleep or nature's calls? His birth was so inauspicious that first, his mother was suspected of her chastity and second, three thousand children below two years got killed and the entire region turned bleak due to this great sorrow of the people. Will the birth of the son of God make the people grieve instead of rejoicing? Never! Therefore, like any other human being, he remained confined in mother's womb, underwent all the pains of birth, took birth as per past karma,

caused suffering to people and committed blasphemy after he grew up, wandered many places and was crucified at the age of thirty-three for his grave sins, moaned aloud in indescribable pain and died. It is evident from the above that he was more sinful than any ordinary soul.

"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" – Mark 13:32.

It is evident from the above that there is only one omniscient God (Father) and Jesus does not possess this power and so Jesus is not omniscient. -- ([pp. 36-38](#))