

SANJEEV NEWAR



A HINDU'S FIGHT FOR MOTHER COW

94 WAYS TO RIP BEEF LOVERS APART

FIRST OF DISCOVER HINDUISM SERIES

**A
HINDU'S FIGHT
FOR
MOTHER COW**

**A
HINDU'S FIGHT
FOR
MOTHER COW**

94 ways to rip beef lovers apart

**BY
SANJEEV NEWAR
Agniveer**

PREFACE

How we treat weak reflects how strong our souls are. “Animals are friends, not food,” declares Holy Vedas - the foundations of Hinduism. The very first Mantra of Holy Yajurveda ends with the word- “*Pashunpaahi*” - don’t kill animals! Creatures that laugh, cry, and play with us, feel happiness and pain like us must live like us- without getting killed for food or fur.

Creatures that serve as a mother by providing us precious milk must be loved and protected like a mother. That is why the cow is respected as Mother in Hinduism. Unfortunately, a malicious campaign in support of beef is being run by fanatics in India. According to them, one should eat beef because Hindus have always eaten beef and Hindu texts encourage beef-eating. Some argue that beef export is a must for the economy. Some say one must eat cows because plants also feel pain.

List of such silly reasons and baseless allegations is quite long. A false shouted hundred times appears as truth. **But it cannot become truth.**

This book critically examines all queries, allegations, and arguments regarding animal slaughter and beef-eating. An ample number of irrefutable scriptural evidence and infallible logic make this book the only one of its kind. With this book, you can understand the true message of Hinduism and also silence anyone who misrepresents Hinduism.

The book is based on content developed over last ten years and published in part on our blog. No one has been able to counter a single point of the content so far.

Agniveer has similarly distilled research on various aspects of Hinduism that it aims to present in the form of easy to read books.

This first volume of “Discover Hinduism” series dispels all false claims regarding beef-eating. This volume will be followed by further volumes that establish the true Hinduism. This series will provide you everything you need to counter any misconception on Hinduism. And in the process, convince you why Hinduism is the best gift for you and the world.

Hinduism is the only religious philosophy that is devoid of intolerance and encourages freedom of choice. Instead of forcing one to fit the dogmas of any religion, Hinduism allows you to custom-fit a religion of your own. Hinduism hinges of two critical foundations:

- Discover the truth that lies within
- Be tolerant and supportive of journey of other souls to discover the truth that lies within them

There is no compulsion, no fire of hell, no threat of apostasy, no agenda of evangelization, no division of people into believers and non-believers in Hinduism.

All that Hinduism has is tolerance, compassion and an urge to be a better human. Hinduism does not ask you to be a Hindu or Muslim. It urges you to be a Human.

We hope this series will bring forth to the world the original philosophy of humanity that we have forgotten. It is the need of the hour in this era of intolerant madness and blind materialism. We hope you will get a new direction from the source of humanity – Hinduism.

Please note that all proceeds from the sale of this book will go towards promoting true Hinduism. Help us serve humanity by sharing, distributing, gifting this book.

Dharma (righteousness) must be protected and nurtured by you. Then it will protect and nurture you.

Sanjeev Newar
September 2016, New Delhi, India

TABLE OF CONTENT

[PREFACE](#)

[SECTION 1: PROVING NO BEEF IN HINDUISM](#)

[There is no beef in hinduism](#)

[Allegations and rebuttals](#)

[SECTION 2: RIPPING BEEF LOVERS APART](#)

[Why beef-lovers are completely wrong?](#)

[Beef-lovers ripped apart](#)

[Agni speaks – beef, murder, and media](#)

[SECTION 3: RIPPING MEAT EATERS APART](#)

[Meat eating – myths and reality](#)

[ABOUT AUTHOR](#)

[ABOUT AGNIVEER](#)

SECTION 1: PROVING NO BEEF IN HINDUISM

CHAPTER 1

THERE IS NO BEEF IN HINDUISM

To treat a human like an animal is Adharma. To treat an animal like a human is Dharma.

-Agniveer



The material presented in first two chapters of the book is based on a thorough and objective analysis of roots of Vedic words, the context in which they appear, Vedic Vocabulary, Philology, Grammar and other tools critical for correct interpretation of the Vedic mantras. Thus, first two chapters of the book do not merely rely on the blind reproduction of works of Max Muller, Griffith, Wilson, Williams and other Indologist on Vedas and Vedic language. While they are more popular in contemporary western academia, I have objective reasons to conclude that their works are far from authoritative. They are popular only because their works got wide publicity while India was under British rule, and those Indian scholars who knew Sanskrit did not know English. We are going to explore this facet in more detail in this book.

Aspersions upon Vedas

For centuries aspersions have been cast upon the Vedas; the primary

holy scriptures of the Hindus of having unholy contents. If one really starts believing in those aspersions, the entire Hindu philosophy, culture, and traditions would reduce to nothing but savagery, barbarism, and cannibalism.

The Vedas – the very roots of Hinduism, and the first source of knowledge on earth – are meant for guiding the actions of a human being to lead a blissful life. This slanderous campaign has been unleashed by different vested interests to embarrass Hindus around the world citing specific references from the Vedas.

This campaign also comes handy in convincing poor and illiterate Indians to give up their faith on the ground that their fundamental holy books – the Vedas – contain all the inhuman elements like denigration of women, meat-eating, polygamy, casteism and above all – **beef eating**.

Also, the Vedas are accused of animal sacrifice in sacrificial ceremonies popularly known as the YAJNA. Interestingly a section of home-bred intellectuals claiming to have a deep study of ancient India has also come up, who cite references from works of Western Indologists to prove such unholy content in the Vedas.

Saying that the Vedas permit beef-eating and cow-slaughter amounts to striking a lethal blow to a Hindu's soul. **Respect for cow forms a core tenet of Hinduism**. Once one can convince a Hindu of flaws in the foundation of this core tenet and make him feel guilty, he becomes an easy prey for the predator faiths. There are millions of ill-informed Hindus who are not empowered to counter argue and hence quietly surrender.

The vested interests that malign the Vedas are not just confined to foreign and home-bred Indologists alone. A certain class among Hindus exploited the rest of the population including the socially and economically weaker sections by forcing them to believe and follow what they said in the name of Vedas or else face the wrath.

All the slanders heaped upon the Vedas can be attributed mainly to the interpretations of commentaries written by Mahidhar, Uvat, and Saayan in the medieval times; and to what Vam-margis or the Tantra cult propagated in their books in the name of the Vedas.

In due course, the falsehood spread far and wide, and they became even more deep-rooted when western scholars with their half-baked knowledge of Sanskrit translated these interpretations of commentaries

of Sayan and Mahidhar, in the name of translating the Vedas.
However, they lacked the pre-requisite understanding of

- *Shiksha* (Phonetics)
- *Vyakarana* (Grammar)
- *Nirukta* (Philology)
- *Nighantu* (Vocabulary)
- *Chhanda* (Prosody)
- *Jyotish* (Astronomy)
- *Kalpa* and so on that are critical for correct interpretation of the Vedas.

Agniveer is committed to exposing all such campaigns denigrating Vedas, dispel myths and misconceptions on Vedas; and as a result, enlighten entire humanity with Vedic wisdom – source of all knowledge.

Now let's know what Vedas are saying about beef and animal sacrifice in Yajna.

No violence against animals in Vedas

*Yasmintsarvaani bhutaanyaatmaivaabhuudvijaanatah
Tatra ko mohah kah shokah ekatvamanupasyatah*

Yajurveda 40.7

“Those who see all beings as souls do not feel infatuation or anguish at their sight, for they experience oneness with them.”

How could people who believed in the doctrines of indestructibility, transmigration dare to kill living animals in Yajnas? They see the souls of their own deceased near and dear ones residing in these animals.

*Anumantaa vishasitaa nihantaa krayavikrayee
Samskartaa chopahartaa cha khadakashcheti ghaatakaah*

Manu Smrithi 5.51

“Those who permit slaying of animals; those who bring animals for slaughter; those who slaughter; those who sell meat; those who purchase meat; those who prepare a dish out of it; those who serve that meat and those who eat are all murderers.”

*Breehimattam yavamattamatho maashamatho tilam
Esha vaam bhaago nihito ratnadheyaaya dantau maa hinsishtam pitaram
maataram cha*

Atharvaveda 6.140.2

“O teeth! You eat rice, you eat barley, you eat gram, and you eat sesame. These cereals are specifically meant for you. Do not kill those who are capable of being fathers and mothers.”

*Ya aamam maansamadanti paurusheyam cha ye kravih
Garbhaan khaadanti keshavaastanito naashayaamasi*

Atharvaveda 8.6.23

“We ought to destroy those who eat cooked as well as uncooked meat, meat involving the destruction of males and females, fetus and eggs.”

*Anago hatya vai bheema kritye
Maa no gaamashvam purusham vadheeh*

Atharvaveda 10.1.29

“It is definitely a great sin to kill innocents. Do not kill our cows, horses, and people.”

How could there be a justification of killing of cow and other animals when killing is very clearly prohibited in the Vedas?

Aghnyaa yajamaanasya pashoonpahi

Yajurveda 1.1

“O human! Animals are *Aghnya* – not to be killed. Protect the animals.”

Pashunstraayethaam

Yajurveda 6.11

“Protect the animals.”

Dwipaadava Chatushpaatpaahi

Yajurveda 14.8

“Protect the bipeds and quadrupeds!”

Many words used for devils and scoundrels in Vedas are those that originate from meat-eating behavior. Let us look at some of them:

- *Kravy da* –*kravya* [meat obtained from slaughter] + *Ada* [the eater]—the meat eater.
- *Pisacha* — *pisita* [meat] +*asa* [eater]—the meat eater.
- *Asutrpa* — *Asu* [breath of life] + *trpa* [one who satisfies himself on] — one who takes others life for his meals.
- *Garba da* and *Anda da* – the foetus and egg eaters.
- *Mans da* – the meat eaters

Meat eaters have always been looked down in Vedic literature. They have been known as *Rakshasa*, *Pisacha* and so on. All these words are synonyms of demons or devils who have been outcast from the civilized human society. How can then anyone claim that Vedas endorse meat-eating in any manner?

Urjam no dhehi dwipade chatushpade

Yajurveda 11.83

“May all bipeds and quadrupeds gain strength and nourishment.”

Hindus recite above mantra before every meal. How could the same philosophy which prays for the well-being of every soul in every moment of life, approve of killing animals?

No violence in Vedic Yajna

Yajna never meant an animal sacrifice in the sense popularly understood. Yajna in the Vedas meant “a noble deed or the highest purifying action.”

Adhvara iti Yajnanaama – Dhvaratihimsaakarmaa tatpratishedhah

Nirukta 2.7

According to Yaaska Acharya, one of the synonyms of Yajna in Nirukta or the Vedic philology is “*Adhvara*.”

“*Dhvara*” means an act involving “*himsa* or violence.” Therefore “*a-dhvara*” means an act involving “no *himsa* or no violence.” There are a large number of such usages of “*Adhvara*” in the Vedas.

In the post-Mahabharata period, misinterpretation of the Vedas and interpolations in other scriptures took place at various points in time. *Acharya* Shankar reestablished the Vedic values to an extent.

In the more recent times, Swami Dayanand Saraswati – known as the

grandfather of modern India – interpreted the Vedas as per the correct rules of the language and authentic evidence. His literature, which includes commentary on the Vedas, Satyarth Prakash loosely translated as Light of Truth, An Introduction to the Vedas, and other texts led to widespread social reformation based on Vedic philosophy and dispelling of myths surrounding the Vedas.

Let us discover what the Vedas have to say on Yajna.

*Agne yam yagnamadhvaram vishwatah pari bhuurasi
Sa id deveshu gacchati*

Rigveda 1.1.4

“O Lord of effulgence! The non-violent Yajna, you prescribe from all sides, is beneficial for all, touches divine proportions and is accepted by noble souls.”

The Rigveda describes Yajna as *Adhvara* or non-violent throughout. Same is the case with all the other Vedas. How can it be then concluded that the Vedas permit violence or slaughter of animals?

The biggest accusation of cattle and cow slaughter comes in the context of the Yajnas that derived their names from different cattle like the *Ashwamedh Yajna*, the *Gomedha Yajna*, and the *Narmedh Yajna*. Even by the wildest stretch of the imagination, the word “*Medha*” would not mean slaughter in this context.

It’s interesting to note what Yajurveda says about a horse.

Imam ma himsirekashafam pashum kanikradam vaajinam vaajineshu
Yajurveda 13.48

“Do not slaughter this one hooped animal that neighs and who goes with a speed faster than most of the animals.”

Aswamedha does not mean horse sacrifice at Yajna. Instead, the Yajurveda clearly mentions that a horse ought not to be slaughtered.

In Shathapatha, “*Ashwa*” is a word for the “nation or empire.”

Ashwamedh, Gomedha and Narmedha

Yajnas

The word “*medha*” does not mean slaughter. It denotes an act done in accordance to the intellect. Alternatively, it could mean consolidation, as evident from the root meaning of *medha* i.e. *medhru san-ga-me* given in Dhatupath – the Sanskrit grammar book providing list of all word roots and their meanings.

*Raashtram vaa ashwamedhah
Annam hi gau
Agnirvaa ashwah
Aajyam medhah*

Shatpath 13.1.6.3

Swami Dayananda Saraswati wrote in his Light of Truth:

“A Yajna dedicated to the glory, wellbeing and prosperity of the Rashtra the nation or empire is known as the ***Ashwamedha Yajna.***”

“To keep the food pure or to keep the senses under control, or to make the food pure or to make a good use of the rays of Sun or keep the earth free from impurities[clean] is called “***Gomedha Yajna.***”

“The word ‘*Gau*’ also means the ‘Earth.’ And the yajna dedicated to keeping the Earth environment clean is called ***Gomedha Yajna.***”

“The cremation of the body of a dead person in accordance with the principles laid down in the Vedas is called ***Narmedha Yajna.***”

No beef in Vedas

Not only the Vedas are against animal slaughter but also vehemently oppose and prohibit cow slaughter. *Yajurveda* forbids killing of cows, for they provide energizing food for human beings

Ghrtam duhaanaamaditim janaayaagne maa himsiheeh

Yajurveda 13.49

“Do not kill cows and bulls that always deserve to be protected.”

Aare gohaa nrhaa vadho vo astu

Rigveda 7.56.17

“In Rigveda cow slaughter has been declared a heinous crime equivalent to human murder and it has been said that those who commit this crime should be punished.”

*Sooyavasaad bhagavatee hi bhooyaa atho vayam bhagvantah syaama
Addhi trnamaghnye vishwadaaneem piba shuddhamudakamaacharantee
Rigveda 1.164.40 or Atharv 7.73.11 or Atharv 9.10.20*

“The *Aghnya* cows – which are not to be killed under any circumstances – may keep themselves healthy by use of pure water and green grass, so that we may be endowed with virtues, knowledge and wealth.”

The Vedic Lexicon, Nighantu, gives amongst other synonyms of Gau[or cow] the words *Aghnya*, *Ahi*, and *Aditi*. Yaska the commentator on Nighantu, defines these as-

- *Aghnya* - the one that ought not to be killed.
- *Ahi* - the one that must not be slaughtered.
- *Aditi* - the one that ought not to be cut into pieces.

These three names of cow signify that the animal ought not to be put to tortures. These words frequently appear throughout the Vedas in the context of the cow.

*Aghnyeyam saa vardhataam mahate soubhagaaya
Rigveda 1.164.27*

“Cow – The *aghnya* – brings us health and prosperity.”

*Suprapaanam Bhavatvaghnyaayaah
Rigveda 5.83.8*

“There should be an excellent facility for pure water for *Aghnya* Cow.”

*Yah paurusheyena kravishaa samankte yo ashwena pashunaa
yaatudhaanah
Yo aghnyaayaa bharati ksheeramagne teshaam sheershaani harasaapi
vrishcha
Rigveda 10.87.16*

“Those who feed on human, horse or animal flesh and those who destroy

milk-giving Aghnya cows should be severely punished.”

Vimucchyadhvamaghnyaa devayaanaa aganma

Yajurveda 12.73

“The Aghnya cows and bulls bring you prosperity.”

Maa gaamanaagaamaditim vadhishtha

Rigveda 8.101.15

“Do not kill the cow. The cow is innocent and aditi – that ought not to be cut into pieces.”

Antakaaya goghaatam

Yajurveda 30.18

“Destroy those who kill cows.”

Yadi no gaam hansi yadyashwam yadi poorusham

Tam tvaa seesena vidhyaamo yatha no so aveeraha

Atharvaveda 1.16.4

“If someone destroys our cows, horses or people, kill him with a bullet of lead.”

Vatsam jaatamivaaghnyaa

Atharvaveda 3.30.1

“Love each other as the Aghnya – non-killable cow – loves its calf.”

Dhenu sadanam rayeenaam

Atharvaveda 11.1.34

“Cow is the fountainhead of all bounties.”

6th Mandal of Rigveda

The entire 28th Sukta or Hymn of 6th Mandal of Rigveda sings the glory of a cow.

Aa gaavo agnamannuta bhadramakrantseedantu

Bhooyobhooyo rayimidasya vardhayannabhinne

Na taa nashanti na dabhaati taskaro naasaamamitro vyathiraa

dadharshati
Na taa arvaa renukakaato ashnute na samskritramupa yanti taa abhi
Gaavo bhago gaava indro me achhaan
Yooyam gaavo medayathaa
Maa vah stena eeshata maaghanshasah

- Everyone should ensure that cows are free from miseries and kept healthy.
- God blesses those who take care of cows.
- Even the enemies should not use any weapon on cows.
- No one should slaughter the cow.
- Cow brings prosperity and strength.
- If cows keep healthy and happy, men and women shall also keep disease free and prosperous.
- May the cow eat green grass and pure water. May they not be killed and bring prosperity to us.

Claims and Facts

There is a severe reaction from various sources that cannot live with the fact that Vedas and ancient culture of our nation could have been ideal than their current, but outdated, communist ideals. I received several emails that tried to refute the research by citing additional references that support beef-eating. These include two mantras from Rigveda and some *Shlokas* from Manu Smriti and a few other texts.

I have to say the following on the claims they have made:

1

Manu Smriti permits beef eating and animal sacrifice.

This chapter has given evidence from Manu Smriti itself which states that even one who permits killing is a murderer. Thus, all these additional *shlokas* are either from adulterated Manu Smriti or misinterpreted by twisting of words.

2

“Mansa” means “Meat” in ancient text.

A typical example of foul play by those hell-bent on justifying their

obsession with beef in ancient texts is to translate *Mansa* as 'meat'. In reality, '*Mansa*' is a generic word used to denote pulp. Meat is called '*Mansa*' because it is pulpy. So the mere presence of '*Mansa*' does not mean it refers to meat.

With regards to Vedas, they could come up with two mantras that supposedly justify beef eating. Let us evaluate them:

3

Rigveda 10.85.13: "On the occasion of a girl's marriage oxen and cows are slaughtered."

The mantra states that in winter, the rays of sun get weakened and then get strong again in spring. The word used for sun-rays is 'Go' which also means 'cow.' Hence, the mantra can also be translated by making 'cow' and not 'sun-rays' as the subject. The word used for 'weakened' is '*Hanyate*' which can also mean 'killing.' But if that be so, why would the mantra go further and state in next line (which is deliberately not translated) that in spring, they start regaining their original form.

How can a cow killed in winter regain its health in spring? This translation amply proves how ignorant and biased communists malign Vedas.

4

Rigveda 6.17.1: "Indra used to eat the meat of cow, calf, horse and buffalo."

The mantra states that brilliant scholars enlighten the world in the manner that wood enhances the fire of Yajna. I fail to understand from where one could discover Indra, cow, calf, horse and buffalo in this mantra!

5

What about the claims from other Sanskrit texts?

The other texts they have referred are among dubious ones not considered authoritative evidence. Their modus operandi is simple – state anything which is written in Sanskrit as Dharma and translate the way they want to prove whatever they want. And this is how they have been fooling us all by filling our textbooks with all unverified demeaning

claims.

Summary

What more proofs does one need to understand the high esteem in which not only the cow but each living being is held in the Vedas?

The learned audience can decide for themselves from this evidence that the Vedas are completely against any inhuman practice... to top it all the Beef and Cow slaughter.

I continue the challenge to everyone – cite one single mantra from Vedas that justify beef-eating and I shall be eager to embrace any faith that he or she may decide for me. If not, they should agree to revert back to the Vedas.

There is no Beef or animal sacrifice in Hinduism.

CHAPTER 2

ALLEGATIONS AND REBUTTALS

Realizing your ignorance is the first step towards realizing the truth.

-Agniveer



In the previous chapter, we have reviewed an analysis exposing the allegation that Vedas have references of beef-eating and animal sacrifice. We provided ample evidence that:

- Vedas are completely against animal killing and violence on innocent creatures
- Vedic Yajna is by definition non-violent, and animal sacrifice is against Vedic precepts
- Contrary to claims of beef consumption in Vedas, there are references that call for the protection of cows and destruction of those who kill this most productive and harmless animal.

After the publication of our work on www.agniveer.com, the slanderous campaign against Vedas has lost its teeth significantly, and no reasonable rebuttal to the content of the work ever surfaced. However, a few minor voices have continued to mislead people on this issue using splinter quotes from translations of Vedic literature by incompetent

Western Indologists and juxtaposing them with their own agenda.

Therefore, in this chapter, I would attempt to address some of those allegations so that these first two chapters of the book can be made a reasonable single point reference to counter any such misled campaign in future. For those desiring a more detailed exposition, I have provided a list of references at the end of this chapter.

Let's review some of the allegations:

1

Animal sacrifice is must in Yajna.

It is well-known that animal sacrifice was necessary for Yajna. Vedas are full of praise of Yajnas.

The word 'Yajna' is derived from root 'Yaj' by adding Nan pratyaya. 'Yaj' root has three meanings:

- *Devapuja* (behaving appropriately with the entities around-worshipping Eeshvar, respecting parents, keeping the environment clean, are few examples)
- *Sangatikaran* (Unity) and
- *Daan* (Charity)

As per Vedas, these form the primary duty of human beings and hence, Yajna is so emphasized not only in Vedas but also in almost entire Indian literature of the ancient era.

What is important however is the fact that *Yajna* has no reference to animal killing whatsoever. In fact, Nirukta (Vedic vocabulary) clearly states in 2.7 that *Yajna* is called *Adhwara*. *Dhwara* means violence, and hence, it is totally banned in Yajna.

In other words, forget about animal killing, any kind of violence – through the mind, body or voice – is completely banned in Yajna.

Adhwara is used to imply Yajna in a large number of mantras in the Vedas.

For example,

Rigveda 1.1.4

Rigveda 1.1.8

Rigveda 1.14.21

Rigveda 1.128.4

Rigveda 1.19.1

Atharvaveda 4.24.3

Atharvaveda 18.2.2

Atharvaveda 1.4.2

Atharvaveda 5.12.2

Atharvaveda 19.42.4

Around 43 mantras in *Yajurveda* refer to *Adhwara*.

In fact, *Yajurveda 36.18* clearly states that “May I look upon everyone – ***Sarvaani Bhootani*** (and not only human beings) with friendly eyes.”

Thus, Vedas nowhere justify animal sacrifice and on contrary condemn any form of violence on innocent beings.

Historically, there may have been the prevalence of animal sacrifice, but that has nothing to do with the content of Vedas. Many Muslim girls and boys have been working as vulgar models and actresses in the film industry. In fact in Bollywood, most top actors and actresses have been Muslims. Many porn actors are Muslim. But this does not necessarily mean Quran justifies vulgarity and pornography. Similarly, adultery and pre-marital sex are widespread in Christian countries does not mean Bible demands them to indulge in these vices.

In the same vein, while animal sacrifice may have been a historical phenomenon due to the decadence of Vedic values, we openly challenge anyone to cite even one single reference from Vedas that talk of animal sacrifice in Yajna.

2

Killing in Ashwamedha and Gomedha Yajnas.

If that be so, what about Ashwamedha and Gomedha yajnas? “Medha” means killing.

In the previous chapter, we have already discussed that the word “*Medha*” does not necessarily mean slaughter. It denotes an act done in accordance to the intellect. Alternatively, it could mean consolidation or nurturing, as evident from the root meaning of *medha* i.e. *medhru san-ga-me* (Refer Dhatupath)

When we already know that Yajnas are supposed to be *Adhwara* or non-violent, why should we take “*Medha*” to mean violence or killing? Don’t we call an intelligent person – *Medhaavi* or name our daughters *Medhaa* in India. Do we imply they are murderers or intelligent persons?

Shatpath 13.1.6.3 and 13.2.2.3 clearly states that:

A Yajna dedicated to the glory, wellbeing and prosperity of the *Rashtra* - the nation or empire - is known as the **Ashwamedh Yajna**.

Thus, likes of Ram Prasad Bismil, Ashfaq, Netaji, Shivaji, Tilak, performed *Ashwamedha Yajna*.

To keep the food pure or to keep the senses under control, or to make a good use of the rays of Sun or keep the earth free from impurities [clean] is called **Gomedha Yajna**.

The word *Gau* also means the Earth. And the Yajna dedicated to keeping the Earth the environment clean is called **Gomedha Yajna**. (Refer *Nighantu 1.1*, and *Shatpath 13.15.3*).

3

Killing in Narmedha and Ajamedha Yajnas.

Vedas even justify killing of human in Narmedha Yajna. And what about Ajamedha Yajna?

The cremation of the body of a dead person in accordance with the principles laid down in the Vedas is called **Narmedha Yajna**.

The dedicated effort for training and productivity of people is also *Narmedha Yajna* or *Purushmedha Yajna* or *Nriyajna*.

Aja means grains. So **Ajamedha Yajna** refers to increasing agricultural productivity or in a very narrow sense: using grains in Agnihotra. (Refer *Shantiparva 337.4-5*)

Vishnu Sharma in *Panchatantra (Kakoliyam)* clearly states that those who perform animal sacrifice in Yajna are fools because they do not understand Vedas properly. If one goes to Heaven by animal sacrifice, what could be the path to go to Hell!

Mahabharat *Shantiparva* has two claiming that those who state that Yajna contains alcohol, fish or meat are frauds, atheists and devoid of knowledge of *Shastras*. (263.6, 265.9)

4

‘Hastina Aalambhate’ means sacrifice of elephants.

What about Yajurveda 24.29 which uses words ‘Hastina Aalambhate’ that means the sacrifice of elephants?

It is not true that *Alambha* derived from *Labha* root means sacrifice or

killing. *Labha* means to acquire or gain. Every Indian knows this. They write “Shubha Labha” on their shops. While *Hastina* has a deeper meaning beyond elephant, even if we take it to mean elephant in this mantra, it only says that the king should acquire elephants for the nurture of his kingdom. What is so violent about it?

Alambha is used in several places to mean ‘acquire’ or ‘gain.’ For example, Manu Smriti prohibits lust for women for *Brahmacharis* by saying “*Varjayet Streenam Alambham.*”

Thus, this conjecture is completely out of place. May be those who concocted *Aalambhate* to mean killing in Vedic mantras were themselves addicted to killing animals for food and hence their first instinct of deriving benefits from animals was to imply killing them.

5

‘Sanjyapan’ means sacrifice.

But what about ‘Sanjyapan’ used in Brahmana and Shraut texts to mean sacrifice?

Atharvaveda 6.10.94-95 says that we should do *Sanjyapan* of mind, body and heart. **Does it mean we should commit suicide?**

Sanjyapan simply means unity and nurture. The mantra says that we should strengthen our mind, body and heart and ensure they work in unity. *Sanjyapan* also means ‘to inform.’

6

Horse sacrifice in Yajurveda and Rigveda.

You are escaping every time from being trapped. But no more. What do you have to say about Yajurveda 25.34-35 / Rigveda 1.162.11-12 which states that:

“What from thy body which with fire is roasted, when thou art set upon the spit, distilleth— Let not that lie on earth or grass neglected, but to the longing Gods let all be offered.”

“They who, observing that the Horse is ready, call out and say, The smell is good; remove it; And, craving meat, await the distribution,—may their approving help promote our labor.”

Very clearly there is an explicit description of horse sacrifice.

We believe this has been quoted from the trash works of Griffiths.

The first has no reference to the horse. It simply means that when

people are suffering due to high temperatures/ fever, the doctors should care for them and provide them treatment.

In the second mantra, it was assumed that 'Vaajinam' word means 'horse.' However, 'Vajinam' means a brave/strong/ dynamic/ fast entity. Thus, the horse is also known as *Vaajinam*. There can be many interpretations of the mantras; however none leads to horse sacrifice.

In fact, even if we mean that *Vaajinam* means horse, still the very verse, in fact, means that those who attempt to kill horses (*Vajinam*) should be prevented from doing so. We strongly recommend reviewing the translation by Swami Dayanand Saraswati for these mantras.

Also, refer to a huge number of mantras provided in the first chapter that explicitly prohibit animal killing and severe punishment for animal killers – especially killers of horses and cows.

7

Atithigna - person served beef to guests.

What about the reference to Goghna or killing of cows in Vedas? What about Atithigva/ Atithigna or a person who served beef to guests?

In the previous chapter, we gave ample references of a cow being *Aghnya* or *Aditi* – not worthy of being killed. We also gave references of strict punishment in Vedas for those who destroy cows.

'Gam' root means 'to go.' That is why planets are also called 'Go' because they move. *Atithigna/ Atithigva* mean one who goes towards the guest or serves his guests sincerely.

'Goghna' has several meanings. Even if we take 'Go' to mean cow, 'Goghna' means *Go+Han*: Approaching cow. (*Han* root means Movement and Knowledge apart from Violence).

There are many references in Vedas where 'Han' is used for approaching and not killing, For example, Atharvaveda states "Husband should *Han*-approach the wife."

Thus, these allegations are equally baseless.

8

Barren cows and bulls are to be killed.

Vedas talk of not killing young cows. But old barren cows (Vashaa) are supposed to be killed. Similarly, Uksha or bulls should be killed as per Vedas.

This hypothesis was popularized in recent times by yet another pseudo-scholar D N Jha to defend his assertion of beef-eating in Vedas despite obvious contradictions that come up because of verses in Vedas that state the exact opposite. With defective home-grown pieces, who needs enemies from outside!

The fact is that *Uksha* refers to a medicinal herb, also known as *Soma*. Even someone like Monier Williams in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary states the same.

Vashaa refers to controlling powers of God and not a barren cow. If *Vasha* is used to mean a barren cow, then many Vedic verses will make no sense.

For example, *Atharvaveda 10.10.4* uses *Sahasradhara* or Thousand flows in relation with *Vasha*. How can a barren cow be compared with *Sahasradhara* used to denote ample food, milk and water?

Atharvaveda 10.190 states that *Vashi* means the controlling power of God and is recited twice daily in Vedic *Sandhya*.

In other verses, *Vashaa* is also used as productive land or a good wife with children (*Atharvaveda 20.103.15*) or a medicinal herb. Monier Williams also uses the word to mean a herb in his dictionary.

I fail to understand which divine inspiration prompted these pseudo-scholars to concoct that *Vashaa* means a barren cow.

9

Couple should eat meat.

Brihadaranyak Upanishad 6.4.18 clearly states that if a couple desires a noble son, they should eat Meat with rice (*Mansodanam*) or Bull (*Arshabh*) or Calf (*Uksha*).

Now that there is nothing to show in Vedas, the focus of allegation has shifted to Upanishads. But even if one can prove beef-eating in Upanishads, that still does not prove that there is beef in Vedas. And the foundation of Hinduism is that Vedas are supreme. Refer *Purva Meemansa 1.3.3*, *Manusmriti 2.13*, *Manusmriti 12.95*, *Jabalamsmriti*, *Bhavishya Puran*, which clearly state that if there is a discrepancy between Vedas and other *Shastras*, then Vedas are considered supreme, and the rest are rejected.

Having said this, we will show that the particular references from *Brihadaranyak* have been misinterpreted.

Let us take *Mansodanam* first. There are four more verses just before this verse that recommend eating particular edibles with rice for having a child with the Vedic wisdom of different types. The other edibles are:

- *Ksheerodanam* (Milk with Rice)
- *Dadhyodanam* (Yogurt with Rice)
- Water with Rice and
- *Tila* (a pulse) with Rice for experts in other Vedas.

It is **only** for mastery of *Atharvaveda* that *Mansodanam* or meat with rice is recommended. This abruptness inflow of text itself shows that the particular reference is an anomaly.

In reality, the right word is *Mashodanam* and NOT *Mansodanam*. *Masha* means a kind of pulse. Hence, there is nothing 'fleshy' about it. In fact, for pregnant women, meat is completely prohibited as per Ayurveda. Refer *Sushruta Samhita*. There is also a verse in *Sushrut Samhita* that recommends *Masha* for husband and wife for a good son. Thus, it is obvious that *Brihadaranyaka* has also explained the same concept as elucidated in *Sushruta Samhita*. There is no reason the two texts would differ in *Masha* and *Mansa*.

Even if someone asserts that it is not *Masha* but *Mansa*, still *Mansa* means pulp and not necessarily meat. There are ample usages of *Mansa* as pulp in ancient texts. Thus, *Amramansam* means pulp of mango. *Khajuramansam* means pulp of date. Refer *Charak Samhita* for such examples. *Taittiriya Samhita* 2.32.8 uses *Mansa* for curd, honey, and corn.

We have already seen that *Uksha* means a herb or Soma, even as per Monier Williams Dictionary. The same dictionary also lists *Rishabh* (from which *Arshabh* is derived) to mean a kind of medicinal plant (*Carpopogan pruriens*). *Charak Samhita* 1.4-13 lists *Rishabh* as a medicinal plant. Same is mentioned in *Sushrut Samhita* 38 and *Bhavaprakash Purna Khanda* – texts on Ayurveda (Medicines).

Further, both *Arshabh* (*Rishabh*) and *Uksha* mean bull and none means 'calf.' So why were two synonymous words used to mention the same thing in the same *shloka* from *Brihadaranyak*. This is like saying; one should eat either curd or yogurt! One should either go to Calcutta or go to Kolkata.

Obviously, the two words must mean two different things. And considering that all the other verses in the sequence mention herbs and

pulses, these words must also mean the same. Why should we imply they mean meat or beef just because some DN Jha or Katju loves to kill a cow?

10

Cow killing in Mahabharat Vana Parva 207.

What about Mahabharat Vana Parva 207 that explicitly states that King Rantideva used to have Yajnas where a huge number of cows used to be killed?

As previously mentioned, if there is a dispute between Vedas and any other text, then Vedas are considered supreme. Further, Mahabharat is a grossly interpolated and adulterated text and hence not considered authority in itself.

The allegation of cow-killing at Rantideva's palace is a fraud allegation refuted decades ago by several scholars.

- *Anushasan Parva 115* lists Rantideva as one of the kings who never consumed meat. How can that be possible if beef was amply available at his palace?
- We have already proven that *Mansa* does not necessarily mean meat.
- The particular *shloka* alleges that each day 2000 cows were killed. Means more than 720,000 cows were killed each year. Is it logical to take such a *shloka* seriously?
- *Mahabharat Shantiparva 262.47* asserts that one who kills cows or bulls is a great sinner. The same Mahabharat calls King Rantideva a great saint and pious person. How can there be such a blatant contradiction in same text?
- In reality, the *shlokas* have been distorted by misled scholars like Rahul Sankrityayana, who are known for their Vedas bashing. Rahul Sankrityayana deliberately quoted only three lines of the verse and left next one line from *Dronaparva* Chapter 67 first two *shlokas*. He misinterpreted *Dwishatsahasra* to mean 2000 when it actually means 200 thousand. (Dwi – two, Shat – hundred, and Sahastra –

thousand.)

This act of his shows his competence in Sanskrit. None of these lines have any reference to beef. And when combined with 4th line that he deliberately missed, it means that *Rantideva* had 200,000 cooks in his kingdom, who used to serve good food (rice, pulses, cooked food, sweets.) day and night to guests and scholars.

Then the word '*Masha*' from the next *shloka* was changed to '*Mansa*' to imply that it talked of beef.

- On the contrary, there are ample verses in Mahabharat, which talk of non-violence and condemn beef eating. Further, they praise charity of cows and their nurture.
- Fools have interpreted '*Badhyate*' to mean killing. However, this is not so as per any Sanskrit text on grammar or usage. '*Badhyate*' means 'to control.'

Thus, there is no way that one can prove that King *Rantideva* used to have cows killed.

Conclusion

To conclude, all allegations of beef or meat in Vedas or Vedic texts are merely desperate attempts by Hinduism haters to project their own vices on the noblest texts of the world.

May the light of wisdom enlighten their minds and may we all together make the world a compassionate place.

Bibliography

- Rigveda Bhashya, commentary on Rigveda - Swami Dayanand Saraswati
- Yajurveda Bhashya, commentary on Yajurveda - Swami Dayanand Saraswati
- No Beef in Vedas - BD Ukhul
- Vedon ka Yatharth Swaroop (True nature of Vedas)- Pt. Dharmadeva Vidyavachaspati

- All four Veda Samhita - Pt Damodar Satvalekar
- Pracheen Bharat me Gomamsa, Ek Sameeksha (Beef in Ancient India – an analysis)- Geeta Press, Gorakhpur
- The Myth of Holy Cow - DN Jha
- Hymns of Atharvaveda - Griffith
- Sacred Books of the East - Max Muller
- Rigveda translations - Williams/Jones
- Sanskrit English Dictionary - Monier Williams
- Commentary on Vedas - Dayanand Sansthan
- Western Indologists, a study of motives - Pt. Bhagvadutt
- Satyarth Prakash - Swami Dayanand Saraswati
- Introduction to Vedas - Swami Dayanand Saraswati
- Cloud over understanding of Vedas - BD Ukhul
- Shathpath Brahman
- Nirukta - Yaska Acharya
- Dhatupath - Panini

SECTION 2: RIPPING BEEF LOVERS APART

CHAPTER 3

WHY BEEF-LOVERS ARE COMPLETELY WRONG?

Truth hurts only those who are on the path of ignorance.

-Agniveer



The ban on beef in Indian state of Maharashtra has caused a huge uproar on social media. This ban is being hailed as a direct attack on their personal freedom. In this chapter, I am putting various points across in support of the beef ban and prove why the beef ban is completely democratic, legal, most logical, as per constitution and in the best interest of the nation.

The argument of beef lovers is as follows:

“What I eat is my choice. Who is any government or moral police to dictate what I eat or do not eat? Will they ban spinach and lauki also tomorrow if I am offended? This is communal politics of right-winged Hindu fanatics and must be opposed.”

On the surface, it appears so reasonable and logical. But let us scratch the surface and explore how valid is this movement against Beef Ban.

I give 13 ways to silence them. If these beef-lovers try to refute one or

more of the arguments, tell them that they must refute all of them to justify their stand. It is like someone who is facing trial for murder of 20 people tries to prove that 3 of them were murdered by someone else. It does not matter. Unless you can prove that not even a single murder charge is valid, you will face death sentence.

1

Why no movement against beef ban in past?

The ban on cow slaughter and most cattle already exists in the majority of states of India. Were these beef lovers sleeping like Rip Van Winkle for last 68 years? What were they eating so far? Were they indulging in illegal activities? Why did they not show their beef love so far? Why could they not raise a movement against the beef ban in last near-seven decades?

2

Ban is not on eating, it is on killing.

No one has any problem with what you eat and what you do not. You are free to eat even from the commode in democracy. **But the ban is not on eating. It is on the killing of cattle.**

Now people like me have several objections to the killing of a cow (and cattle in general). **If you can create beef in the laboratory without killing my mother, I have absolutely no issues with you.**

But if you want to kill my mother in the name of democracy then, better explore that democracy in Somalia or ISIS zones. **Your freedom to swing your arm ends where my nose begins.**

3

Cow is my mother.

Yes, it is true that for the overwhelming majority of India, the cow has sentimental values. They consider cow as mother. Their most popular God – Lord Krishna – is known as *Gopal* for his love for cows. On every occasion – birth, death, festival, happiness, and sorrow – feeding and worshipping cow are considered a primary duty. There are multiple festivals dedicated primarily to the cow. And this respect is extended to cattle in general. Bull is considered as a companion of another revered

God – Lord Shankar.

It does not matter whether you agree with this cow worship or not. **But so far the majority of Indians consider cow as a mother, killing of cows cannot be acceptable.** Think of it. Say I name an animal on your mother and slaughter it. I write the name of a Hindu God, Prophet Muhammad or Jesus Christ on an animal and slaughter it. I desecrate a temple, mosque or church. **Will you encourage this kind of behavior?**

If yes, I will call you pervert. But that is beside the point. First, dare to perform such acts as above, post videos of same on youtube, put your address in the description and raise a movement to allow you such crazy behavior in the name of democracy. **Don't have double standards in your apparent love for freedom.**

If no, then the slaughter of revered mother cow and associated cattle cannot be accepted in a country where the cow is the foundation of the religious and cultural ethos of the majority.

4

Religion doesn't matter.

Don't give the sick argument that cows and cattle are mistreated in the country. Don't prove to me that most cow-sellers for beef production are Hindus. Hence, a ban on beef shows double standards.

If above is indeed the case, tell me instead, what you propose to do to help solve this problem. The reality is also that women are unsafe in many parts of the country because of the attitude of society. That does not mean having punishment for rape shows double standards. **Your sick argument mirrors exactly the views of a rapist in *Nirbhaya* case.**

You cannot rape a woman just because women-safety is an issue in the nation! On contrary, tell us whether you are ready to save dignity of woman at any personal cost?

It does not matter what the religion of all beef producers in India is. What matters is that killing of cattle is equivalent to abusing sentiments of the majority and hence must be banned. The day people like you form the majority of India and are comfortable posting youtube video of slaughtering an animal named after their mothers or religious figures; you can repeal the ban. Thankfully, that is not the case today, and hence, the beef ban is justified.

Respect the sentiments of majority.

It is true that even if there were no rational basis behind cattle-worship in Indian culture, still beef ban is justified on pure respect for sentiments of the vast majority. **But thankfully the truth is that foundations of Indian culture are very rational and scientific.** It is not out of jingoism that we consider India as a lighthouse for the entire world. It is because Indian culture stands on the foundation of reason and science.

Coming to matter of cow and cattle worship:

- **The cow is the most productive animal known on this planet.** It is a living factory cum hospital producing products of utility from its cow dung, urine, milk, sweat and even breath. **Its benefit to the economy, environment, fuel generation and healthcare is parallel to none.** When bombing a factory or place of productivity attracts a penalty, why not a cow?
- **The environmental cost of beef production is highest of all livestock activities.** Meat is the most polluting industry in the world. And beef is most polluting of all meat-producing industries. Refer [Raising beef creates more pollution than raising pork, poultry, dairy, or eggs](#) for example.
- **The water footprint of beef is highest of all food.** Estimates range from 441 gallons to 12008 gallons of water per pound of beef. In comparison, rice and wheat are 50 to 100 times more efficient!! Forget about India; there is a global movement to sway people away from beef to ensure our future generations have water to drink and food to eat. Refer [Beef: The "King" of the Big Water Footprints](#).
- Beef production is the most inefficient use of fossil energy at an energy input to output ratio of 54:1. Compare with chicken 4:1, pork 26:1, eggs 6:1. For Indian food grains, it is around 2:1. The implication is clear: When you eat beef instead of grains, 26 people go hungry to fulfill your so called “**personal**

freedom of tongue indiscipline.” Review [U.S. could feed 800 million people with grain that livestock eat](#). Also review [Sustainability of meat-based and plant-based diets and the environment](#). Here is another one: [Beef – The Global Issue](#).

We shower our deepest respect to seers who formed foundations of Indian culture. They saw what the world is repenting today for being too late to observe and act upon. **We are proud of them.**

6

Beef lovers and their double standards.

If one demands permission to kill cow and cattle because of his “personal freedom to eat whatever he or she wants,” then they should first raise their voice against following:

- Ban on the killing of national and endangered animals and birds in most civilized countries of the world. (In India, you cannot poach lions and tigers. In United State, killing bald and a golden eagle in banned through a Special Act. Just possessing feathers lead to a heavy penalty. Killing will give you long prison time and hefty fine.)
- Ban on defacing and damaging heritage and protected buildings. Why be certain buildings considered so special after all? Why “freedom-lovers” do not have freedom to choose what buildings they decide to consider special?
- Ban on insulting and desecration of national symbols like a flag.
- Ban on sale and carrying of unlicensed arms and weapon.
- Ban on roaming naked and having sex in public.
- Ban on mutual cannibalism with consent.
- Ban on sale and consumption of narcotics. And so on....

The same gangs of “liberals” who are crying foul on beef ban have never shown any solidarity with above or any other related aspect of personal freedom. Many Bollywood celebrities are twitting against the beef ban. Shirin Devi – only woman editor of Urdu magazine – was fired, arrested and now forced to live in oblivion for publishing Charlie Hebdo cartoons in the magazine. She published them to criticize the cartoons and yet she had to face unimaginable trauma. **The issue made headlines, she hails from Mumbai, but no Bollywood personality or beef-lover dared to stand up to defend her.** No one dared to publish Charlie Hebdo cartoons on their own walls and tweets to show solidarity with “freedom of speech”.

This itself shows blatant double standards.

I challenge all “beef-lovers” first to show their solidarity with above bans and restrictions that pre-date beef-ban. Please explain your selective silence on these issues.

One celebrity porn-writer wrote that she is willing to face five years of jail to defend the right of beef-eaters in Maharashtra. Let her post Charlie Hebdo cartoons to defend write of publishers, let her publicly consume narcotics to defend the right of ecstasy-lovers, let her perform nude sex acts in public to defend the right of sex-maniacs and so on. But they will not do so simply because the risks are too high.

Insulting sentiments of the peaceful majority of Indians is a harmless hobby instead. It is harmless because Indian majority will not retaliate, unlike many other groups that are famed for putting a prize on your head.

7

There is no absolute freedom in democracy.

In an enlightened democracy, there can never be absolute freedom. Because your freedom can invade in my zone of freedom. All matters of freedom and restrictions are bound by following:

- Collective wisdom of majority that is witnessed through election process
- Responsibility and maturity with which one can use the freedom

- Respect for harmless sentiments of the public. Your freedom ends where it restricts my freedom.

In the case of a beef ban, **that happened through a democratic and legal manner.** The government that brought this legislation made their intentions very clear in their election manifesto. They went to voters on a plank of stopping beef production. Voters gave them their support and allowed them to proceed on this legally. Now, if they do not fulfill the promise made to voters, that would amount to cheating. Instead, the government decided to follow the path of honesty, show respect to the process of democracy and fulfill aspirations of people who voted for them.

If someone has objections to democracy, **he better relocate to jungles where every animal has full freedom to do whatever it wants.** And not complain because a government fulfilled its promise to public.

8

Terrorist mindset of beef protestors.

What these protestors are saying is:

"I don't care if she is your mother. I don't care if it destroys the environment. I don't care if it results in 30 hungry people who die. I don't care if it results in 20 thirsty dead. I don't care about culture, economy, environment, poor people, sentiments of others...nothing. I don't care about law and democracy. I just care about the taste of my tongue. If I enjoy eating your mother – living or dead – let me have that even if it is against law. That is my fundamental right."

This is exactly the way ISIS terrorists think, rapists think, psychopaths think, criminals think. It only proves something else – that even love for beef has such brutal effect on Indian brains. Only God can imagine its impact when consumed. **That is why Gandhi equated cow-protection with Swarajya.**

9

No unemployment due to beef ban.

Another lame argument given is that banning beef will lead to unemployment of people in this industry. Beef ban is inhuman. This

argument again shows your double standards. Why suddenly this selective love for other people? If you are so sensitive to others, why ignore sensitivities of the vast majority, poverty caused due to beef, hunger caused due to beef.

This lame argument can be used for banning any legal or illegal industry. For example, banning illegal firearms, illegal liquor, narcotics, and opium production will all lead to unemployment of some people. After all, there is no industry that functions without people. Even fighting against ISIS, Al Qaeda, Boko Haram and other terror groups will render many terrorists unemployed! **Should we then start promoting terrorism also as a career option instead?** Clearly, all this is the mindset of sociopath – for whom self-indulgence supersedes social responsibility.

Those who will be displaced by the ban on the beef industry are free to move to other legal industries. If beef producers start using same resources for grain production, they can cater to 30 to 100 times bigger market. **There will be more prosperity and employment. And the environment will also thank them.**

Instead of crying hoarse over the beef ban, beef-lovers should instead propose alternatives for the adoption of people in beef-industry in other worthwhile industries. **If you have money and commitment to go even to jail, why not allocate some funds for rehabilitation of these people?** Why demand legalization of terrorism in the name of safeguarding careers of terrorists?

10

Stop justifying insult of mother.

Don't impose your moral policing on me. Don't tell me why I should not worship cow as mother. Don't ridicule me for electing a government that promises to respect my sentiments for cattle, eliminate hunger, protect the environment and reduce poverty. Don't threaten me that you would take law in your hands and insult my sentiments for your taste-buds. All this amounts to fanaticism as displayed by ISIS and moral brigade. And if you do so, be prepared to be repaid in the same currency.

If, indeed, you are so passionate about “freedom and liberty”, then raise your voice on more pertinent issues. Do not justify insult of the mother. Do not promote the damage of environment and hunger. **Raise**

voice for the uniform civil code to give equal rights to all women of all communities. Raise voice for Shirin Devi who cannot even move in public because she published Charlie Hebdo cartoons. Raise voice for mute animals whose right to live is jeopardized because of taste-buds of others. Raise voice for hundreds of more pertinent issues than your obsession to eat my mother.

11

There is a correct way to get anything banned.

Another silly argument given by many mentally deprived beef-lovers is as follows:

"I worship lauki and potato. Eating them hurts my religious sentiments. So ban them also."

Here is the answer. Yes, you have right to get them banned. Follow the following steps:

- First of all, stop eating lauki, potato, roti, pulses – whatever hurts your sentiments.
- Next, form an association of like-minded people who share your worship of potato.
- Third, stand in elections, prepare election manifesto that clearly states your commitment to ban potato, pulses blah blah. Feel free to put death sentence as punishment for potato eaters.
- Fourth, win the elections, prepare a bill, and have it passed in the Assembly to make an act.
- Now thank your voters and be happy.
- **If I eat potato after that, lawfully hang me to death.**

India believes in this democratic process. Everyone is encouraged to respect and adopt it. **But if democracy is not your cup of tea, I recommend asylum in Somalia or ISIS territories or jungles of**

Africa.

12

Beef ban is completely lawful.

A large number of beef-lovers are threatening to violate the law and satisfy their cravings. Some say, if beef roams in the night and gets eaten, it's their fault. One porn-writer says she will eat beef even if she has to go jail for this. Here is our response:

Don't act like terrorists. By this logic, you can also defend eating children in isolated streets. This mindset is called psychopath mindset.

Further, if you have right to violate the law to claim your "personal freedom" of eating my mother, then I also have right to violate the law and thrash you for attempting to attack my mother. In other words, don't complain if illegal beef-activists are brought in control through illegal means by cow-worshippers. So respect the law. Don't promote anarchy.

13

Beef ban is democratic.

Another breed of beef-lovers is calling this ban anti-democratic and unconstitutional.

What a joke! They forgot Civics lessons of school perhaps. Ban on the slaughter of cattle is clearly documented as a Directive Principle of State Policy in Part IV of Indian Constitution. It has been clearly stated that *"it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws."* (Para 37)

Para 48 states that: "The State shall endeavor to organize agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds, and prohibiting the slaughter, of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle."

So what Maharashtra Government has done is strictly in lines of Constitution and also in a constitutional manner. Those who have objections to it must accuse and abuse the Constitution and its makers instead of those people who respect and follow the Constitution. If you have fundamental issues with Indian Constitution, better relocate to another country because India will continue to run as per its Constitution and celebrate the Republic Day as a promise to abide by the Constitution.

Summary

Let beef-lovers and potato-lovers and culture-haters do whatever they can. We are resolved to counter them democratically, intellectually and legally. And if they resort to the promotion of illegal means – directly and indirectly, then they lose right to complain when they face the same.

Hence, we appeal to them to stop this double standard and join Agniveer in fulfilling aspirations of millions in a democratic manner.

If they do not, please note that we take pride in *Veer Shivaji* who risked his life to protect the cows. We take pride in Gandhi. And we take pride in our visionary culture that taught us ways to fight poverty, hunger, pollution and live with compassion. We shall protect and nurture it irrespective of anyone's perverted fetish. And go to any extent for it.

CHAPTER 4 **BEEF-LOVERS RIPPED APART**

Killing cow is your fun, beef-eaters. Ripping you apart is mine.

-Agniveer



In the previous chapter, I have discussed various points proving how the whole movement against the beef ban is completely wrong. This chapter is specifically targeting beef-lovers and ripping them apart with facts and logic for their statements and threats I (Agniveer) have come across.

1

The Beef ban is against the constitution.

The Beef ban is against the constitution and anti-democratic.

Agniveer:

- I think you read the constitution of Pakistan instead of India.
- The beef ban came through a democratic process of voting, debate, elections and law formulation.

What will poor tigers in Bombay zoo eat?

Because of beef ban poor tigers in Bombay zoo are forced to eat chicken.

Agniveer:

- Since when did you start loving tigers so much? And what crime has cow committed to earning your hatred?
- Why not offer your own meat to tigers if you love them so much? Why suggest killing of my mother? Human meat is most tasty for tigers!
- What do tigers eat in zoos of those cities where beef is banned since last 60 years?
- If you indeed love tigers so much, then instead of having pity for their chicken food, start demand for their freedom from captivity. Start a movement to get them back to their natural environment. Tamed animals like you can be a replacement for the cages emptied. One, you can enjoy free chicken! Two, you would indeed attract much more crowd and hence generate revenue for the economy. And this revenue can be used to feed those who have become unemployed because government disallowed them from killing cattle. Win-Win for everyone.

3

You are not becoming liberal.

The whole world is becoming liberal. And you are taking a step backward.

Agniveer:

- Then why not talk about the liberation of cows and bulls as well? Why all notions of liberty must circle around you? Are you the center of the universe?
- Why does your notion of liberty imply that others must be your slaves that you can kill anytime?

- If killing a cow is liberty in your definition, then why you have a problem with human flesh? Because as per you, more intelligent an animal you kill, more liberal you are! And since you claim to be most intellectual, you must be killed first to make world liberal.

4

Beef ban is a threat to foreign investments.

How will we encourage foreign investments in a country with such regressive laws? What will foreigners eat?

Agniveer:

- Would you or any of your beef-headed group refuse to go to USA or Switzerland because you don't get Vada Paav there?
- Would you refuse to explore opportunities abroad because you can't find lungi to wear?
- I never heard any sane foreigner refusing to travel because of food and culture. In fact majority of them (those who matter) are sensitive to cultural diversity and respect local customs. On the contrary, they enjoy the same. No one will die because beef is not available. No sensible foreigner will refuse to invest because beef (the unhealthiest form of meat) is unavailable in India! Even in developed countries, there is increasing trend to replace beef with other forms of healthy alternatives since beef is considered the worst form of meat and triggers cancer.
- Rest of India continues to attract foreign investors and people despite non-availability of beef. Middle-east continues to attract foreigners despite non-availability of pork. Gujarat continues to be leading investment hub. I never heard anyone preferring a state because of food habit.

5

My life, my choice.

Agniveer:

Yes, My life, my choice. And my choice is to protect my cattle. My choice is to thrash those who attempt to kill my cattle. My choice is to show zero tolerance to those who don't respect the constitution and sentiments of our freedom fighters. **My choice is to be a ferocious guard of my mother - Mother India, Mother Cow, Mother Culture, Mother Language, Mother Vedas and Mother Earth.** And it is my choice to consider these as Mother. And it can be my choice to kill those who attempt to kill my mother.

Moral of the story: Restrict your choice of moving your hand till it does not touch my nose.

6

Beef ban will cause unemployment.

So many people in the beef industry will get unemployed. Who will feed their families?

Agniveer:

- Why don't you start feeding them? Charity begins at home.
- Then also demand legalization of narcotics trading, terrorism, human trafficking. They also feed millions of families.
- Refer first point. Get yourself in zoos. That will generate a lot of funds to feed these families.
- Agniveer suggests that these families be put in alternate professions. Why not dairy and agriculture? **Let the hands that killed cow till yesterday become humane and serve the same cow.**

7

Blame Hindus. They own the most slaughterhouses.

It is Hindus who sell off their old cows for the beef industry. It is Hindus who own most cattle slaughterhouses. Blame them.

Agniveer:

- Yes, we blame them. Does it change the fact that cow is a mother for the majority of Indians?
- If you are so concerned about old cows, please donate to Agniveer. We are working actively for protection and shelter of old cows. We use their urine and cow dung to generate electricity.

8

Who are you to dictate what I eat?

Agniveer:

- Who are you to dictate whom I must consider mother?
- I don't care what you eat. But I do care if you kill my mother. And to best of my capacity, I will stop you from dictating me my sentiments.

9

If I worship potato, will you ban it?

Tomorrow I will say I worship potato. Then will you ban potato?

Agniveer:

- Good luck. First, make sure you have never eaten your Potato God in your lifetime. Just in case you have discovered that potato is your God, make sure you never eat it in future irrespective of whether it is banned or not.
- Go and try enforcing such a ban. People will put you in mental hospital (and not jail!)
- If millions of people believe so for thousands of generation, yes, you can try for the ban.
- When insane people like you announced the "massive" rally against the beef ban in Mumbai, no one even bothered to attend except few people from erstwhile industry. No single

representation from the likes of Rishi Kapoors and Farhan Akhtars who wept so much for being denied the right to kill my mother.

10

You are spreading Hindu fundamentalism.

Agniveer:

- If considering cow as a mother is Hindu fundamentalism, then shamelessly suggesting eating my mother is communal hatred against religious sentiments of majority or Hindus. So you are spreading communal hatred.
- Why you never dared to call the Indian constitution as “Hindu fundamentalist” for last 68 years? This source of this “Hindu fundamentalism” lies in Directive Principles of Constitution of India. Thus by accusing cow-lovers and threatening to eat beef, you are being communal and anti-national at the same time.

11

A lot of Hindus also eat beef.

Agniveer:

- A lot of Indians rape, murder, and loot. So what?
- A lot of Muslims eat pork. A lot of Christians indulge in seven sins. So what?
- The law is not for Hindus or Muslims. It is for Indians. And as Indian, if you directly or indirectly kill cattle where it is illegal, you will land in jail.

12

Even Hinduism endorses beef-eating.

Rig Veda has verses recommending beef-eating. The beef was served in Yajna. Swami Vivekanand also ate beef.

Agniveer:

- So much of love for Hinduism! For one beef-ban you did so much research. It inspires for more bans in future!
- Cite one single verse in entire Vedas that endorses beef-eating. It's an open challenge from Agniveer that remains unchallenged even after years. Prove Agniveer wrong and Agniveer will eat beef with you.
- I can show verses that suggest that such people should be severely thrashed. Do we now go ahead with it given that you claim to love both Hinduism and beef so much?
- Were you personal cook of Vivekananda?

13

Verse X, Y, Z of Rig Veda recommend beef-eating.

Agniveer:

- Can you even decipher a single letter of Rig Veda? You are just copy-pasting from illiterates like Dr. Naik and Dr. Jha perhaps.
- Agniveer has refuted this in previous section. Ask your doctors to come with more credible proofs!
- Why should we follow Hinduism based on claims of perverts like you whose love for Hinduism also emerges out of pervert fetish on the tongue?

14

This country belongs to Muslims also.

This country belongs not only to Hindus but also to Muslims.

Agniveer:

- How is beef-ban against Islam? Cite one single verse in Quran that states that eating beef is central to the Islamic religion.

- **There are several Hadiths which state that while milk of a cow is beneficial, the meat of cow is harmful to health. This proves that beef ban is pro-Hindu as well as pro-Islamic.**
- Huge numbers of Muslims don't touch beef. Do you mean people like Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam are anti-Islamic?

15

You are against Muslims.

But most people in the beef trade are Muslims. Why are you against Muslims?

Agniveer:

- One minute ago, you were claiming that Hindus are involved in the beef business. Now you start putting that blame on Muslims!
- The reality is that beef-trade has nothing to do with Hinduism or Islam. It is an illegal trade that promotes pollution, disease, and poverty. And insults Hinduism as well as Islam. Hence, the ban is most welcome.

16

You are inhumane to poor.

Beef is the cheapest source of meat and staple diet of poor. Why are you inhumane to them?

Agniveer:

- Shit is even cheaper and also contains fibers and proteins. Start eating it if another food seems expensive to you. You can also rummage through waste bins outside restaurants to save cost.
- If beef is such staple diet, why is it not the most popular form of meat in India? Why it gets exported when so many meat-eaters stay hungry?

- Beef is neither cheapest source of protein nor staple diet of poor. It is a harmful unhygienic food habit that causes cancer. Why do you hate poor so much that you want to feed them with cancer?

17

Beef ban will hurt Indian economy.

India is the largest exporter of beef. Beef ban hurts the Indian economy.

Agniveer:

- Prostitution is more lucrative than beef export. Would you start with your family members to help Indian economy? **Would you feel nice if I start seeing economic potential in flesh-trade of your mother?** Then why judge flesh of my mother cow in monetary terms?
- Replace beef trade with grain-trade and you will feed more hungry and export much more.
- Raise issue against opium farming if economy be a concern. After all, narcotics fetch much more money in the international market than beef. Raise movement against restriction on narcotic drug-farming.

18

Why only a cow and no other animals?

What about other animals? Why only a cow? Why be so inhuman to other animals?

Agniveer:

- Are you a beef lover or animal-rights activist? Or are you an opportunist who changes colors like a chameleon?
- You mean to say that we must either ban all form of meat eating or allow beef as well. In that case, we must allow human killing as well unless even slap is punished. We must allow murders because we cannot prevent ISIS from killing

innocents. Let us start with you. Why don't you give your life to raise this demand?

- Ban on Beef is a first nice step in right direction. Nothing like it if entire world shuns meat. That would be a boon to environment and economy. If you indeed are concerned about other animals, stop this howling over the beef ban and instead become an animal-rights activist.

19

Even cow milk must be banned.

Even milk of cow must be banned. You hurt cow in the process.

Agniveer:

Why this sudden surge of love for cows? Whatever be the reason, if you indeed believe so, you can go vegan. Many in the world are doing so. If you are so compassionate about cows, then you must be the first person to welcome beef-ban.

20

What about cow slaughter across the world?

Many cows are being killed across the world. Why don't you stop them? Are they not your mother?

Agniveer:

- A lot of people urinate in public toilets. Why don't you then open your home for public relief as well?
- Many innocents are being murdered by ISIS in Syria. Many heads are chopped off in Saudi Arabia. Does that mean we lift the ban on murder in India?
- Let people in other countries follow their culture. In my country, the culture of my people will be followed.

21

But this is not just your country.

Beef-lover: But this is not just your country. There are crores of people with

diverse customs and traditions.

Agniveer:

- India is not just your country as well. There are crores of people with diverse customs and traditions who do not die for beef.
- That is why I don't impose every personal whim of mine on public. I go with views of the majority so far they are not damaging and detrimental to anyone. Ban on beef does not hurt anyone's sentiments. **It only hurts selfish fetish of few perverts and a money-generation cartel of some more.** In return, it damages the environment and causes poverty.

22

You sound so jingoistic and arrogant.

Agniveer:

Did you expect Aarti after suggesting that you want to enjoy eating my mother?

23

If a cow is your mother, who is your father!

Agniveer:

- This is the difference between true sons of mother and rascals. **We consider everyone who nurtured us as a mother. We respect each female as a mother. We consider earth, nation, rivers, cow, culture and language as a mother because they gave us so much selflessly.** We live as humans because of their care. But rascals keep a dirty eye on every female, every giver. These pimps will not hesitate to sell flesh of those who gave selfless care. They make a dirty joke on motherhood. They can't respect womanhood. Shame!
- Even your own mother is a mother for us. **Now think yourself how your shameless question insults her.** Shame

on you!

24

I am a beef eating Hindu.

I am a beef eating Hindu. Does that mean I am less God fearing then a non-eater? Think!! (Rishi Kapoor – Bollywood actor).

Agniveer:

Why should I think for you? Is it that years of indulgence in vices have stolen your capacity to think? BTW, we thought, we acted, and we got the beef banned.

25

So you can't have 'beef' with someone.

So now in Maharashtra, you can have a beef with someone, but you can't have a beef with someone. (Farhan Akhtar – Bollywood actor).

Agniveer:

Very true! Good that reality is dawning on you. **Beware that you don't have a beef with Agniveer over beef. You may end up being beef yourself.**

26

Media and Bollywood are against beef-ban.

Agniveer:

- That explains the mental bankruptcy evident in silly arguments of beef lovers!
- So what? How many of them are putting a few crores each to rehabilitate people from erstwhile beef-industry into legal professions?

27

I enjoy the taste of beef.

I enjoy the taste of beef. You must also try. You will also enjoy.

Agniveer:

I enjoy thrashing people like you. You must also volunteer once. You will

enjoy the thrashing.

28

I will keep eating beef. Do what you can do.

Agniveer:

I will keep thrashing people like you wherever I can and as much I can.
Do what you can do.

29

I see a future Bal Thackeray in you.

*The growth of Agniveer is a worrying trend. I see a future Bal Thackeray in
you.*

Agniveer:

BE PREPARED.

CHAPTER 5

AGNI SPEAKS – BEEF, MURDER, AND MEDIA

Respect others' harmless sentiments. Defend your own. If you are confused, choose the more kind and humane.

-Agniveer



The nautanki (drama) by fake-liberals (in media, Bollywood, politics, corporate sector) reminds me of autocratic Jailor of English era in Hindi film “Sholay” played by Asrani. The Jailor would shout his Bravados as if Hitler is no match. But would escort criminals till exit gate at the mere mention of a pistol behind his back.

These fake-liberals (or do we call them feku-liberals) are no different. They know that ridiculing Hindu beliefs is no more dangerous and no less entertaining than playing Battlefield on their *Playstations*.

But the moment they are asked to confront demons that roam outside their gaming box in streets, they would seek the emergency route to the toilet. Legends speak of the ‘brave warrior’ Uttar, who boasted about his bravery among women in his palace. But when he saw the vast army facing him in the battlefield, Arjuna could see Uttar getting wet at wrong places and smell suspiciously foul.

Here are counter-measures to neutralize their foul smell:

1

Cow is not my mother. I will organize a "beef party".

The cow may be your mother. It is not mine. What about rights of a beef-eating Hindu? I will organize a "beef party".

Agniveer:

Your argument also applies to religions, religious figures, prophets, religious books, parents. I want to see which true-liberal has 'chutzpah' to organize following parties:

- To burn the holy book of religion, that means peace.
- To draw cartoons of holy figures of religion, that means peace.
- To tear photos of pilgrim destinations of religion, that means peace.

If you are true to your notions of liberalism and rights, organize such parties, share locations, post videos and reveal your addresses. We will do our bit to guarantee that these videos and address details become viral among peaceful people whose rights you pretend to protect.

Let us see which liberal Maardande Cashew, Bhosa De, Fatehal Actor, FasaUsDin Vahashi comes forward.

2

What I serve on my plate is my choice.

What I serve on my plate is my choice. Who are you to decide?

Agniveer:

What I burn in my stove is my choice. What I use to wipe my toilet is my choice. What paper I remove my spit with is my choice. This choice can go to any crazy extent. It can contain any image, any verse, any page from any holy book of any religion that is considered sacred by others but not me.

Fake-liberals like you will stop where you realize that this game will become risky. You will offend Hindus because Hindus are peaceful. But you will dare not offend those who claim to be peaceful. Because you

know that if you do even one act like this, the wrath of 'peaceful' may put you to peace forever.

That is why Agniveer follows true liberalism - ***Respect others' harmless sentiments. Defend your own. If confused, choose which is more kind and humane.***

3

I will eat beef to protest against killing in Dadri.

Agniveer:

Few months ago a rapist was lynched in Nagaland. Will you now rape to protest?

4

I just ate beef. Come and murder me. – Bhosa De.

Agniveer:

Do it yourself. Jump from the balcony. Else it will be very messy.

5

Come to me. I have eaten beef.

*I have eaten beef. Instead of attacking helpless people come to me. I have Danda (a stick) waiting for you and getting impatient. - Maardande
Cashew*

Agniveer:

- Are you tweeting to the mob? They do not even have twitter accounts.
- You are the same person who said Netaji was Japanese agent and Gandhi British?
- You condemned Salman Rushdie and had recommended that right to freedom must have reasonable restrictions to harmonize with the public interest. Where was your Danda then?
- I just called you pig. Come to me with your Danda. I promise to cure its impatience.

6

Cow cannot be anyone's mother. I eat beef.

A cow cannot be anyone's mother. I eat beef and will continue to eat.

Agniveer:

Look at yourself. If a pig can be anyone's son, why not cow can be anyone's mother?

7

But I am not a pig. I am a human.

But I am not a pig. I am a human. I can think, speak, and write.

Agniveer:

Pig with extraordinary abilities! Post your video on social media. It will go viral.

8

If a cow is your mother, is bull your father?

Agniveer:

- This is why you are pig-headed. Sensible people look at the essence. Pig-heads take things literally. If India is my mother that does not mean Asia is my granny and World great granny. It only means I have similar sentiments for my country as I have for my mother.
- If you really believe in taking things so literally, ask for a ban on Vande Mataram. Its a different matter that we will do what it takes to deal with pigs spreading swine flu.
- **Would you ask the followers of the religion of peace if Kaba is the house of God, where are His toilet?** I saw you all laughing your hearts out when some alien PK made similar remarks on Hindus. This is where you are exposed. Always offend harmless Hindus but don't touch religion of peace.

9

If I am a pig, where is my tail?

Agniveer:

- Search yourself. Ask your mother. She may have thrown it in dustbin considering its haram. You just admitted that you have rare abilities to think and speak.
- If you are not a pig, don't show your pig-head. Stop using your fingers to ejaculate nonsense on the keyboard. Show restraint, give respect to earn respect.

10

You are a Hindu fundamentalist.

You are a Hindu fundamentalist. You are justifying lynching.

Agniveer:

- You are a racist who hates me because of my birth and religion. No different from white supremacists like Ku Klux Klan.
- Who has justified lynching? On the contrary, Agniveer is against anyone like you (or the mob that kills) who creates Kangaroo courts and issues fatwas.
- We offer condolences to innocents killed and deepest sympathies for their families. We must all support a law to nab the culprits.
- Those who have slightest common-sense can see that killing an innocent human is wrong. But that does not imply that rape is justified. Or killing cow is legal.

11

Hindu fundamentalist are suppressing Muslims.

This is an example of how Hindu fundamentalists are suppressing Muslims in India. Don't you know India is a secular country?

Agniveer:

- This is an example of how video-game addicts like you are supporting the cause of Islamic terrorism by nurturing hatred in minds of Muslims against Hindus.
- Who are you to issue a fatwa on what happened, who did, who supported and with what motive? If you indeed know something valuable, please inform police and help bring justice. Do not sensationalize a stray unfortunate incident as a communal vendetta to get TRP or some kick. You may get the wrong kick. Do not try to be a Khaap Panchayat.
- India is secular because of Hindus like us who respect personal beliefs of everyone and are willing to control our own urges to respect sentiments of others. **We shed tears when an APJ Abdul Kalam dies instead of sensationalizing the hanging of terrorists like Yakub Memon.**
- You accuse cow-lovers of lynching. But refuse to accept the fact that it was a group of cow-worshipping Hindus, vocal supporters of Agniveer ideology, who protected the family of deceased from the mob at risk of their own lives.

12

Do not pretend to be secular.

Do not pretend to be secular. You killed people in Gujarat and Mumbai riots. You destroyed Babri mosque.

Agniveer:

- Why are you pointing at me? Hang me, jail me – if I participated in any riot. Should I point you that you performed genocide in Kashmir, you and your forefathers invaded India for last 1300 years, beheaded and raped in millions, and yet you glorify the terrorists like Babur and Aurangzeb?
- Any riot is wrong. Killing any helpless woman or child is wrong. Religion, caste, region does not matter. Period.

Agniveer stands against every such act. Unlike you who would vanish away when you are asked to stand for more serious cases of human rights violation happening in Kashmir, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and West Bengal.

- As for Babur, he was a murderer and rapist whose name must be in Guinness Book of World Records for being the greatest pervert ever born. Babri mosque was in memory of his gay sex partner named Babri built over a sacred temple. There is nothing Islamic or human about Babur, Babri, or Babur's aulads who were equally devils. Go and read the autobiography of Babur instead of abusing Hindus.

13

We also support the right to eat pork.

We do not just support right to eat beef. We also support the right to eat pork. See, we are unbiased to both Hindus and Muslims.

Agniveer:

The cow is considered sacred as a mother by at least 100 crore Hindus (and many Muslims as well). Pig is considered most disgusting animal by Muslims.

The cow is revered. A pig is abhorred. Only a moron will equate the two.

It does not matter to a Muslim whether you eat pig or kill it. All he asks is to keep pig away from him. For a Hindu, it matters what happens to the mother. Just as it matters to you what one does with your mother.

A more close parallel of a cow in the Muslim world would be Holy Quran. Or Holy Prophet Muhammad. Or the image of Holy Kaaba. Or think of eating pork in a mosque.

Killing cow in Hinduism is akin to disrespecting these symbols of Holy Islam.

We know you are too scared to even think of doing this. If not, share videos and your address details. Help us bring more popularity for you.

If yes, stop insulting my mother.

14

We will raise any issue that violates human rights.

Agniveer:

- Why this sudden love for human rights. Or is it restricted to only bashing Hindus?
- Why no Bollywood celebrity, media person, politician raised a loud voice against illegal detention and raping of two Nepali women by a Saudi diplomat for several months in India. The incident is not even a month old. No one dared to shout against this gravest insult of womanhood by a rascal. No one is writing open letters to the Saudi government. Perhaps because

- It is too risky. It may upset those forces that spread most brutal form of terrorism today.

- Petrodollars form the foundation of luxuries that most of these fake liberals are enjoying. Bollywood finance from the Middle East is well known for some time. Many media houses have been allegedly funded from roots that lie near the country of rapist diplomat. Corporates have a huge business; professionals have great career opportunities that link to that country. And who cares about poor Hindu women from a poor country like Nepal! If I am wrong, let me see that this becomes the biggest women rights issue for these liberals.

- Why no tweets and coverage over a policeman who was killed by a mob of “peace-loving” who were stealing cows in UP.
- No tweets when a girl was abducted, raped and forced to convert to Islam in Meerut last year.
- No outrage when a Hindu man was murdered by Brothers of his Muslim wife in Hapur. [Muslim woman weds Hindu man-both killed.](#)
- No tears when Javed, Pervez, and Mannan gang raped a minor girl in Shamli. [Minor girl gang-raped by three youths.](#)
- No tweets when Ghalib and Feroz assaulted a school teacher

in Amroha, and when a girl in Muzaffarnagar was raped by Shaukeen and Raheel. [Girl, School teacher sexually assaulted](#)

- No outcry when 30 years old woman was gang-raped and filmed by Naushad, Parvaiz, Hassan, and Nazar in Sikri. [Woman gang-raped by four men filmed in Muzaffarnagar.](#)
- No reaction when Muslim mob killed two people in Azad Maidan, Mumbai out of religious hatred and sexually assaulted five lady police constables.
- Not a single word for the Muslim woman who was raped by his father in law in Muzaffarnagar and later declared as the mother of her husband and wife of her rapist father in law.
- No story on Tuktuki Mandal, a Hindu minor girl, abducted by Muslim goons in West Bengal.
- You raised so much of noise when a nun was gang raped in Bengal few months back. You shouted how Hindu fanatics are trampling the minorities. But the moment it came to light that all the criminals were Islamic fanatics from Bangladesh, suddenly there is no tweet, no press coverage, no TV report. Your deeds are encouraging fanatics among Muslims to continue one crime after another. You are the greatest cause of communal hatred.

15

We have written many tweets against Dadri killing.

Agniveer:

- Do you think the killers are reading your tweets?
- The reality is that you are writing these tweets not for killers but for tolerant Hindus like Agniveer, who love cow as mother. You are writing with a foolish convenient assumption that we – cow lovers – are killers. You are writing to use this

incident to justify your fetish for bashing Hinduism and eating my mother.

- If indeed you are so enlightened, then choose the path of compassion and environment protection. Respect compassionate sentiments of 100 crores Hindus.

16

You are provoking people to kill Muslims.

You have posted images of Shivaji cutting the hand of a butcher on your website. You are instigating people to take law in hands to kill Muslims.

Agniveer:

- By your argument, India should ban legacy of Bhagat Singh, Chandrasekhar Azad, and Netaji as well. This is what happens when naazuk-heroes compensate for their cowardice with hollow arguments.
- What Shivaji did was perfectly right in his era when invaders like Mughals had forcefully annexed India. Thanks to cow-lovers like Rana Pratap, Shivaji, Guru Gobind and Mangal Pandey you are safe enough to abuse cow-lovers. Else you would have been destroyed like Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan. We are proud of them and are in an oath to continue their legacy.
- Read our disclaimer. What we write is within the ambit of our disclaimer. We stand for non-violence, communal harmony, compassion and respect for the law of the land.
- **By your logic, 90% of Bollywood productions must also be banned for instigating violent activities.** If yes, then fight them instead of wasting time here. If no, dare you insult Hindus, their heroes, or their symbols of faith. Watch some action movies to know consequences.
- In a matter of cow, we are very clear that Hindus must do 'all' it takes to protect them. And do all it takes to guarantee that

no harm comes to holy cow under 'any situation.'

- A strict warning to all miscreants: Please desist from insulting Shivaji, Pratap, Guru Gobind, Banda Singh Bahadur, APJ Abdul Kalam or any of our heroes. Do not fuel unnecessary hatred. Hatred will have a bad effect on health.

17

You support militant groups like RSS.

Do you support fundamentalist right groups like Bajrang Dal, Shiv Sena, VHP, RSS, who are militants?

Agniveer:

Hindus are very moderate and docile. We are aware of no Hindu group that has ever been militant. But yes, we always support right group and right causes. We are against glamorizing wrong groups and wrong causes.

If Islamic fundamentalism continues to rise and liberals like you continue to bash Hindus to support the fundamentalists, **Prataps and Shivajis are bound to emerge**. We can't leave our responsibility to Putin from Russia bombing ISIS.

18

What about Bal Thackeray?

Agniveer:

Till he was alive, no Rassi Kabootars of Bollywood would dare to justify their love to kill cows. Instead, all would wait in front of his bungalow to seek his blessings. We definitely need someone today whose presence alone suffices to keep shut mouths of these PlayStation-heroes. That gap must be urgently filled.

19

Beef-lover: Gandhi was also against a ban on beef!

Agniveer:

You want me to follow Gandhi? Or want to tell me that you follow Gandhi?

In the first case, if you want me to follow Gandhi, I want you to follow

Shivaji and destroy cow-killers. In the second case, stop eating meat, wear khadi, and stop using gadgets and take part in cleanliness drive. Don't spit your hatred and lust in public.

20

Ancient Indian culture supported beef eating.

I will eat beef because people used to eat beef in ancient India. You don't know about your own culture.

Agniveer:

- I am surprised to see this sudden love for ancient Indian culture! Interestingly, this love is witnessed only when you need to justify your perverted desire for p*rnography or satisfy your cannibalistic fetishes of having innocent lives in your food plate.
- In stone-age, people used to roam around naked. So you too are going to loosen your pants now?
- In ancient times, India was Hindu Rashtra. So let's declare India a Hindu Rashtra now. What? No? Why? If beef must be consumed because ancient Indians did it why Hindu Rashtra is wrong? Where have all beef-lovers vanished now?
- By the way, show one single authentic verse from Vedas – the source of Hinduism – that asks one to enjoy beef and Agniveer will join you to promote beef-lovers. If you fail to show, then Agniveer will bash you like Shivaji and Pratap. Deal?

And don't start quoting from the silly research of DN Jha et al.

21

Hindu texts permit beef eating.

I will eat beef. Even your Hindu texts like Vedas, Geeta, Ramayan, Mahabharat, Manusmriti, permit it.

Agniveer:

- The beef-lover is now the Hinduism-lover after becoming ancient India-lover! Irony commits suicide when it comes to knowing that this same beef-lover had gone bald at the tender age of 25 due to hatred for right-wing forces for their jingoistic love for ancient India and fanatic love for Hinduism.
- Vedas also command courts to shoot down someone that kills innocent humans and animals like a cow. Let us have a deal. You follow your part of Vedas- i.e. eating beef. I follow mine, i.e. beef-eater! Deal?
- Do you have guts to ever claim that Quran allows pork or making cartoons of Prophet? Why your freedom of speech does turn into 'internal matter of religion' suddenly as things change from Hindu to Islamic? Now don't say that you know enough Arabic to know that Quran bans pork and cartoons, and enough Sanskrit to claim that Vedas sanction beef. Knowing your brain-size and Aukaat, I know you are a copycat (+ pussycat) that can offend harmless beliefs of peace-loving Hindus only on the basis of copied stuff from morons like Jha that you don't even understand.
- If you are sure that Quran bans pork and cartoons, when are you calling it Ban-Ch*d. You did exactly the same for Hinduism and India in the case of beef and p*rn ban?
- If you are sure that Quran allows pork and cartoons, say it loudly.
- If you are not sure whether Quran allows pork (or cartoon) or not, then what makes you so sure that Vedas allow beef? Do you want to say that you don't know Quranic Arabic but are a genius in Vedic Sanskrit? Or is it that attacking Hindus is as harmless as playing a video game. But offending peaceful elements may put you to peace forever!

Moral of the story: Beef-eating for Hindus is like drawing of a cartoon of Prophet among Muslims. It is even more serious because, in the

cartoon, no one gets killed. In beef-eating, a motherly creature gets killed. So follow Agniveer's advice – respect harmless sentiments of others.

- Why is it that in the case of Islamic terrorism, you keep ejaculating the non-sense of- 'terrorism has no religion' despite published translations of hundreds of verses from Quran and Hadith clearly promoting violence? But when a billion Hindus request you not to kill a cow, you suddenly become expert of Vedic literature and start quoting holy verses in support of beef? In the case of Hindus, you neither listen to majority voice nor do you know an iota of texts and still impose your views as Bhagavan Ka Vachan. But when it comes to Islam, you have the audacity to claim terror has no religion when neither the majority voice nor the published translations of Islamic texts support your claim.

22

Vivekananda supported beef eating.

Vivekananda said that beef was an essential part of ancient Hindu culture.

Agniveer:

- Now suddenly you became a fan of Vivekananda. Do you know that Vivekananda said that love for a cow is the common thread across all sects of Hinduism, Jainism, and Sikhism? Do you want to break that thread? Are you from ISIS?
- It does not matter what quote you put on which person. Beef eating hurts sentiments of today's Hindus like nothing else. Killing cow is an inhuman, environment-damaging, unhealthy practice that has innumerable alternatives that do not hurt Hindu sentiments. So beef-eating does not make any sense.
- Read Vivekananda in totality. Accept what is right. Reject what hurts harmless sentiments. That is Dharma.

Don't talk about ancient history. Don't talk about the era when no one

existed who believed that Hindus will go to Hell because they worship idols. Don't talk of the era when the color of the flag was saffron. Don't talk of the era when India had not faced religious terrorism from western borders. Don't talk about the era before Prithviraj Chauhan made the blunder of showing kindness on an Islamic terrorist. Don't talk about the era before Jai Chand sided with enemies. Such talks will not take you anywhere.

- You misquote on Vivekananda, and his intentions are clearly mischievous. Instead of digressing from core topic, let me tell you: Even if you misquote God himself that beef is good, that will not change anything. Because Hinduism is not based on blind faith in some book from the sky that no one can question. **Hinduism is based on intellect and sentiments.**

Better focus on the present. Respect sentiments of people. Accept that Hinduism provides in its core a crucial healthy, environment-friendly, economy-boosting practice that is imminent need of the world. And become compassionate. Don't try being a modern day Jaichand.

- For facts on beef in ancient Hinduism, have a look on following video that analyzes the presence of beef in oldest book of Hinduism (and the world) – The Vedas. Read carefully – they recommend punishing those who kill our cows. Considering your love for ancient India, are you ready for poetic justice? Then just jump from the balcony.

23

Beef is consumed globally.

Beef is eaten everywhere across the world. Would you seek a ban on beef there as well?

Agniveer:

- Mosquitoes fly everywhere. Does it mean you will invite dengue in your home as well? Or you want to admit that you have no brains to decide what is right for you. And hence, you depend on rest of the world to be your alpha?

If yes, then brainless skulls should waste time playing video games instead of insulting my mother.

If no, then don't give an example of the world. I will decide what is best for my home (my country) based on my own intellect.

- Every civilized country punishes killing of certain species based on its sentiments. Try killing bald eagle in the USA.

SECTION 3: RIPPING MEAT EATERS APART

CHAPTER 6

MEAT EATING – MYTHS AND REALITY

There must be some difference between carnivores and humans apart from a number of legs and tail.

-Agniveer



In this last chapter, I will attempt to logically answer some of the most common questions asked by meat eaters who want to justify meat eating, mainly because they struggle to get convincing answers to their doubts. But before we delve into the questions and answers session, let me give you the reasons why I do not eat meat. I do not eat meat. I do not eat egg products as well. I want everyone to quit eating meat. Here are the reasons.

Most polluting industry

Because meat and livestock are **one of the most polluting industries** in the world. Whatever ecological damage we face today can be attributed significantly to this non-essential industry. (Refer United Nations document on meat industry being culprit for climate change, land pollution, water depletion and loss of biodiversity.)

Cause of hunger and poverty

Because **meat is the cause of hunger and poverty in the world**. Just as I hate being hungry and under-nutritioned, I feel the same for millions of my brothers and sisters born from same mother earth. If I could have killed myself to satisfy their hunger, I would have gladly done so.

But for all I know, if people stop eating meat and adopt vegetarian ways, **they could feed at least ten times more people using the same efforts and energy**. This is based on the principle of energy pyramid which states that the at least ten units of vegetation is consumed to prepare 1 unit of meat by feeding the meat-producing animals. Refer any text on food chain or energy pyramid. In fact for most of the commercially produced meat that humans eat currently, energy losses are much higher.

Thus, each person who stops eating meat is feeding at least nine more people apart from himself. **What could be a greater form of charity than simply avoiding meat!** And what could be a greater sin for me than forcing at least nine people to die from hunger because I love the taste of mutton! Moreover, meat industry also significantly depletes water.

Since I consider entire humanity as my own family, I cannot sleep peacefully with the guilt of being a cause of hunger and thirst for my dearest brothers and sisters and innocent children in my global home.

Vegetarian alternatives exist

Because in today's era, I don't see anybody hunting to survive like the lions in Africa. Meat is simply a non-essential addiction. **There is no meat product for which a healthier vegetarian alternative does not exist.**

Meat is non-renewable

Because meat is non-renewable. An animal once killed cannot grow more animals. But a plant, even when uprooted, can grow a new plant from its roots, shoots, and seeds. Thus, the hunger and thirst caused by meat-

eating is much longer term and intense than that discussed earlier.

Life is Beautiful

Because I consider my life to be dearest to me. I consider the life of my near and dear ones to be most precious. I see all humans considering lives of their near and dear ones equally precious. If I kill any of them, **I am deemed a murderer because I snatched the most precious gift of life.**

So how can I commit the same crime on other species who too have a face and brain like me, who also love their life so much, who also face the same fear when they approach death, who also express happiness and grief like me and my dear ones? Is it simply because I do not understand their language or consider them less intelligent? By this logic, even killing of mental patients should also be legitimized. The killing of coma patients should also be legitimized. Eating orphans should also be legitimized.

And since they are not, even meat eating is a crime of same order for me.

1

Plants have life too.

Then should you not stop eating plants also? After all, even they have life, as proved by science.

Research has only proved that plants also demonstrate similar processes and cellular structures that are found in animals. Science does not say that plants have a personality like animals. There is no way to prove that plants exhibit the same form of sorrow or joy or put efforts like animals. Plants don't reproduce in a manner similar to animals or stop being able to reproduce more plants like animals after they are killed. **There are significant differences in plants and animals, and that is why the even science of biology clearly differentiates study of botany and zoology.**

So I do not consider plants to have a soul that feels "I am this mango tree." This coupled with reasons discussed above justify eating of plants, but not of animals.

But even if we assume that plants can feel pain like animals. Still, we

can live without eating animals. **But we cannot live without eating plants.** We simply do not have a choice here. And by eating plants, at least, ten times more humans in our family can get food to eat and water to drink than by tasting a beef-steak. Thus common-sense and basic humanity demands that we show mercy on those at least whom we can allow to live without killing ourselves and torturing our family members. Or else, same reason may be given tomorrow to justify cannibalism as well.

2

Animals eat meat. Why humans shouldn't?

Even lions and tigers eat meat. So what is wrong if humans eat meat?

Lions and tigers and other carnivorous animals eat meat because **they are designed by nature to do so. If they do not eat so, they will die.** They are not in a position to think, analyze, choose and decide what to eat and what not to eat. They do not know whether to eat in a plate or in a bowl, whether to cook or not cook, whether to mix five varieties of meat with some toppings or eat plain and raw, whether to cook in Tandoor or roast. Since humans possess this finesse, **question of right and wrong also is relevant to humans alone.**

Now humans have a choice of food – animals or plants. There is 100% evidence that eating of animals causes hunger, pollutes nature. Further, eating animals is optional. So a sensible person like me will not eat animals. On plants, there is controversy. People like me believe that they are chemical reactions and not souls with personalities. Others may differ. But in the absence of conclusive proof for latter, it would be still wiser to prefer them for food instead of animals and be less criminals in the worst case. Further, we do not even have a choice in this case.

Say you are forced to drink from one of the two bottles. One is confirmed to contain deadly poison. And opening the bottle will definitely kill ten other people. For other, there is confusion about it being poison and no one else gets killed. What would you choose? **At least, I would choose the second bottle without second thoughts.** Same is that case with eating plants – the natural, humane way of eating.

3

I am an atheist. I can eat anything.

But I am an atheist. I do not believe in a soul or God. So plants or animals are all similar biochemical reactions. Why should I differentiate?

If you are an atheist or agnostic, **there are more reasons you should eat plants but not animals.** Because I assume, you admit that you are a human. And being a human, I assume, you agree that hurting other humans is not acceptable in any rational society. I assume that you love your fellow human beings. I assume you consider humanity to be your own family. I assume you care for each and every innocent human being. And hence, I assume you would want to keep at least nine people hungry and thirsty while you relish on chicken tikka. And you would not like our future generations to be permanently diseased and in poverty simply because we have been screwing up the environment. I assume that you indeed love your children and would love to gift them with blessings than curse them with hatred.

If my assumptions are correct, then an atheist must be the frontrunner for “Say No to Meat” campaign. **If my assumptions are wrong, then even eating up an atheist is equally justified.**

4

Even drinking milk should be a crime.

Then even domestication of animals and drinking milk should be a crime?

Well, these are ambiguous topics. There can be views and counter views. One can discuss and debate on these. But regardless of that, at least, this is certain that if these were to be a crime, **then killing animals is bound to be a crime of much higher magnitude.** So, at least, we should avoid conducting such great crimes against nature, humanity, and animals, even if we differ on these few issues.

For example, we cannot justify killing of human beings on the pretext that a lesser crime called ‘corporate fraud’ is not clearly defined in law. For someone who raises a question that domestication of animals and drinking of milk are also crimes, there is all the more reason why such a person should be torch-bearer of movement for compassion on animals and promote vegetarianism.

5

I am in a place where I only get meat.

What will I eat if I am in a place where I only get meat, for example, if I am

stranded on an island or am in Antarctica?

This is a very interesting question! Tell me, how many times you have actually been in Antarctica or have been stranded on an island like Robinson Crusoe? This very question implies that you agree that **EXCEPT** when you are stranded on an island or a place where you must eat meat to survive, in all other situations, you should not eat meat.

OK, so we give you this concession. When you become Robinson Crusoe, eat meat if you indeed believe so. But 99.9999% of human inhabitations and situations don't demand you to be a Robinson Crusoe! You get ample non-meat food in almost all locations where humans live as a society. After all the animals they eat also eventually have to eat plants. (All food chains do begin with plants. There is no animal that converts solar energy into bio-energy. Only plants can do that.)

6

Eggs are good for health.

What about eggs? Eggs are good for health, and even the government promotes the eating of eggs.

The government is also mired in scam charges. Just because government promotes something does not make it rational. Had that been the case, there would have never been a movement against scams and for a change of governance!

Coming to eggs, have you ever been in a poultry farm? The way these eggs are produced by ruthlessly torturing the chickens can raise your hairs (assuming you have compassion). Further, it is one of the most unhygienic locations. If you consider that humans should also be motivated to eat shit after picking from commode and serving on a beautiful plate, then perhaps you have at least one lame reason to defend egg-eating. Because the most modern and expensive egg farms are no more hygienic than a dirty toilet in a dirty bus-stop of Karachi. (By the way, the most hygienic of the meat-farms are even dirtier.)

Also, there is no special nutrient in eggs that is not available in plants in ample. In fact, eggs don't even come close to be termed nutritious compared to common plant food. Eating pulses would be a much wiser and nature-friendly option than invite diseases and destroy the environment for eating womb of a bird.

We must eat meat to preserve natural balance.

If we stop eating animals, will not their numbers grow up and fill the entire earth? We must kill animals to preserve natural balance.

This is perhaps the **cutest cruel question** I have ever heard in my life. Cute because it seems as if an innocent child who first learned about nature in his pre-school has framed the question. Cruel because one is attempting to project himself as Robinhood who kills to save the planet!

But let's face the reality. **How many of us actually eat animals because of our genuine concern for nature?** How many of us are indeed environmentalists? Or is it merely tingling of our taste-buds that we want to satisfy by hook or crook?

Coming to the facts, this argument would have been valid had humans as a race would have been eating meat exclusively through hunting like lions and tigers. Now lions and tigers do not create farmhouses to rear deer and sheep so that they can have a ready supply of food.

Humans, on the contrary, have created a huge commercial industry to **PRODUCE** meat-providing animals and then kill them to fulfill their tastes. 99% of humans actually **GROW** the animals they kill. And in the process of this growth, they destroy the nature like anything.

Thus, this cruel question puts the enquirer at par with Osama Bin Laden who justifies his terror attacks as service to humanity! (This is a hard truth that most terrorists seriously believe that they are serving humanity and God by killing others!)

By the way, humans do not eat all the animals and birds. Humans don't eat carnivorous animals for example. Most humans don't eat crows, vultures, jackals or scorpions. Why have they not filled the entire earth then?

Also, this line of thinking can be extended to allow cooking up terminally ill and aged humans. After all, we all are trained since the childhood to cite population as the greatest problem facing us.

Someone who has studied ecology at the even basic level will not give such unscientific arguments and invite ridicule.

On the contrary, the meat industry has endangered many species to extinction. So if preservation of the natural and balance of population are the overriding selfless goals, then do not think even a second to adopt

vegetarianism.

8

Eating meat is natural to humans.

To kill other animals is a natural phenomenon. All powerful animals kill to eat. So what is wrong if humans also act naturally?

First, as discussed earlier, no animal ever grows animals. No animal constructs poultry farms and butcher houses. They simply follow their hunger instincts on a need basis.

Second, the most powerful animals are primarily vegetarians. Be it an elephant, or horse, or hippopotamus, or wild buffalo, or rhino, or gorilla.

Third, animals also live nude, do not read poems, do not clean their parts after shit and do not do a lot of things that humans do. They also do not cook meat before eating. If meat eating is so natural for humans, then most of us would have been relishing raw meat without using spoons and forks.

Humans were designed to be intelligent. To be able to judge and decide what is wrong and what is right. To be compassionate. To be loyal. To be rational. **Thus, if indeed humans want to be 'natural', they should protect and not torture animals.**

And if this logic is to be considered seriously, then even cannibalism is also natural if practiced by powerful humans. Of course, there remains no basis for anti-corruption movement. After all, it is natural for the more powerful to trample those who are less powerful, as per the Enquirer!

But let's be human.

Let's accept it; this is a **beast-mindset** and not human way of thinking. **Humanity is about analysis, love, compassion and urge to protect the less powerful.** These traits alone make humans so special and different from animals.

9

Biologically humans are designed to eat animals.

Biologically, humans are designed to eat animals. Look at our teeth, our intestines. We don't have organs to digest cellulose like herbivorous animals. Hence are we not designed to eat animals?

This is yet another lame excuse to justify cravings of the tongue. Humans

are designed to be separate from both herbivores and carnivores. Unlike herbivores, humans cannot digest grass. That is why we are not grass-eaters. But unlike carnivores, we are also not designed to eat raw meat. So we don't have huge canines like lion and tiger. Human canines are at best good for peeling sugarcanes (Though consult your dentist before you attempt so. Because if you have been eating too much of junk, then sugarcane may peel off your teeth instead!).

If meat was so natural to us, we would have naturally been eating uncooked meat. By chasing, hunting, killing and eating away an animal using fingernails and teeth alone. We would not have required tying or imprisoning the animal and then killing it using special weapons. No animal does that.

On the contrary, fruits and vegetables can be eaten uncooked. In fact, many health-regimes focus on purely uncooked-diet. But meat demands use of fire. The fire is used so that meat is converted to a more acceptable form. These days a raw meat concept is on rage in some places. But medical advice is to have it cooked to ensure there is no infection. And most humans find even the mention of raw meat very disgusting. After all, we were designed by the nature to be not cruel.

So if biology is your inspiration, be a vegetarian. Our brain, body, intellect and emotions were designed only to be compassionate humans.

10

In my society meat is predominant food.

But I live in a family and society where meat is predominant food. How can I suddenly stop eating meat and appear crazy in my group?

This is a more honest question. It is indeed an issue with many genuine, honest people who are forced to eat meat due to peer pressure. The way out is to rethink the same issue from a different perspective.

Just assume for a second that you are among a group of cannibals who want to eat your family members. Would you enjoy feasting with them and eating away leg of your daughter, finger of your mother and intestine of your brother with masala curry?

A rational human being considers all living beings as his own family. But even if you consider all humans as your own family, still meat eating means you are killing, at least, ten of your own family members.

Thus, if we simply start considering the Mother Nature as our

mother indeed, the problem is solved. Then we care for Mother Nature as we care for our own mother. Then we are deeply touched by hunger and poverty of our own brothers and sisters across the globe, and would not be party to anything that makes so many innocents die and suffer due to lack of food. So instead of being someone ashamed of your honesty, you become an agent of positive change. Instead of fearing that you appear crazy, you feel proud that you are the most sensible.

11

Then all meat eaters must be murderers.

Does it mean all meat-eaters are murderers and should be hated?

Technically, the first part of the question is yes. Anyone who is, in any way, instrumental to death of an innocent is indeed a culprit. But we disagree that they should be hated. Meat-eating is a cultural issue today. Cultural issues are tackled through sensitization and awareness and not through Talibanization and hatred. Remember, the entire foundation of the movement against meat-eating lies in **compassion and genuine concern for all living beings**. So we should eradicate this brutal practice through humane means.

We do agree that law should be appropriately formulated to discourage meat-eating and promote healthy environment-friendly human-friendly habits like plant-eating. But not through any feeling of hatred towards anyone. We all humans are one single family. We should love each other and encourage each other for improvements. So even if you eat meat, I still love you as a mother loves her newborn calf. And that is why I appeal to you to say not to meat.

12

Ceasing meat industries will cause unemployment.

What would then happen of so many meat-rearing farms and industries?

Would it not cause people in these industries to become unemployed?

No, they would become even more productive. Instead of meat, if they start producing plant food, they can feed at least ten times more people with same investments. And hence, this would boost the economy like anything and bring prosperity to all. And future generations will thank them for gifting them a less-polluted environment and a less-hungry life.

13

Humans started eating meat for a reason.

If meat-eating was so unnatural, why humans started eating meat in the first place?

The same question can be posed for crimes like murder, fraud, racism, gender discrimination, terrorism and rape. Any evil breeds on ignorance and lack of education. Even if you look into Bible, it states that originally all humans were plant-eaters (Genesis 1.29 for example).

Vedas – the oldest books known to humanity – vociferously suggest a non-meat diet for humans. The first mantra of Yajurveda itself begins with advice to protect the animals.

Overages, due to lack of wisdom, lack of development, and violent periods, there was an incentive to focus only on immediate needs rather than think smartly. Or believe blindly in ape old customs in the name of religion or culture. Hence, meat-eating became as prevalent as gender-discrimination or racism.

When we plan our present and future, we are not at all bothered about why we did not do something in past. We simply rationally evaluate the benefits in present and future, and plan accordingly. That is why we use laptops, speak on mobile phones, watch TV and travel in planes and trains even though human civilization never had these ever before. **What we should be bothered today is not why something happened in past.** We should instead focus on what we need to do right now to save our lovely planet and bring nourishment for teeming billions that are facing punishment for our cravings of the tongue. We should focus on what we must do today to not be a villain torturing our own lovely children tomorrow.

14

Why human-rights and not animal-rights?

I thought you would argue as an animal-rights activist, and I would question why you are not a plants-right activist. You instead started arguing as a human-rights activist. How do I counter you then?

The way Supreme Lord has designed this world, if one genuinely starts caring for humans alone, then care for animals would chip in automatically. After all, this is just a marvelously symbiotic world where

everything is interrelated. **You get back what you give.**

Why do you need to counter something which is so obvious and intuitive? Let us admit that **meat-eating is a social evil** that thrives from dark-ages-like gender discrimination and racism. It is hardly a century ago that we gave voting rights to women. Racism and casteism were legally uprooted hardly a few decades ago. Still movement against these evils continues. So we are not as evolved as technological advances may make us believe. Let us take meat-eating as next evil to tackle, given the appalling situation of the environment and given the poverty statistics of the world. **We should realize that each bite of meat we relish makes one poor die somewhere in the world. And making earth closer to hell for our children whom we love the most.**

For those who indeed are rational and compassionate, this is indeed also animal-rights issues. We inherited this tribal mentality somehow that the whole world is designed exclusively for us – the humans. This lust made us destroy the environment and start considering the entire earth as our personal consort. And within last century, the situation has turned so worse that scientists are now worried about what would happen about our basic necessities of food, land and water in times to come.

In medieval times, the lust made us disregard women as inferior to men in the name of even religion. Women, like animals, were considered by many priests to have no soul. Others considered them to be half-intelligent than men and impure.

Many other people, like “blacks” were considered fit to be slave alone. Then in last few decades, the enlightened ones took a journey backward to rectify the blunders. We thus uprooted racism and casteism. We started considering women as equal to men in social, intellectual and political rights. And now it is time to take the journey a step further and show our concern for animals as well. All these concerns – human-rights, gender-rights, animal-rights – are part of the same spectrum and caused out of same ignorance in human mind. **So, the evolved ones should work to take this next step.**

And even those societies that are yet to do their homework on gender-rights and human-rights also could expedite their progress if they holistically incorporate animal-rights as well.

But even if they do not, the dangerous situations of today force any

rational person to embrace animal rights. As a means to fulfill demands of grave human-rights issues like poverty of teeming billions and damage of environment guaranteeing a dangerous future for our children.

Conclusion

Do not counter the light of truth. Be honest, be humble and be rational. Love others as you expect others to love you. The least you can do to showcase your love for your own brothers and sisters and children of future is to replace that chicken soup with tomato soup.

Be human, love humans.

Say no to meat!

And remember, you get back what you give.

ABOUT AUTHOR

Sanjeev Newar is a Yogic scholar of Vedas, Gita and Hinduism. He has written several popular books on Vedas, Yoga, spirituality and misconceptions on Hinduism. He is the founder of Agniveer - a spiritual movement that works for equality of castes, genders, regions and religions in India and abroad. He is pioneer of Hindu Ekta Yajna initiative to bring equality across all regions and castes . He is an eloquent poet, orator and motivational expert who works to address suicidal or depressive tendencies. He is an alumnus of IIT-IIM, and a noted data scientist specializing in Risk Management. He considers casteism or birth-based caste system as anti-Hindu and has a mission to replace it with Vedic system of merit.

ABOUT AGNIVEER

Agniveer was founded by Shri Sanjeev Newar, an IIT-IIM professional, data scientist, and Yogi to provide a solution-oriented, spiritually driven, and honest approach to improving the world - within and outside an individual. Agniveer specializes in practical applications of timeless wisdom of Vedas, Geeta, and Yoga to address the contemporary challenges of life. Thousands of testimonials of transformation - from people who were on verge of committing suicide, fighting depression, confused about life, directionless, unable to address social injustice around - attest the massive change it has been able to bring.

Agniveer takes credit in bringing several ignored, uncomfortable but critical issues to public attention. Agniveer is the leading advocate of social equality in India and pioneer of 'Dalit Yajna' initiative to break caste and gender barriers. Agniveer spearheaded the Muslim women rights campaign facing severe backlash from conservative and fanatic elements. Yet, it was successful in bringing details of disgusting practices like Halala, sex-slavery, polygamy, triple talaq and love jihad to limelight and evolving a consensus against them. Agniveer women helpline deals with such cases and has brought many smiles.

Agniveer also introduced the concept of unarmed combat workshops across sensitive parts of country to create a skilled team that is able to defend vulnerable from criminals. Agniveer is a prominent champion of de-radicalization and has brought innumerable youth to join the mainstream path. Agniveer's narrative on history has created a significant momentum to question the authenticity of populist history taught out of political compulsions.

Agniveer has published several books on social equality, caste equality, gender equality, human rights, the controversial religious rights and history, apart from books on self-help, Yoga, Hinduism, and life-hacks. Readers appreciate the books for straightforward, original, solution-oriented, practical, fresh, and mind-bending experience.

Everyone keen to live a meaningful life to fullest is welcome to join or support Agniveer mission.

To know more about us, kindly visit

Website: www.agniveer.com

Facebook: www.facebook.com/agniveeragni

Youtube: www.youtube.com/agniveer

Twitter: www.twitter.com/agniveer

To join us to be part of Agniveer, please fill our membership form:

www.agniveer.com/membership-form/

To contribute to Agniveer, kindly make payment through

Payment page: www.agniveer.com/pay

Paypal: give@agniveer.com

To purchase other books from Agniveer, please visit:

www.agniveer.com/books

AGNIVEER

SERVING NATION | PROTECTING DHARMA