

Fourteen

112

Obstacles and Objections to Sai worship

The obstacles to Sai worship that have existed from the very beginning of Sai's rise to public notice and which continue up to now are numerous. Only some have been mentioned till now on account of the great and prominent part those obstacles played in the initial stages of the Sai movement. We shall notice, however, some more obstacles to Sai worship. Obstacles spring not merely from those who are against religion and who care nothing for saints or god, but also from those who are religious and professedly religious too and exulting in their orthodoxy as the special form in which God has to be approached and religion exercised. Orthodoxy in all religions played a great part in the resistance to the Sai movement. The Gita declares that all greatness is from God¹⁶⁹ and its worship is the worship of God¹⁷⁰, opposition to Sai worship is greatly toned down among Hindus in this century. Persons who have fixed ideas, a sort of straight jacket for religion, and who assume that everyone must bend to their views, or be considered irreligious is the best description we can give of Ultra orthodoxy. These look askance at anything new which they have not understood. In the case of Sai Baba, he was very little understood in his life time, and even now, after so much trouble has been taken to unearth all the experiences of many devotees, and to arrange them and see what light they throw upon Baba, his ideas, his methods, and the plan he had, still we are left in considerable doubt about Baba on many an important matter. No wonder orthodox people with self-assurance as to the correctness of their modes and as to their being in high favour with God, on account of their religious orthodoxy and proud of the position given to them in society, fail to understand Baba or his methods and work. Of course it is not all orthodox people that object to Sai. If Baba turned water into oil, several of these orthodox would not get convinced thereby, but explain it away as a piece of magic worked with the help of some inferior power and for some worthless purpose. Even Syama alias Madhav Rao thought so at first. They would not take the trouble of calmly studying all the facts and arriving at a conclusion as to how that particular *chamatkar* came to be exhibited, what Baba's motive was, and how Baba intended that the *chamatkar* should operate.

Baba was really anxious to humble the two *vanis* who uttered lies and said that they had no oil when they had it, and to make them realise that God has various ways of helping *bhaktas* like Baba, when people like the *vanis* should refuse their help. Baba used that occasion for teaching very good lessons to the offending *vanis* and perhaps incidentally realised that the effect upon large portions of the masses would be to make them no longer deal with him as a negligible *fakir* but as a person who enjoyed at least some of God's powers, if not all, and who is really a Godman. The very highly orthodox, however, would not draw these conclusions. They kept up their attitude and would not take any notice of Baba and his work. The immediate result of the *chamatkar*, namely, worship of Baba in the Mosque by some unsophisticated villagers, would and did stiffen the backs of several of the orthodox and make them abhor its result, a Mohammadan worshipped by Hindus in a Mosque. To treat that as a good act of religion was something unthinkable for them. They could only condemn this as being a great evil a doubly bad affair and the *chamatkar* that produced this as a still greater evil. This explains how the railway personnel at Kopergaon and various people like the Valambi Station Master and others continued lecturing to people that Baba was a dangerous and immoral man or at least not a person for any good work of God. Many of the orthodox also have a sort of group feeling and they hold on their ideas decade after decade uninfluenced by the progress of events. Unfortunately, in the case of Sai Baba, for a long time, there was no history or explanation of Baba like the present work, nothing that could enlighten even a fairly calm and impartial member of the orthodox group or help him to study Baba and arrive at correct conclusions. No wonder that Sai Baba was misunderstood by many in the regions around Shirdi and in Maharashtra. Even now a number of the orthodox in the various States, to which the Sai movement has spread, continue to be moving and thinking on the old lines. All sorts of flippant and frivolous objections to some act of Baba or some fact about Baba which comes to their notice are raised and considered important by them. Even in January 1955 some one ran up to the All India Sai Mandir and said that an objection was raised as to the inconsistency in Baba. He asked, 'If Baba was Venkusa's *sishya*

and Venkusa was a worshipper of Tirupati Venkatesa, then Sai Baba ought to have worn *Namam*', that is, three perpendicular marks on his forehead, whereas several pictures of Baba exhibit him with three horizontal lines on his forehead. This person who raised this objection was a very well meaning and educated man. Yet the objection struck him as a forcible one. Then he had to be shown that.

Baba did not wear any mark at all on his forehead,

The pictures that the objector had seen were pictures drawn by worshippers of the present day who knew only that Sri Babu Rao Chandorkar and some other worshippers had put on Baba horizontal lines on the forehead to which Baba finally yielded assent and nothing more.

The whole thing was a mere external observance of very little significance.

That if Das Ganu and similar Vittal worshippers could put on Baba's head vertical marks, Baba would have raised no objection either. Baba's explanation for his submission to these forehead marks was, 'What am I to do? This worshipper believes that I am his *Guru*, Kaka Dhopeswar, and puts marks on me which he put on his *Guru*.' Therefore, it must be understood that Baba was neither *Saivaite* nor *Vaishanavaite*, either in his views or in his external observances as to painting his forehead, and that he took no interest at all in all this.

Baba was perfectly neutral and submitted to the peculiar idiosyncracies of his worshippers in order to avoid offending them. Left to himself Baba would have no mark on his forehead. Baba did not believe at all that there is a separate Siva and a separate Vishnu as Gods. To him, there was only one God, and that might be called Siva or Vishnu, Vittal, Rama or Datta, Khuda or Khandoba or Devi or Allah or Hari with equal justification, for a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. God is only one and not many. To him, God was to be pleased by the right loving approach from the heart, while the external marks and observances or names might be varied and be either indifferent or worthless. Another objection raised by a Hindu at Madras was that Sai Baba had no right to allow the performance of his worship by Hindus or for that matter by anybody.

This objection was raised also by a European Missionary at Rahata to whom the worship of Baba was a mortal sin. This worship shows that he puts himself on a level with God, so said that missionary. The missionary's objection was stated with reference to another Baba but that objection applies equally to Sai Baba or anybody else who is being worshipped. The orthodox objection is also the same that Sai Baba, being a man, ought not to be worshipped, and allowing himself to be worshipped shows that he is unfit to be respected even. It would take a very long time to convince each of these objectors and show how Baba's worship was first objected to by himself and finally acquiesced in by him in the interest of the vast masses and of the nation and of humanity and that his worship is the *Guru* worship ordained by the *sastras*. In spite of all our arguments, such critics would still continue unconvinced, because their heart is not convinced. A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still. Therefore, wise Sai *bhaktas* do not wish to waste their time in trying to convince such hopeless opponents. But here we may point out the answer to such criticism. Sai Baba's agreeing to his worship, as has been stated already, was not because he wanted plantains, coconuts, edibles, camphor, *stotras* and all the rest. It was justifiable even according to Hindu scriptures and was productive of various benefits, individual, national and international. It has the remarkable support of every sacred book of authority amongst Hindus whether *Saivaite*, or *Vaishanavaite*. The *Acharya* or *Guru* is in every Hindu community to be worshipped with the same reverence as God¹⁷¹. It is only in that case the fullest benefit of divine influence can reach the *bhakta*, through the *Acharya*¹⁷². A powerful and pure *Vairagi* like Sai Baba gains nothing by anything done at the worship. Baba could command all wealth and all conveniences by his wonderful powers, but he did not care for any of these. It is not for these petty things that *Acharyas* like Sai Baba agree to be worshipped. They agree to be worshipped to carry out the divine plan that the vast masses of pious people should approach God through a Godman, and derive all the benefits which they wish to attain, temporal and spiritual alike. Such answers do not easily convince our orthodox friends. They continue to contend that the existing gods and institutions provide sufficient scope for one's religious

inclinations, and that the addition of an extra god called Sai Baba is unnecessary and wrong. In the first place, it must be remembered that Sai Baba is not an additional god. If you have reverence for him and treat him as God, he is God, and there is only one God. If, however, any one is accustomed to think always in terms of polytheism and wants additional gods, one after another, he is at liberty to manufacture out of Sai Baba an additional God if that suits his need. But really each person that is worshipped is not an additional God. The objection that there are 33 crores of gods and that there is no need to add one more to that very large number fails because the number of persons worshipped according to the Upanishads and *Sastras* is not 33 crores but more. Every *Acharya* is a *Deva*, just like every *Pathi*, husband and parent to the person concerned, and so if we count the number of *Acharyas*, fathers, mothers, husbands and who are worshipped or who can be worshipped, it will run into many hundreds of crores. This is a patently frivolous objection, because we are not concerned with the number of gods. No earnest man is bothered, when he is going on with his *puja* or worship of his own gods in his home or temple, about the existence of other gods whom others are worshipping elsewhere or their number. Why should not others go on worshipping their own forms of God? What harm does that do to any one? The objections are so patently frivolous to one who has real *bhakti* in Sai that we need not dilate on the subject. We may stop with this, that is, that there is no end of frivolous objections that can be raised. There is a saying in one of the southern languages that if you do not like a person, say a wife, any touch of that person's hand or leg or anything else is an offence. So, we may dismiss this objection to Sai Baba worship on the ground of adding to the number of gods worshipped in the country as due to prejudice and not worthy of further attention.

Another obstacle that arose to Sai worship was from the conservative set, who consider it wrong for Sai Baba's devotees to ignore what they insist on as the essentials of religion, for instance, the putting on of marks and the observance of ceremonies. It is not true to say that Baba discouraged the orthodox people from following the use of these marks or the performance of ceremonies, where the usage still lingers. He distinctly encouraged the

performance of the post funeral ceremonies, in the case of several of his *bhaktas*, for instance, of S.B. Nachne, S.B. Dhumal, and Upasani Baba. In fact when people were beginning to doubt whether there was any use in performing post funeral ceremonies for fear that they might never reach the departed or prove of any use, the fact that Baba rendered help in the above cases and assured all of post-mortem life has made some of the loving *bhaktas* follow the usual postmortem ceremonies with greater faith. Baba knew that the subtle body or *Sukshma sarira* survives the *sthula* gross and that certain benefits could be derived and would be derived by the recently departed soul by the observance of these ceremonies. Therefore, he never objected to these ceremonies. He, however, had the remarkable power of guiding and directing the departed souls at the moment of death and thereafter, and his advice and action in the matter are of special importance to Sai *Bhaktas*. Baba told S.B. Dhumal to perform the *Masik sraadha* ceremony for his wife at Shirdi and added that he would see that her soul was benefited. It is clear that Baba attached some meaning and value to these ceremonies. But the main interest in the case of departed people is not merely the feeding of the hungry *Sukshma* or *Linga sarira*, astral body. The main interest is the help one can give it to reach God, which is the goal of the above mentioned states or our present life. On this matter Baba said If a devotee should die even a thousand miles away, I draw the spirit to myself and see that it is helped. About Upasani's third wife he said to the greatly agitated Kasinath Upasani Maharaj that her soul had come to him. As Baba is identified with God, the statement can only mean that the departed soul had reached God. Such a solace is a very valuable solace and Baba gave it to several people, not only to Sri Upasani Maharaj known as Upasani Baba but also to M.B. Rege who lost his child. This matter is dealt with later on in another chapter. At present we shall only say that the objection that Baba interfered with the customary and orthodox ceremonies for the living or the dead is not true and sound. Baba allowed everyone to carry on whatever he considered proper unless there was any direct harm in allowing it. However objections are not always well thought out and based on reason. It is the conservative feeling that all is well with the objectors;

that they are safe with God and with men, that is at the root of the objections. If some one starts something outside the accustomed circle and groove of ideas, several at once condemn it as being totally wrong, for to them, only their ideas and their practice are right. When we realise that such is the nature of orthodox and other objections, we can see how orthodoxy and similar criticism failed to stem the torrent of the Sai movement. That movement is based upon very sound principles of religion, morality, philosophy and the fact that Sai Baba is a God realiser of the highest level working to benefit humanity itself, that he was a *Parama Bhagavata*, a *Parama Jnani*, and a perfect master of all *yoga*, whether understood from the Sufi or Hindu or Muslim stand point. Throughout his life he carried on a very noble mission and acted mostly unperceived as the *Guru* and protector of many souls, though expressly and avowedly acting as *Guru* to some. The basis of Baba's dealing as *Guru* with such *sishtyas* has to be explained and understood, and that is why a number of chapters in this book have been devoted to the headings of *Guru Worship*, *Qualifications of Gurus and Sishyas*, their relations, number of *Gurus*, before a detail account of the *sishtyas* is given. For Baba has acted for many decades as the *Guru* and had plenty of instances which are covered by what has been said in these chapters. A small percentage of his earlier *sishtyas* were orthodox to some extent. The extreme opposition by the orthodox to such Sai worship would naturally fall blunted and made ineffective where the worship of and adherence to Baba was by such learned and eminent persons like Narayan Govind Chandorkar, Deputy Collector, B.V. Dev, *Mamlatdar* and so many others, all at the head of orthodox circles. As time went on, the number of orthodox men in eminent positions joining the Sai movement and treating him as their great Divine *Guru* increased, and that is what is going on even now in the twentieth century. It is clear that it was Baba's intention to overcome orthodox objections by mere lapse of time, allowing the Sai worship by its intrinsic merit to extend and overflow to all parts in India and thus make the orthodox realise that the great oceanic movement has vast force, Divine force, behind it. Even one of a very dull imagination would be forced to see that the movement which has covered the whole country and in so short a

time, say within the past 20 years, must be Divine as explained by Lord Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita.

Yadyad vibhutimat satvam

Srimat Urjitameva Va

Tattat eva avagachcha tvam

Mama Tejo Amsa Sambhavam.

this means, Whatever has abundance of splendour or has all prosperity, or strength, know that as a manifestation of a small fraction of Myself. So, says Lord Krishna. The essence of the tenth chapter of the Gita is to point out that whatever is powerful and splendid in every class or genius in existence is a manifestation of God, like the lion amongst the animals and the ocean amongst the waters. Thus, the slowly thinking and slowly working mind of even the torpid ultraorthodox objectors at last comes to realise that this movement is of God and cannot be resisted, and that the best thing one can do is to make the best of it, for Sai *Bhakti* offers excellent chance of individual benefits to all and sundry, provided they summon up some faith and act upon the same.

Truth is one and falsehoods are many. The sorts of objections that are raised from time to time to Sai worship or that have been or can be raised are so varied that it is not possible to give an exhaustive list of them, nor is it worthwhile. All these have been washed away by the tide of the Sai movement and more of them are now being washed away. When the flimsiness of these objections is realised, the fact that the objections are so flimsy adds to the strength of the Sai movement. Objections to the Sai movement have been raised in some quarters with reference to *Sastraic* texts such as that *Brahmins Srotria* are the highest class and others are lower and that *Brahmins* should not worship persons of the lower class or adopt a *Guru* from the lower class. This raises again the old vexed question about caste and class which luckily in the present state of Independent India is dying out. There is increasing recognition even from political or social standpoints that class and caste fetters are out of date, that the formerly accepted standards of class and caste are not being kept up by everyone coming under the group name, and that there is no justification for the limitations and

disqualifications imposed on members of the several classes. Above all this objection begs the question as to caste. As has been discussed amply elsewhere, if there is any caste still surviving. Baba's caste cannot be peremptorily fixed as being of this or that caste. Baba is to be treated as a *Brahmin* according to the definition given of that word in various scriptures¹⁷³. For instance, it has been said that he who has got intense *bhakti* to God is a *Brahmin*. Baba was the embodiment of God devotion, God love, and was preeminently, therefore, a *Brahmin*. Again only realisers of *Brahman* should be called *Brahmins*. Under this heading Baba is a person about whom we can feel confident in asserting that he had realisation, that he identified his soul with that of God, Brahman, and as a corollary, was the *Antaryami* of so many creatures. He was ever remembering God and was for many decades immersed in his concentration on God, and this could not have but produced perfect *laya* and perfect absorption in God. Therefore, being merged in God, he must be treated as *Brahman* and therefore, as a *Brahmin* if one wants that class name. We have elsewhere pointed out the absurdity of enquiring into the caste status of a *Parama Jnani* and *Parama Bhakta* like Sai Baba and quoted not merely Scripture but also latter day sayings of saints to the same effect¹⁷³. So the objection to Sai worship on the score of his caste position raised still by some of the orthodox section cannot be considered sound or worthy of further attention.

The objection to Sai worship did not come always from the orthodox sections. It came mostly from the inertia of human nature. People do not wish to move out of ruts into which they have fallen. It is so unpleasant to be called upon to realise new situations. The old lines of demarcation have all been washed away and new lines are forming. But still there are several Rip Van Winkles who have not awakened themselves to the fact that the world has marched on since they last took note of it. *Sai Bhakti* is now a fact of very great religious importance to millions of souls in this country and the Sai light is being carried across the waters to illuminate distant corners of the earth. There is no good blinking the fact that *Sai Bhakti* is a live force. It is operating and moulding the destinies of human beings here and elsewhere, and it will go on doing the same whether we

care to face the fact or not. It is much wiser to take note of facts as they are and to make the best use of the movement for individuals and society.

Sometimes persons turn up and ask, Do you ask us to give up our Rama worship and Siva worship? And if we have those worships, why should we worship Sai? Why should you go on promoting propaganda of Sai and not Siva or Rama? In the first place, one has to give up all hope of satisfying such curious objectors, because the objection arises not from reasoning of an earnest *sadhaka* anxious to advance his temporal and spiritual welfare by learning the truth but from the underlying mentality or emotional factors. It is these factors that have to be treated and not a reasoning to be met in these cases. Anyhow, the question having been put, the reader would expect an answer, and let us give the answer.

The first objection reminds us of the oft quoted illustration of a leading question, Have you left off beating your mother?

Answer yes or no. There is a vicious assumption which is patent in the question about the mother. It ought to be equally patent in the above mentioned objection. No respectable *Sai bhakta* ever objected, and this author certainly does not object nor did Sai ever object to people worshipping Siva or Rama. The truth is exactly the opposite. Sai Baba sent Appa Kulkarni to go and worship at a Siva temple Mohiniraj at Nivas before appearing to answer the charges framed against him by the Deputy Collector in a departmental enquiry. Similarly he sent Shama to worship the goddess Vani on a hill and Megha to worship Khandoba and all the other gods and he blamed Nana Chandorkar for avoiding *darsan* of Datta¹⁷⁴. Baba promoted faith in Gods¹⁷⁵. Sai allowed all legitimate worship, and his *bhaktas* do the same. So the question, Why do you object to Siva or Rama worship is just like the question about stopping the beating of the mother. As for the rider added to that question, namely, whether, when Siva and Rama are available for worship, they should be given up in favour of Sai worship, this again is a baseless assumption. Nobody asked, certainly Sai did not ask people to give up Siva or Rama worship and take Sai as a substitute. The question may be however referring to the fact that several hereditary worshippers of Siva or Rama

or other gods have taken ardently to Sai worship which at the final stage drowns all other worship in it. One ought to remember the *Na Hi Ninda Nyaya* which says; When one gets very fond of a particular form of worship, one is apt to ignore any other form of worship as a needless diversion of his thoughts and energies, which however involves no condemnation of other forms. On the other hand, Sai becomes finally the One God and so the same as the other forms of God, such as Siva, Rama and others. The *Vedas* thus praise God in One form only in each place. This is interpreted liberally by *Na hi Ninda Nyaya* but is called Henotheism¹⁷⁶, worship of one form at one time and another form at another by Max Muller. To that extent the above question may have a basis, and if an explanation is wanted for that fact, the explanation is furnished by such worshippers. They find enormous, unmistakable, and clear benefits accruing to them from the heartfelt Sai worship that they are going in for, and above all the presence of Sai as an ever present guardian with them, undertaking to safeguard and advance all their temporal and spiritual interests *yoga keshemam vahami aham* and carrying out the undertaking by most miraculous or remarkable means unavailable to such worshippers and undreamt of by them till they came to Sai Baba. This ought to be a sufficient answer. Unfortunately, the combatant mood still persists, and such objectors ask, Cannot the same benefit be derived by that worshipper by his proceeding with Rama or Siva worship instead of Sai worship? This is a hypothetical question which we must decline to answer. The worshipper also would be entitled to decline an answer. In the first place it is the feeling of the worshipper and this writer's feeling and that of many *bhaktas* that Sai is not different from God, that Siva, Rama, and other *Murthis* are not different from God as truly proclaimed by Baba himself¹⁷⁷. Therefore, when a person goes on sincerely and earnestly worshipping Sai with all his heart, feeling that he is worshipping god, the absence of one name or another, Siva or Rama, Allah, Khuda or Hari, in the particular process of worship is no objection to his persistence in his formula. Feeling alone counts. *Vishnu Sahasranama* gives a thousand names, and nobody should insist on every worshipper mentioning all these one thousand names. Some are satisfied with Rama alone, and say,

Sri Rama Rama Rameti Rame Rame Manorame
 Sahasranama tat tulyam
 Sri Rama Nama Varanane
 Raghupati Raghava Rajaram Patita pavana Sitaram
 Iswara Allah Tere nam Sabko Sanmati De Bhagavan
 Rama Rahim Krishna Karim Sabko Sanmati de
 Bhagavan.

This means, Siva tells Parvati, I repeat Sri Rama, Rama Rama, O dear one, I delight in that name Rama, That name Rama is equal to one thousand names, That is the unique power, charm and value of the Rama nama to a Rama worshipper. It might with perfect truth and sincerity be uttered about Sai also, by a zealous Sai devotee in which case it would run thus,

Sri Sai Sai Sayeeti Sayee Sayee Vadamyaham
 Sashranama Tat tulyam Sainama Varamparam,

which has the same meaning, as the above *mutatis mutandis*.

This quarrel over names is very difficult to escape, as there is the law of association of ideas and feelings working in the region of language. Mahatma Gandhi in trying to effect a *rapprochement* between Hindus and Muslims started the formula noted above in which Rahim and Ram are put together, and made his Hindu and Muslim followers repeat the formula or *mantra*. But some fastidious and over zealous adherents of each group unable to overcome the effects of the above law started up with an objection. One set said, Why not omit all reference to Allah and Rahim and content ourselves with our usual Hindu names. The other set, equally tenacious upholders of Muslim or Arabic names, said, Why not omit all reference to Hindu names and retain only the Arabic or Urdu names. To both Mahatma Gandhi had to point out that the object of the compounded formula was to familiarise the ear of impartial and co-operatively minded Hindus and Muslims with the admixture of both so that both may get into use with an inclination to hear both Muslim and Hindu names without loss of equanimity. This would become easier and inspiring by habit for future generations. That was the great object of Mahatma Gandhi's formula. Our

objectors belong to the separatist fold and object to anything that seems new. Baba's standpoint on this matter was similar to Mahatma's and was 'Live and let live', to unite persons in using common joint formulas as far as possible. Baba added to Gandhiji's plan of work. He secretly worked on the hearts of all. But if each wants to get on in his own way, the way that suits him best, by all means let him do so; he should not be hindered. This is the only way in which all sincere worshippers can be drawn together; and worship of Sai by sincere *bhaktas* is in no way different from worship of God. That is their feeling and according to correct metaphysics and philosophy, there is no difference between the worship of Sai treated as God and the worship of God under any other name or any other form. Both achieve the same ends.

Ye yatha Maam prapadyante Taams

tathaiya bhajami aham

that is, In whatever form you surrender to Me, in that form, I respond¹⁷⁸.

As regards the objection to any propaganda being done for Sai, the short answer is this. The honey and flavour in the flower do propaganda for the flower to attract bees and carry on the work of reproduction of the plant so that the earth may be replenished and more fruits may be had. This is Nature. Similarly many a propagandist, who is perfectly sincere, is unconsciously a propagandist. His devout *bhakti*, having achieved various rewards and the supreme reward of getting Baba for one's powerful guardian, the all round guardian, to look after every interest, is so grand, alluring and contagious. The *bhakta* after achieving so much of his welfare desires, in his heart wants to share it with others, and therefore communicates his experience to others so that others may also have the same benefit following the well known principle or aphorism *Ekah Svadu Na Bhunjita* which means When you get nice things to eat, do not monopolise it, but share it with others. In the case of the author of this book, that rule has been his life principle for numerous decades. Having discovered the great benefit of approaching Sai, he cannot resist the desire to communicate it to others so that all in the world may have the same benefit. Perhaps our readers have been told of Sri Ramanuja's conduct. His *Guru* gave him a sacred *mantra* for *moksha*

consisting in the utterance of the holy name of God, and added the advice to him that he should not reveal it to others but keep it a profound secret, in accordance with the Stanza which says,

Ayur Vittam Griha Chidram Mantram Oushada

Samagamah Dana Manapamanascha

Navagopya Manishibhih,

that is, The wise men conceal these nine things, including *mantra*, or *Gurum prakascayet dhiman Mantram Yatnena Gopayet*. The wise men conceal that *mantra* but proclaim the *Guru*. What did Sri Ramanuja do? He got on the top of a tower and shouted the *mantra*; that is, the holy name of God, and said, 'If I have committed a sin, let me go to hell. But if this *mantra*, being heard by others, will save them, let all these innumerable people who hear get saved thereby. I am willing to be damned to save all'. That is exactly the feeling of this writer and of many other propagandists of Baba. The word Propaganda has, unfortunately, gathered a bad odour in English.

During the war the term propaganda meant downright falsehood. In our case propaganda is downright truth without the least tinge or taint of falsehood in it. Warlike propaganda was selfish and false. The present Sai propaganda is unselfish and absolutely true.