

ourselves for a ceremony which shall last for many years, practice not unrighteousness, O Vena: this is not the eternal rule of duty. Thou art in every deed a Prajapati of Atri's race, and thou hast engaged to protect thy subjects.' The foolish Vena, ignorant of what was right, laughingly answered those great rishis who had so addressed him; 'Who but myself is the ordainer of duty or whom ought I to obey? Who on earth equals me in sacred knowledge, in prowess, in austere fervour, in truth? Ye who are deluded and senseless know not that I am the source of all beings and duties. Hesitate not to believe that I, if I willed, could burn up the earth, or deluge it with water, or close up heaven and earth.' When wing to his delusion and arrogance Vena could not be governed then the mighty rishis becoming incensed, seized the vigorous and struggling king, and nibbed his left thigh. From this thigh, so rubbed, was produced a black man, very short in stature, who, being alarmed, stood with joined hands. Seeing that he was agitated, Atri said to him 'Sit down' (Nishada). He became the founder of the race of the Nishadas, and also progenitor of the hivaras (fishermen), who sprang from the corruption of Vena. So two were produced from him the other inhabitants of the Vindhya range, the Tukharas and Tumburas, who are prone to lawlessness. Then the mighty sages, excited and incensed, again rubbed the right hand of Vena, as men do the Arani wood, and from it arose Pritha, respondent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni."

"The son of Vena (Pritha) then, with joined hands, addressed the great Rishis: 'A very slender understanding for perceiving the principles of duty has been given to me by nature; tell me truly how I must employ it. Doubt not that I shall perform whatever thy shall declare to me as my duty, and its object'. Then those gods and great rishis said to him: 'Whatever duty is enjoined perform it without hesitation, disregarding what though mayest like or dislike, looking on all creatures with an equal eye, putting far from thee lust, anger, cupidity and pride. Restrain by the strength of thine arm all those men who swerve from righteousness, having a constant regard to duty. And in thought, act, and word take upon thyself, and continually renew, the engagement to protect the terrestrial Brahman (Veda or Brahmins?)..... And promise that thou wilt exempt the Brahmans from punishment, and preserve society from the confusion of Castes'. The son of Vena then replied to the gods, headed by the rishis: 'The great Brahmans, the chief of men, shall be revered by me'. 'So be it,' rejoined those declares of the Veda. Sukra, the depository of divine knowledge, became his

Purohita; the Balakhilyas and Sarasvatyas his ministers; and the venerable Garga, the great rishi, his astrologer.

The second recorded conflict took place between the Brahmins and the Kshatriya king Pururavas. A brief reference to it occurs in the Adiparva of the Mahabharat.

Pururavas was born of Ha. Ruling over thirteen islands of the ocean, and surrounded by beings who were all superhuman, himself a man of great renown, Pururavas, intoxicated by his prowess engaged in a conflict with the Brahmins, and robbed them of their jewels, although they loudly remonstrated. Sanatkumara came from Brahma's heaven, and addressed to him an admonition, which however, he did not regard. Being then straightway cursed by the incensed rishis, he perished, this covetous monarch, who, through pride of power, had lost his understanding. This glorious being (virat), accompanied Urvashi, brought down for the performance of sacred rites the fires which existed in the heaven of the Gandharvas, properly distributed into three.

A third collision is reported to have occurred between the Brahmins and King Nahusha. The story is given in great details in the Udyogaparva of the Mahabharat. It is there recorded:

"After his slaughter of the demon Vrittra, Indra became alarmed at the idea of having taken the life of a Brahmin (for Vrittra was regarded as such), and hid himself in waters. In consequence of the disappearance of the king of gods, all affairs, celestial as well as terrestrial, fell into confusion. The rishis and Gods then applied to Nahusha to be their king. After at first excusing himself on the plea of want of power, Nahusha at length, in compliance with their solicitations, accepted the high function. Up to the period of his elevation he had led a virtuous life, but he now became addicted to amusement and sensual pleasure; and even aspired to the possession of Indrani, Indra's wife, whom he had happened to see. The queen resorted to the Angiras Vrihaspati, the preceptor of the Gods, who engaged to protect her. Nahusha was greatly incensed on hearing of this interference; but the Gods endeavoured to pacify him, and pointed out the immorality of appropriating another person's wife. Nahusha, however, would listen to no remonstrance, and insisted that in his adulterous designs he was not worse than Indra himself; "The renowned Ahalya, a rishi's wife, was formerly corrupted by Indra in her husband's lifetime; why was he not prevented by you? And many barbarous acts, and unrighteous deeds, and frauds were perpetrated of by old Indra; Why was he not prevented by you?" The Gods, urged by Nahusha, then went to bring Indrani; but Vrihaspati would not

give her up. At his recommendation, however, she solicited Nahusha for some delay, till she should ascertain what had become of her husband. This request was granted. The Gods next applied to Vishnu on behalf of Indra; and Vishnu promised that if Indra would sacrifice to him, he should be purged from his guilt, and recover his dominion, while Nahusha would be destroyed. Indra sacrificed accordingly; and the result is thus told; "Having divided the guilt of Brahmanicide among trees, rivers, mountains, the earth, women and the elements, Vasava (Indra), lord of the Gods, became freed from suffering and sin, and self governed." Nahusha was by this means, shaken from his place. But he must have speedily regained his position, as we are told that Indra was again ruined, and became invisible. Indrani now went in search of her husband; and by the help of Upasriti (the Goddess of night and revealer of secrets) discovered him existing in a very subtle form in the stem of a lotus growing in a lake situated in a continent within an ocean north of the Himalaya. She made known to him the wicked intention of Nahusha, and entreated him to exert his power, rescue her from danger, and resume his dominion. Indra declined any immediate interposition on the plea of Nahusha's superior strength; but suggested to his wife a device by which the usurper might be hurled from his position. She was recommended to say to Nahusha that "if he would visit her on a celestial vehicle borne by rishis, she would with pleasure submit herself to him". The question of the Gods accordingly went to Nahusha, by whom she was graciously received, and made this proposal: "I desire for thee, king of the Gods, a vehicle hitherto unknown, such as neither Vishnu, nor Rudra, nor the asuras, nor the rakshases employ. Let the eminent rishis, all united, bear thee, lord, in a car; this idea pleases me". Nahusha receives favourably this appeal to his vanity, and in the course of his reply thus gives utterance to his self congratulation: "He is a personage of no mean prowess who makes the *Munis* his bearers. I am a fervid devotee of great might, lord of the past, the future and the present. If I were angry the world would no longer stand; on me everything depends Wherefore, O Goddess I shall, without doubt, carry out what you propose. The seven rishis, and all the Brahman rishis, shall carry me. Behold beautiful Goddess, my majesty and my prosperity." The narrative goes on: "Accordingly this wicked being, irreligious, violent, intoxicated by the force of conceit, and arbitrary in his conduct, attached to his car the rishis, who submitted to his commands, and compelled them to bear him". Indrani then again resorts to Vrihaspati, who assures her that vengeance will soon overtake Nahusha for his presumption; and promises that he will himself perform a sacrifice with a view to the

destruction of the oppressor, and the discovery of Indra's lurking place. Agni is then sent to discover and bring Indra to Vrihaspati; and the latter, on Indra's arrival, informs him of all that had occurred during his absence. While Indra with Kuvera, Yama, Soma, and Varuna, was devising means for the destruction of Nahusha, the sage Agastya came up, congratulated Indra on the fall of his rival, and proceeded to relate how it had occurred: "Wearied with carrying the sinner Nahusha, the eminent divine rishis, and the spotless brahman-rishis asked that divine personage Nahusha (to solve) a difficulty: 'Dost thou, Vasava, most excellent of conquerors, regard as authoritative or not those Brahmana texts which are recited at the immolation of king?' 'No', replied Nahusha, whose understanding was enveloped in darkness. The rishis rejoined: 'Engaged in unrighteousness, thou attainest not unto righteousness: these texts, which were formerly uttered by great rishis, are regarded by us as authoritative.' The (proceeds Agastya) disputing with the munis, impelled by unrighteousness, touched me on the head with his foot. In consequence of this the king's glory was smitten and his prosperity departed. When he had instantly become agitated and oppressed with fear, I said to him, 'Since thou, O fool, condemnest that sacred text, always held in honour, which has been composed by former sages, and employed by Brahman-rishis, and hast touched my head with thy foot, and employest the Brahma—like and irresistible rishis as bearers to carry thee,—therefore, short of thy lustre and all thy merit exhausted, sink down, sinner, degraded from heaven to earth. For then thousand years thou shalt crawl in the form of a huge serpent. When that period is completed, thou shalt again ascend to heaven. 'So fell that wicked wretch from the sovereignty of the Gods."

Next there is a reference to the conflict between King Nimi and the Brahmins. The Vishnu Puran relates the story as follows:—

"Nimi had requested the Brahman-rishi Vasishtha to officiate at a sacrifice, which was to last a thousand years, Vasishtha in reply pleaded a pre-engagement to Indra for five hundred years, but promised to return at the end of that period. The king made no remark, and Vasishtha went away, supposing that he had assented to this arrangement. On his return, however, the priest discovered that Nimi had retained Gautama (who was equal with Vasishtha a Brahman-rishi) and others to perform the sacrifices; and being incensed at the neglect to give him notice of what was intended, he cursed the king, who was then asleep, to lose his corporeal form. When Nimi awoke and learnt that he had been cursed without any previous warning, he retorted, by uttering a similar curse on

Vasishtha, and then died. In consequence of this curse the vigour of Vasishtha, however, received from them another body when their seed had fallen from them at the sight of Urvashi. Nimi's body was emblamed. At the close of the sacrifice which he had begun, the Gods were willing, on the intercession of the priests, to restore him to life, but he declined the offer, and was placed by the deities, according to his desire, in the eyes of all living creatures. It is in consequence of this fact that they are always opening the shutting, (nimishas means "the twinkling of the eye")."

Manu mentions another conflict between the Brahmins and King Sumukha. But of this no details are available.

These are instances of conflict between the Brahmins and the Kshatriya Kings. From this it must not be supposed that the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas as two classes did not clash. That there were clashes between these two classes as distinguished from conflicts with kings is abundantly proved by material the historic value of which cannot be doubted. Reference may be made to three events.

First is the contest between two individuals Vishvamitra the Kshatriya and Vasishtha the Brahmin. The issue between the two was whether a Kshatriya can claim Brahmahood. The story is told in Ramayana and is as follows:-

"There was formerly, we are told, a king called Kusa, son of Prajapati, who had a son called Kushanabha, who was father of Gadhi, the father of Visvamitra. The latter ruled the earth for many thousand years. On one occasion, when he was making a circuit of the earth, he came to Vasishtha's hermitage, the pleasant abode of many saints, sages, and holy devotees, where, after at first declining he allowed himself to be hospitably entertained with his followers. Visvamitra, however, coveting the wondrous cow, which had supplied all the dainties of the feast, first of all asked that she should be given to him in exchange for a hundred thousand common cows, adding that "she was a gem, that gems were the property of the king, and that, therefore, the cow was his by right". On this price being refused the king advances immensely in his offers, but all without effect. He then proceeds—very ungratefully and tyrannically, it must be allowed—to have the cow removed by force, but she breaks away from his attendants, and rushes back to her master, complaining that he was deserting her. He replied that he was not deserting her, but that the king was much more powerful than he. She answers, "Men do not ascribe strength to a Kshatriya; the Brahmins are stronger. The Strength of Brahmins is divine, and superior to that of Kshatriya. Thy strength is immeasurable. Visvamitra, though of great vigour, is not

more powerful than thou. Thy energy is invincible. Commission me, who have been acquired by the Brahmanical power, and I will destroy the pride, and force, and attempt of this wicked prince". She accordingly by her bellowing creates hundreds of Pahlavas, who destroy the entire host of Visvamitra, but are slain by him in their turn. Sakas and Yavans, of great power and valour, and well armed, were then produced, who consumed the king's soldiers, but were routed by him. The cow then calls into existence by her bellowing, and from different parts of her body, other warriors of various tribes, who again destroyed Visvamitra's entire army, foot soldiers, elephants, horses, chariots, and all. "A hundred of the monarch's sons, armed with various weapons, then rushed in great fury on Vashistha, but were all reduced to ashes in a moment by the blast of that sage's mouth. Vishvamitra, being thus utterly vanquished and humbled, appointed one of his sons to be regent, and travelled to the Himalaya, where he betook himself to austerities, and thereby obtained a vision of Mahadeva, who at his desire revealed to him the science of arms in all its branches, and gave him celestial weapons with which, elated and full of pride, he consumed the hermitage of Vashishtha, and put its inhabitants to flight. Vashishtha then threatens Vishvamitra and uplifts his Brahminical mace. Vishvamitra too, raises his fiery weapon and calls out to his adversary to stand. Vashishtha bids him to show his strength, and boasts that he will soon humble his pride. He asks: "What comparison is there between a Kshatriya's might, and the great might of a Brahman? Behold, thou contemptible Kshatriya, my divine Brahmanical power". The dreadful fiery weapon uplifted by the son of Gadhi was then quenched by the rod of the Brahman, as fire is by water. Many and various other celestial missiles, as the nooses of Brahma, Kala (time), and Varuna, the discus of Vishnu, and the trident Siva, were hurled by Vishvamitra at his antagonist, but the son of Brahma swallowed them up in his all-devouring mace. Finally, to the intense consternation of all the Gods, the warrior shot off the terrific weapon of Brahma (Brahmastra); but this was equally ineffectual against the Brahmanical sage. Vashishtha had now assumed a direful appearance: 'Jets of fire mingled with smoke darted from the pores of his body; the Brahminical mace blazed in his hand like a smokeless mundane conflagration, or a second sceptre of Yama". Being appeased, however, by the munis, who proclaimed his superiority to his rival, the sage stayed his vengeance; and Vishvamitra exclaimed with a groan: 'Shame on a Kshatriya's strength; the strength of a Brahman's might alone is strength; by the single Brahmanical mace all my weapons have been destroyed.' No

alternative now remains, to the humiliated monarch, but either to acquiesce in this helpless inferiority, or to work out his own elevation to the Brahmanical order. He embraces the latter alternative: "Having pondered well this defeat, I shall be take myself, with composed senses and mind, to strenuous austere fervour, which shall exalt me to the rank of a Brahman". Intensely vexed and mortified, groaning and full of hatred against his enemy, he travelled with his queen to the south, and carried his resolution into effect; and we are first of all told that three sons Havishyanda, Madhusyanda, and Dridhanetra were born to him. At the end of a thousand years Brahma appeared, and announced that he had conquered the heaven of royal sages (Rajarshis); and, in consequence of his austere fervour, he was recognised as having attained that rank. Vishvamitra, however, was ashamed, grieved, and incensed at the offer of so very inadequate a reward, and exclaimed: "I have practised intense austerity, and the Gods and Rishis regard me only as a Rajarshi and not as a Brahman." There is conflict recorded between the same persons or different persons of the same name though on a somewhat different issue.

King Trisanku, one of Ikshvaku's descendants, had conceived the design of celebrating a sacrifice by virtue of which he should ascent bodily to heaven. As Vashistha, on being summoned, declared that the thing was impossible (*asakyam*), Trisanku travelled to the south, where the sage's hundred sons were engaged in austerities, and applied to them to do what their father had declined. Though he addressed them with the greatest reverence and humility, and added that "the Ikshvaku regarded their family—priests as their highest resource in difficulties, and that, after their father, he himself looked to them as his tutelary deities" he received from the haughty priests the following rebuke for his presumption: "*Asakyam*" "Fool, thou hast been refused by thy truth speaking preceptor. How is it that, disregarding his authority, thou hast resorted to another school (*sakha*). The family priest is the highest oracle of all the Ikshvakus; and the command of that veracious personages cannot be transgressed. Vashishtha, the divine Rishi, has declared that 'the thing cannot be'; and how can we undertake thy sacrifice? Thou art foolish king; return to thy capital. The divine (Vashishtha) is competent to act as priest of the three worlds; how can we shew him disrespect?" Trisanku then gave them to understand, that as his preceptor and "his preceptor's sons had declined compliance with his requests, he should think of some other expedient". In consequence of his venturing to express this presumptuous intention, they condemned him by their imprecation to become a Chandala. As this curse soon took effect, and the unhappy

king's form was changed into that of a degraded outcast, he resorted to Vishvamitra (who, as we have seen, was also dwelling at this period in the south), enlarging on his own virtues and piety, and bewailing his fate. Vishvamitra commiserated his condition, and promised to sacrifice on his behalf, and exalt him to heaven in the same Chandala form to which he had been condemned by his preceptor's curse. "Heaven is now as good as in thy possession, since thou hast resorted to the son of Kusika". He then directed that preparations should be made for the sacrifice, and that all the Rishis, including the family of Vashishtha should be invited to the ceremony. The disciples of Vishvamitra, who had conveyed his message, reported the result on their return in these words: "Having heard your message, all the Brahmans are assembling in all the countries, and have arrived, excepting Mahodaya (Vashishtha)? Hear what dreadful words those hundred Vashishthas, their voices quivering with rage, have uttered: "How can the Gods and Rishis consume the oblation at the sacrifice of that man, especially if he be a Chandala, for whom a Kshatriya is officiating priest? How can illustrious Brahmans ascend to heaven after eating the food of a Chandala, and being entertained by Vishvamitra?" These ruthless words all Vashishthas, together with Mahodaya, uttered, their eyes inflamed with anger. Vishvamitra, who was greatly incensed on receiving this, message by a curse doomed the sons of Vashishtha to be reduced to ashes, and reborn as degraded outcasts (mritapah) for seven hundred births, and Mahodaya to become a Nishada. Knowing that this curse had taken effect, Vishvamitra then after eulogizing Trisanku, proposed to the assembled Rishis that the sacrifice should be celebrated. To this they assented, being actuated by fear of the terrible sage's wrath. Vishvamitra himself officiated at the sacrifices as yajakas; and the other Rishis as priests (Ritvijah) (with other functions) performed all the ceremonies. Vishvamitra next invited the gods to partake of the oblations; "When, however, the deities did not come to receive their portions, Vishvamitra became full of wrath, and raising aloft the sacrificial ladle, thus addressed Trisanku: 'Behold, O monarch, the power of austere fervour acquired by my own efforts. I myself, by my own energy, will conduct thee to heaven. Ascend to that celestial region which is so arduous to attain in an earthly body. I have surely earned SOME reward of my austerity'." Trisanku ascended instantly to heaven in the sight of Munis. Indra, however, ordered him to be gone, as a person who, having incurred the curse of his spiritual preceptors, was unfit for the abode of the celestials:—and to fall down headlong to earth. He accordingly began to descend, invoking loudly, as he fell, the help of

his spiritual patron. Vishvamitra, greatly incensed, called out to him to stop: "Then by the power of his divine knowledge and austere fervour created, like another Prajapati, other Seven Rishis (a constellation so called) in the southern part of the sky. Having proceeded to this quarter of the heavens, the renowned sage, in the midst of the Rishis, formed another garland of stars, being overcome with fury. Exclaiming, 'I will create another Indra, or the world shall have no Indra at all', he began, in his rage, to call Gods also into being". The Rishis, Gods, (Suras), and Asuras now became seriously alarmed and said to Vishvamitra, in a conciliatory tone, that Trisanku, "as he had been cursed by his preceptors, should not be admitted bodily into heaven, until he had undergone some lustration". The sage replied that he had given a promise to Trisanku, and appealed to the Gods to permit his proteage to remain bodily in heaven, and the newly created stars to retain their places in perpetuity. The Gods agreed that "these numerous stars should remain, but beyond the Sun's path, and that Trisanku, like an immortal, with his head downwards should shine among them, and be followed by them", adding "that his object would be thus attained, and his renown secured, and he would be like a dweller in heaven". Thus was this great dispute adjusted by a compromise, which Vishvamitra accepted.¹

When all the Gods and rishis had departed at the conclusion of the sacrifice, Vishvamitra said to his attendant devotees; "This has been a great interruption (to our austerities) which has occurred in the southern region: we must proceed in another direction to continue our penances". He accordingly went to a forest in the west, and began his austerities anew. Here the narrative is again interrupted by the introduction of another story, that of king Ambarisha, king of Ayodhya, who was, according to the Ramayana, the twenty eighth in descent from Ikshvaku, and the twenty second from Trisanku. Vishvamitra is nevertheless represented as flourishing contemporaneously with both of these princes. The story relates that Ambarisha was engaged in performing a sacrifice, when Indra carried away the victim. The priest said that this ill-omened event had occurred owing to the king's bad administration; and would call for a great expiation, unless a human victim could be produced. After a long search the royal rishi (Ambarisha) came upon the Brahmin-rishi Richika, a descendant of Bhrigu, and asked him to sell one of his sons for a victim, at the price of a hundred thousand cows. Richika answered that he would not sell his eldest son; and his wife added that

¹ This is the story of Trisanku. It will have been observed, it differs materially from the one quoted above from Harivansa; but brings out more distinctly the character of the conflict between Vashishtha and Vishvamitra.

she would not sell the youngest: "Eldest sons," she observed, "being generally the favourites of their fathers, and youngest sons of their mothers". The second son, Sunassepa then said that in that case he regarded himself as the one who was to be sold, and desired the king to remove him. The hundred thousand cows, with ten millions of gold pieces and heaps of jewels, were paid down, and Sunassepa was carried away. As they were passing through Puskara, Sunassepa beheld his maternal uncle Vishvamitra who was engaged in austerities there with other rishis, threw himself into his arms, and implored his assistance, urging his orphan, friendless, and helpless state, as claims on the sage's benevolence. Vishvamitra soothed him; and pressed his own sons to offer themselves as victims in the room of Sunassepa. This proposition met with no favour from Madhushanda and the other sons of the royal hermit, who answered with haughtiness and derision: "How is it that thou sacrificest thine own sons, and seekest to rescue those of others? We look upon this as wrong, and like the eating of one's own flesh". The sage was exceedingly wrath at this disregard of his injunction, and doomed his sons to be born in the most degraded classes, like Vashishtha's sons, and to eat dog's flesh, for a thousand years. He then said to Sunassepa: "When thou art bound with hallowed cords, decked with a red garland, and anointed with unguents, and fastened to the sacrificial post of Vishnu, then address thyself to Agni, and sing these two divine verses (gathas), at the sacrifice of Ambarisha; then shall thou attain the fulfilment of thy desire". Being furnished with the two gathas, Sunassepa proposed at once to King Ambarisha that they should set out for their destination. Then bound at the stake to be immolated, dressed in a red garment, "he celebrated the two Gods, Indra and his younger brother (Vishnu), with the excellent verses. The thousand-eyed (Indra) was pleased with the sacred hymn, and bestowed long life on Sunassepa". King Ambarisha also received great benefits from this sacrifice. Vishvamitra meanwhile proceeded with his austerities, which he prolonged for a thousand years, "At the end of this time the Gods came to allot his reward; and Brahma announced that he had attained the rank of a rishi, thus apparently advancing an additional step. Dissatisfied, as it would seem, with this, the sage commenced his task of penance anew. After a length of time he beheld the nymph (Apsara) Menka, who had come to bathe in the lake of Pushkara. She flashed on his view, unequalled in her radiant beauty, like lightning in a cloud. He was smitten by her charms, invited her to be his companion in his hermitage, and for ten years remained a slave to her witchery, to the great prejudice of his austerities. At length he became ashamed of this ignoble subjection, and full of indignation at

what he believed to be a device of the Gods to disturb his devotion; and, dismissing the nymph with gentle accents, he departed for the northern mountains, where he practised severe austerities for a thousand years on the banks of the Kausiki river. The Gods became alarmed at the progress he was making, and decided that he should be dignified with the appellation of great rishi (Maharshi); and Brahma, giving effect to the general opinion of the deities, announced that he had conferred that rank upon him. Joining his hands and bowing his head, Vishvamitra replied that he should consider himself to have indeed completely subdued his senses, if the incomparable title of Brahmin-rishi were conferred upon him. Brahma informed him in answer, that he had not yet acquired the power of perfectly controlling his senses; but should make further efforts with that view. The sage then began to put himself through a yet more rigorous course of austerities, standing with his arms erect, without support, feeding on air, in summer exposed to five fires (i.e. one on each of four sides, and the sun overhead), in the rainy season remaining unsheltered from the wet, and in winter lying on a watery couch night and day. This he continued for a thousand years. At last Indra and the other deities became greatly distressed at the idea of the merit he was storing up, and the power which he was thereby acquiring; and the chief of the celestials desired the nymph Rambha to go and bewitch him by her blandishments. She expressed great reluctance to expose herself to the wrath of the formidable muni, but obeyed the repeated injunction of Indra, who promised that he and Kandarpa (the God of love) should stand by her, and assumed her most attractive aspect with the view of overcoming the sage's impassibility. He, however, suspected this design, and becoming greatly incensed, he doomed the nymph by a curse to be turned into stone and to continue in that state for a thousand years. The curse took effect, and Kandarpa and Indra sunk away. In this way, though he resisted the allurements of sensual love, he lost the whole fruit of his austerities by yielding to anger; and had to begin his work over again. He resolved to check his irresistibility, to remain silent, not even to breathe for hundreds of years; to dry up his body; and to fast and stop his breath till he had obtained the coveted character of a Brahmin. He then left the Himalaya and travelled to the east, where he underwent a dreadful exercise, unequalled in the whole history of austerities, maintaining silence, according to a vow, for a thousand years. At the end of this time he had attained to perfection, and although thwarted by many obstacles, he remained unmoved by anger. On the expiration of this course of austerity, he prepared some food to eat; which Indra, coming in the form of a Brahmin, begged

that he would give him. Vishvamitra did so, and though he had 'done left for himself, and was obliged to remain fasting, he said nothing to the Brahmin, on account of his vow of silence. "As he continued to suspend his breath, smoke issued from his head, to the great consternation and distress of the three worlds." The Gods, rishis, etc., then addressed Brahma. "The great muni Vishvamitra has been allured and provoked in various ways, but still advances in his sanctity. If his wish is not conceded, he will destroy the three worlds by the force of his austerity. All the regions of the universe are confounded, no light anywhere shines; all the oceans are tossed, and the mountains crumble, the earth quakes, and the wind blows confusedly. We cannot, O Brahma, guarantee that mankind shall not become atheistic Before the great and glorious sage of fiery form resolves to destroy (everything) let him be propitiated." The Gods, headed by Brahma, then addressed Vishvamitra : 'Hail, Brahman rishi, we are gratified by the austerity; O Kausika, thou hast, through their intensity, attained to Brahmahood. I, O Brahman, associated with the Maruts, confers on thee long life. May every blessing attend thee; depart wherever thou wilt.' The sage, delighted, made his obeisance to the Gods, and said : 'If I have obtained Brahmahood, and long life, then let the mystic monosyllable (omkara) and the sacrificial formula (vashatkara) and the Vedas recognise me in that capacity. And let Vashishtha, the son of Brahmin, the most eminent of those who are skilled in the Kshatra-Veda, and the Brahma-Veda (the knowledge of the Kshatriya and the Brahmnical disciplines), address me similarly' Accordingly Vashishtha, being propitiated by the Gods, became reconciled to Vishvamitra, and recognised his claim for all the prerogatives of a Brahman rishi Vishvamitra, too having attained the Brahmanical rank, paid all honour to Vashishtha".

The second event has a reference to the slaughter of the Brahmins by the Kshatriyas. It is related in the Adiparva of the Mahabharat from which the following account is taken:—

"There was a King named Kritvirya, by whose liberality the Bhrigus, learned in the Vedas, who officiated as his priests, had been greatly enriched with corn and money. After he had gone to heaven, his descendants were in want of money, and came to beg for a supply from the Bhrigus, of whose wealth they were aware. Some of the latter hid their money under ground, others bestowed it on Brahmins, being afraid of the Kshatriyas, while others again gave these last what they wanted. It happened, however, that a Kshatriya, while digging the ground, discovered some money buried in the house of Bhrigu. The Kshatriyas then assembled and saw this treasure, and, being incensed,

slew in consequence all the Bhrigus, who they regarded with contempt, down to the children, in the womb. The widows, however, fled to the Himalaya mountains. One of them concealed her unborn child in her thigh. The Kshatriya, hearing of its existence from a Brahmani informant, sought to kill it; but it issued forth from its mother's thigh with lustre, and blinded the persecutors. After wandering about bewildered among the mountains for a time, they humbly supplicated the mother of the child for the restoration of their sight; but she referred them to her wonderful infant Aurva into whom the whole Veda, with its six Vedangas, had entered as the person who (in retaliation of the slaughter of his relatives) had robbed them of their eyesight, and who alone could restore it. They accordingly had recourse to him, and their eyesight was restored. Aurva, however, meditated the destruction of all living creatures, in revenge for the slaughter of the Bhrigus, and entered on a course of austerities which alarmed both Gods, Asuras, and men; but his progenitors (Pitris) themselves appeared, and sought to turn him from his purpose by saying that they had no desire to be revenged on the Kshatriyas: "It was not from weakness that the devout Bhrigus overlooked the massacre perpetrated by the murderous Kshatriyas. When we became distressed by old age, we ourselves desired to be slaughtered by them. The money which was buried by someone in a Bhrigu's house was placed there for the purpose of exciting hatred, by those who wished to provoke the Kshatriyas. For what had we, who were desiring heaven, to do with money?" They added that they hit upon this device because they did not wish to be guilty of suicide, and concluded by calling upon Aurva to restrain his wrath; and abstain from the sin he was meditating, "Destroy not the Kshatriyas. Oh, son, nor the seven worlds. Suppress thy kindled anger which nullifies the power of austere fervour." Aurva, however, replies that he cannot allow his threat to remain unexecuted. His anger, unless wreaked upon some other object, will, he says, consume himself. And he argues on grounds of justice, expediency, and duty, against the clemency which his progenitors recommend. He is, however, persuaded by the Pitris to throw the fire of his anger into the sea, where they say it will find exercise in assailing the watery element, and in this way his threat will be fulfilled."

The third event has reference to the slaughter of the Kshatriyas by the Brahmins. This story is told in several places in the Mahabharat.

The magnificent and mighty Kartavirya, possessing a thousand arms, was lord of this whole world, living in Mahishmati. This Haihaya of unquestioned valour ruled over the whole sea-girt earth, with its oceans and continents. He obtained boons from the Muni Dattatreya, a thousand arms whenever he should go into battle, power to make the conquest of the whole earth, a disposition to rule it with

justice and the promise of instruction from the virtuous in the event of his going astray. "Then ascending his chariot glorious as the resplendent Sun, he exclaimed in the intoxication of his prowess, 'Who is like me in fortitude, courage, fame, herosim, energy, and vigour?' At the end of this speech a bodyless voice in the sky addressed him: 'Thou knowest not, O fool, that a Brahman is better than Kshatriya. It is with the help of the Brahman that the Kshatriya rules his subjects.' Arjuna answers: 'If I am pleased, I can create, or, if displeased, annihilate living beings; and no Brahman is superior to me in act, thought or word. The first proposition is that the Brahmins are superior; the second that the Kshatriyas are superior; both of these thou hast stated with their grounds, but there is a difference between them (in point of force). The Brahmins are dependent on the Kshatriyas and not the Kshatriyas on the Brahmins, who wait upon them, and only make the Vedas a pretence. Justice, the protection of the people, has its seat in the Kshatriyas. From them the Brahmins derive their livelihood; how then can the latter be superior? I always keep in subjection myself those Brahmins, the chief of all beings, who subsist on alms and who have a high opinion of themselves. For truth was spoken by that female the Gayatri in the sky. I shall subdue all those unruly Brahmins clad in hides. No one in the three worlds, god or man, can hurl me from my royal authority; therefore I am superior to any Brahman. Now shall I turn the world in which Brahmins have the upper hand into a place where Kshatriyas shall have the upper hand; for no one dares to encounter my force in battle.' Hearing this speech of Arjun, the female roving in the night became alarmed. Then Vayu hovering in the air, said to Arjuna: 'Abandon this sinful disposition, and do obeisance to the Brahmins. If thou shall do them wrong, thy kingdom shall be convulsed. They will subdue thee; those powerful men will humble thee, and expel thee from thy country.' The King asks him, 'Who art thou?' Vayu replies, 'I am Vayu, the messenger of the Gods, and tell thee what is for thy benefit.' Arjuna rejoins, 'Oh, thou displayest today a great warmth of devotion to the Brahmins. But say that a Brahman is like (any other) earth-born creature.'

This king came into conflict with Parsuram the son of a Brahman sage Jamadagni. The history of this conflict is as follows:—

There lived a king of Kanyakubja, called Gadhi, who had a daughter named Satyavati. The marriage of this princess to the rishi Richika, and the birth of Jamadagni, are then told in nearly the same way as above narrated. Jamadagni and Satyavati had five sons, the youngest of whom was the redoubtable Parasuram. By his father's command he

kills his mother (who, by the indulgence of impure desire, had fallen from her previous sanctity), after the four elder sons had refused this matricidal offence, and had in consequence been deprived of reason by their father's curse. At Parasuram's desire, however, his mother is restored by his father to life, and his brothers to reason; and he himself is absolved from all the guilt of murder; and obtains the boon of invincibility and long life from his father. His history now begins to be connected with that of king Arjuna (or Kartavirya). The latter had come to Jamadagni's hermitage, and had been respectfully received by his wife; but he had requited this honour by carrying away by force the calf of the sage's sacrificial cow, and breaking down his lofty trees. On being informed of this violence, Parasurama was filled with indignation, attacked Arjuna, cut off his thousand arms, and slew him. Arjuna's sons, in return slew the peaceful sage Jamadagni, in the absence of Parasuram.

Rama, after performing, on his return, his father's funeral obsequies, vowed to destroy the whole Kshatriya race; and executed his threat by killing first Arjun's sons and their followers. Twenty one times did he sweep away all the Kshatriyas from the earth, and formed five lakes of blood in Samantpanchaka; in which he satiated the manes of the Bhrigus, and beheld face to face (his grandfather), Richika, who addressed himself to Rama. The latter gratified Indra by offering to him a grand sacrifice, and gave the earth to the officiating priests. He bestowed also a golden altar, ten fathoms long and nine high, on the mighty Kasyapa. This, by his permission, the Brahmins divided among themselves, deriving thence the name of Khandavavanas. Having given away the earth to Kasyapa, Parasuram himself dwells on the mountain Mahendra. Thus did enmity arise between him and Kshatriyas, and thus was the earth conquered by Parasuram of boundless might."

The Kshatriyas who were slain by Parasuram are described in the Dronaparvan of the Mahabharata as of various provinces, viz., Kasmiras, Daradas, Kuntis, Kshudrakas, Malavas, Angas, Vangas, Kalingas, Videhas, Tamraliptakas, Marttikavatas, Sivis and other Rajanyas.

The means by which the Kshatriya race was restored is also told as part of this story of annihilation of the Kshatriyas by the Brahmins. It is said:—

"Having one and twenty times swept away all the Kshatriyas from the earth, the son of Jamdagni engaged in austerities on Mahendra the most excellent of mountains. After he had cleared the world of Kshatriyas, their widows came to the Brahmins, praying for offspring. The religious Brahmins, free from any impulse of lust

cohabited at the proper seasons with these women, who in consequence became pregnant, and brought forth valiant Kshatriya boys and girls, to continue the Kshatriya stock. Thus was the Kshatriya race virtuously begotten by Brahmins on Kshatriya women, and became multiplied and long lived. Thence there arose four castes inferior to the Brahmins.”

No country has such a dismal record of class war as Hindustan. It was the proud boast of the Brahmin Parsuram that he exterminated the Kshatriyas twenty one times from the face of Hindustan and recreated them by Brahmins cohabiting with the widows of the Kshatriyas.

It must not be supposed that this Class War in India is a matter of ancient History. It has been present all along. Its existence was very much noticeable in Maharashtra during the Maratha Rule. It destroyed the Maratha Empire. It must not be supposed that these class Wars were like ordinary wars which are a momentary phenomena which come and go and which leave no permanent chasms to divide the peoples of the different nations. In India the class war is a permanent phenomenon which is silently but surely working its way. It is a grain in the life and it has become genius of the Hindus.

These facts it will not be denied are symptomatic in the sense they indicate health and character. Do they suggest that there is fraternity among Hindus? In the face of these facts I am sure it would be impossible to give an affirmative answer.

What is the explanation of this absence of fraternity among the Hindus? It is Hinduism and its philosophy that is responsible for it. The sentiment of fraternity as Mill said is natural but it is a plant which grows only where the soil is propitious and the conditions for its growth exist. The fundamental condition for the growth of the sentiment of fraternity is not preaching that we are children of God or the realization that one's life is dependent upon others. It is too rational to give rise to a sentiment. The condition for the growth of this sentiment of fraternity lies in sharing in the vital processes of life. It is sharing in the joys and sorrows of birth, death, marriage and food. Those who participate in these come to feel as brothers. Prof. Smith very rightly emphasizes the importance of sharing food as a prime factor in the creation of community feeling when he says;

“The sacrificial meal was an appropriate expression of the antique ideal of religious life, not merely because it was a social act and in which the God and his worshippers were conceived as partaking together, but because, as has already been said, the very

act of eating and drinking with a man was a symbol and a confirmation of fellowship and mutual social obligations. The one thing directly expressed in the sacrificial meal is that the God and his worshippers are commensals but every other point in their mutual relations is included in what this involves. Those who sit at meal together are united for all social effects; those who do not eat together are aliens to one another, without fellowship in religion and without reciprocal social duties”.¹

There is no sharing among Hindus of joys and sorrows involved in the vital facts of life. Everything is separate and exclusive. The Hindu is separate and exclusive all through his life. A foreigner coming to India will not find men crying Hindu Pani (water for Hindus) and Musalman Pani (water for Musalmans). He will find Brahmin Coffee Houses, Brahmin Eating Houses, where no non-Brahmin Hindus can go. He will find Brahmin Maternity Homes, Maratha Maternity Homes and Bhatia Maternity Homes although Brahmins, Marathas and Bhatias are all Hindus. If there is a birth at the house of a Brahmin, no non-Brahmin will be invited nor will he feel the desire to join. If there is marriage in the family of a Brahmin, no non-Brahmin will be invited nor will he feel the desire to join if a Brahmin dies, no non-Brahmin will be invited to join the funeral nor will he think it necessary to join in the procession. If there is a festivity in the house of a Brahmin, no non-Brahmin will be called and no non-Brahmin will feel any wrong about it. Joys and sorrows of one caste are not the joys and sorrows of another. One caste has no concern with other castes. Even charity has become caste bound. Among Hindus there is no public charity in the sense of its benefit being open to all. You have Brahmin Charity for Brahmins. Within that you have Chitpavan Brahmin Charity for Chitpavan Brahmins only. Deshastha Brahmin Charity for Deshastha Brahmins only, Karhada Brahmin Charity for Karahda Brahmins only. You have Sarasvat Brahmin Charity. Within that you have Kudaldeshkar Brahmin Charity. One could go on with such instances *ad nauseum* to show the exclusive character of Hindu Charity—rather Charity among Hindus—for there is no such thing as Hindu Charity. Thus one Hindu will share nothing with another Hindu while they are alive. But they will be separate and exclusive even when they are dead. Some Hindus bury their dead. Some Hindus burn their dead. But those bury will not share the same cemetery. Each will appropriate a part of the cemetery to bury its dead. Those who burn will not burn at the same burning place. If they do, each will have a separate funeral pan.

Is there any wonder that the sentiment of fraternity is foreign to the Hindus? With a complete refusal to share the joys and sorrows of life how can the sentiment of fraternity take roots?

¹ The Religion of the Semites—p.269.

But the question of all questions is why do the Hindus refuse to share the joys and sorrows of life? It needs no saying that he refuses to share because his religion tells him not to share them. This conclusion need cause no surprize. For what does Hinduism teach? It teaches not to interdine, not to inermarry, not to associate. These don'ts constitute the essence of its teaching. All the shameful facts I have referred to, to illustrate the separate and exclusive character of the Hindus is the direct outcome of this philosophy of Hindusim. The philosophy of Hinduism is a direct denial of fraternity.

This brief analysis of the Philosophy of Hinduism from the point of view of justice reveals in a glaring manner how Hinduism is inimical to equality, antagonistic to liberty and opposed to fraternity.

Fraternity and liberty are really derivative notions. The basic and fundamental conceptions are equality and respect for human personality. Fraternity and liberty take their roots in these two fundamental conceptions. Digging further down it may be said that equality is the original notion and respect for human personality is a reflexion of it. So that where equality is denied, everything else may be taken to be denied. In other words it was enough for me to have shown that there was no equality in Hinduism. But as Hinduism has not been examined so far in the manner I have done, I did not think it sufficient to leave it to implication that Hinduism was a denial of Fraternity and Liberty as well.

There is one final observation with which I wish to conclude this discussion with the profound observation of Lord Acton. The great Lord says that inequality has grown as a result of historical circumstances. It has never been adopted as a creed. It is obvious that in making this observation Lord Acton must have omitted to take note of Hinduism. For in Hinduism inequality is a religious doctrine adopted and conscientiously preached as a sacred dogma. It is an official creed and nobody is ashamed to profess it openly. Inequality for the Hindus is a divinely prescribed way of life as a religious doctrine and as a prescribed way of life, it has become incarnate in Hindu Society and is shaped and moulded by it in its thoughts and in its doings. Indeed inequality is the Soul of Hinduism.

Let me now turn to the examination of the philosophy of Hinduism from the point of view of Utility.

This examination of Hinduism from this aspect need not be long and detailed. For as Mill pointed out there is no necessary antagoism between justice and utility. In other words what is unjust to the individual cannot be useful to society. Apart from this we have before us the consequences of caste staring us in the face.

The ideal of caste was not mere ideal. The ideal was put into practice; was therefore something real. So that, in the matter of the Chaturvarna the Hindus have very faithfully followed the German Philosopher Nietzsche who said "Realize the ideal and idealize the real",

The value of the ideal must be tested by its results. If experience therefore must be the criterion then the ideal of Chaturvarna stands thrice condemned. Purely as a form of social organization it stands condemned. As a producer's organization it stands discredited. As an ideal scheme of distribution it has miserably failed. If it is an ideal form of organization how is it that the Hinduism has been unable to form a common front. If it is an ideal form of production, how is it that its technique never advanced beyond that of the primitive man. If it is an ideal form of distribution, how is it that it has produced appalling inequality of wealth, immense wealth side by side extreme poverty.

But I do not wish to dismiss the subject so summarily, for I know many Hindus who claim great social utility to the institution of caste and praise Manu for having been so wise and so thoughtful not only in devising it but in giving it a divine sanction.

This view of the caste is due to taking the separate aspects of caste separately. One must take them in conjunction. The resultant social utility or disutility of caste can be ascertained only by putting together the separate aspects of caste and judge them in their combination. Following this line of attacking the problem, the following conclusions follow :—

(1) Caste divides Labourers (2) Caste disassociates work from interest (3) Caste disconnects intelligence from manual labour (4) Caste devitalises by denying to him the right to cultivate vital interest and (5) Caste prevents mobilization. Caste System is not merely division of labour. ***IT IS ALSO A DIVISION OF LABOURERS.*** Civilized society undoubtedly needs division of labour. But in no civilized society is division of labour accompanied by this unnatural division of labourers into water-tight compartments. Caste System is not merely a division of labourers—which is quite different from division of labour—it is an hierarchy in which the divisions of labourers are graded one above the other. In no other country is the division of labour accompanied by this gradation of labourers. There is also a third point of criticism against this view of the Caste System. This division of labour is not spontaneous, it is not based on natural aptitudes. Social and individual efficiency requires us to develop the capacity of an individual to the point of competency to choose and to

make his own career. This principle is violated in the Caste System in so far as it involves an attempt to appoint tasks to individuals in advance, selected not on the basis of trained original capacities, but on that of the social status of the parents. Looked at from another point of view this stratification of occupations which is the result of the Caste System is positively pernicious. Industry is never static. It undergoes rapid and abrupt changes. With such changes an individual must be free to change his occupations. Without such freedom to adjust himself to changing circumstances it would be impossible for him to gain his livelihood. Now the Caste System will not allow Hindus to take occupations where they are wanted if they do not belong to them by heredity. If a Hindu is seen to starve rather than take to new occupations not assigned to his Caste, the reason is to be found in the Caste System. By not permitting readjustment of occupations, caste becomes a direct cause of much of the unemployment we see in the country. As a form of division of labour the Caste System suffers from another serious defect. The division of labour brought about by the Caste System is not a division based on choice. Individual sentiment, individual preference has no place in it. It is based on the dogma of predestination. Considerations of social efficiency would compel us to recognize that the greatest evil in the industrial system is not so much poverty and the suffering that it involves, as the fact that so many persons have callings which make no appeal to those who are engaged in them. Such callings constantly provoke one to aversion, ill will and the desire to evade. There are many occupations in India which on account of the fact that they are regarded as degraded by the Hindus provoke those who are engaged in it to aversion. There is a constant desire to evade and escape from such occupations which arises solely because of the blighting effect which they produce upon those who follow them owing to the slight and stigma cast upon them by the Hindu religion.

The second mischief it does is to dissociate intelligence from work and create contempt for labour. The theory of the Caste is that a Brahmin who is permitted to cultivate his intellect is not permitted to labour, indeed is taught to look down upon labour. While the Shudra who is required to labour is not permitted to cultivate his intelligence. The disastrous consequences of this have been well portrayed by Mr. R. C. Dutt.*

Caste devitalizes a man. It is a process of sterilization. Education, wealth, labour are all necessary for every individual if he is to reach a free and full manhood. Mere education without wealth and labour is

* *Quotation not given in the MS.*—Editors

barren. Wealth without education and wealth is brutal. Each is necessary to every one. They are necessary for the growth of a man.

That the Brahmin should cultivate knowledge, Kshatriya should bear arms, the Vaishya should trade and that the Shudra should serve is presented as a theory of mutual interdependence found in the family. It is asked why should the Shudra need trouble to acquire wealth when the three Varnas are there to support him; Why need the Shudra bother to take to education when the Brahmin to whom he can go when the occasion for reading or writing arises; Why need the Shudra worry to arm himself because there is the Kshatriya to protect him? The theory of Chaturvarnya understood in this sense may be said to look upon the Shudra as the ward and the three Varnas as his guardians. Thus interpreted it is a simple and alluring theory. Assuming this to be the correct view of the underlying conception of Chaturvarnya it seems to me that the system is neither fool-proof nor knave-proof. What is to happen if the Brahmins, Vaishyas and Kshatriyas fail to pursue knowledge, to engage in economic enterprises and to be efficient soldiers which are their respective functions? Contrarywise, suppose that they discharge their functions but flout their duty to the Shudra or to one another? What is to happen to the Shudra if the three classes refuse to support him on fair terms or combine to keep him down? Who is to safeguard the interests of the Shudra or for the matter of that of the Vaishya and Kshatriya when the person who is trying to take advantage of his ignorance is the Brahmin? Who is to defend the liberty of the Shudra or that of the Brahmin and the Vaishya, when the person who is robbing him of it is the Kshatriya? Inter-dependence of one class on another class is inevitable. Even dependence of one class upon another may sometimes become allowable. But why make one person depend upon another in the matter of his vital needs? Education every one must have. Means of defence every one must have. These are the paramount requirements of every man for his self-preservation. How can the fact that his neighbour is educated and armed, help a man who is uneducated and disarmed. The whole theory is absurd. These are the questions which the defenders of Chaturvarnya do not seem to be troubled about. But they are very pertinent questions. Assuming their conception of Chaturvarnya that the relationship between the different classes is that of ward and guardian is the real conception underlying Chaturvarnya, it must be admitted that it makes no provision to safeguard the interests of the ward from the misdeeds of the guardian. Whether the relationship of guardian and ward was the real underlying conception on which Chaturvarnya was based there is no doubt that in practice

the relation was that of master and servant. The three classes, Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas although not very happy in their mutual relationship managed to work by compromise. The Brahmin flattered the Kshatriya and both let the Vaishya live in order to be able to live upon him. But the three agreed to beat down the Shudra. He was not allowed to acquire wealth lest he should be independent of the three Varnas. He was prohibited from acquiring knowledge lest he should keep a steady vigil regarding his interests. He was prohibited from bearing arms lest he should have the means to rebel against their authority. That this is how the Shudras were treated by the Trayavarnikas is evidenced by the Laws of Manu. There is no code of laws more infamous regarding social rights than the Laws of Manu. Any instance from anywhere of social injustice must pale before it. Why have the mass of people tolerated the social evils to which they have been subjected? There have been social revolutions in other countries of the world. Why have there not been social revolutions in India is a question which has incessantly troubled me. There is only one answer which I can give and it is that the lower classes of Hindus have been completely disabled for direct action on account of this wretched system of Chaturvarnya. They could not bear arms and without arms they could not rebel. They were all ploughmen or rather condemned to be ploughmen and they were allowed to convert their ploughshares into swords. They had no bayonets and therefore everyone who chose ploughs did sit upon them. On account of the Chaturvarnya they could receive no education. They could not think out or know the way to their salvation. They were condemned to be lowly and not knowing the way of escape and not having the means of escape, they became reconciled to eternal servitudes which they accepted as their inescapable fate. It is true that even in Europe the strong has not shrunk from the exploitation, nay the spoliation of the weak but in Europe, the strong have never contrived to make the weak helpless against exploitation so shamelessly as was the case in India among the Hindus. Social war has been raging between the strong and the weak far more violently in Europe than it has ever been in India. Yet the weak in Europe has had in him freedom of military service his physical weapon, in suffrage his political weapon and in education his moral weapon. Three weapons for emancipation were never withheld by the strong from the weak in Europe. All these weapons were however denied to the masses in India by Chaturvarnya. There cannot be a more degrading system of social organization than Chaturvarnya. It is the system which deadens, paralyses and cripples the people from helpful activity. This is no exaggeration. History bears ample evidence.

There is only one period in Indian history which is a period of freedom, greatness and glory. That is the period of the Mourya Empire. At all other times the country suffered from defeat and darkness. But the Mourya period was a period when Chaturvarnya was completely annihilated, when the Shudras, who constituted the mass of the people came into their own and became the rulers of the country. The period of defeat and darkness is the period when Chaturvarnya flourished to the damnation of the greater part of the people of the country.

Caste prevents mobilization. Occasions arise when society must mobilize all its resources to one end in order to save itself from a catastrophe. To take a catastrophe like war, Society must mobilize all its resources for militarization. Every one must do war. Every one must be a soldier. Is this possible under the theory of caste? Obviously not. Indeed the destiny of a defeat which has been the lot of India throughout history is due to caste. Caste prevented general mobilization. Or the extent of mobilization was of a very limited character. Only the Kshatriyas were expected to fight. The rest the Brahmins and the Vaishyas were not armed and the Shudras who formed the large majority of the country were disarmed. The result was that once the small class of Kshatriyas were defeated by a foreign foe the whole country fell at his feet. It could offer no resistance. It was not capable of resistance. Indian wars have been mostly wars of single battles or single campaigns. This was due to the fact that once the Kshatriyas fell everything fell. Why? Simply because there was no general mobilization and the theory deeply imbedded in the psychology of the people.

If these conclusions are sound, how can a philosophy which dissects society in fragments, which dissociates work from interest, which disconnects intelligence from labour, which expropriates the rights of man to interests vital to life and which prevented society from mobilizing resources for common action in the hour of danger, be said to satisfy the test of Social Utility.

IV

The Philosophy of Hinduism therefore neither satisfies the test of social utility nor does it satisfy the test of individual justice.

The result of my analysis is so odd that it will surprise many. Astonished some may even say that if the conclusions are so odd then there must be something wrong in my analysis of the philosophy of Hinduism. I must meet this objection. To those who refuse to accept