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CONCLUSION

In the conclusion our aim is to emphasise the relevance of ancient Indian tradition found in the Panchatantra to the needs of the present Indian society. After studying the book and other references related with it, I have the opinion that this book has filled up a certain cultural gap which we find in Indian intellectual tradition. Indian civilisation even when it was at its creative heights had suffered a great setback and many of its values have been eroded through a long period of cultural decay. No doubt this tradition contained seed of decadence within itself, in the form of caste, ritualism and the absence of a critical tradition in social thinking. But many invasions by different races also made the intellectual deterioration in India a positive consequence. The invasions firmly entered the path of stagnation and eventual decay. There was also the belief in timeless being. It made Indians believe that their religion, called "Sanātana dharma" had always existed and would always exist whatever might be the ups and downs brought about by time, and this enabled them to accept the reverses in their fortunes with a certain degree of philosophical calm, resulting in their capacity to wait patiently
for the next phase of change when time would inevitably alter the picture. Thus the tradition began to decline in its intellectual dimensions and all intellectual activities eventually came to a halt by the fourteenth/fifteenth century. The intellectual tradition of India fell into such oblivion in course of time that it had to be rescued by the labours of western orientalists who took it upon themselves to undertake extensive research on old texts, the existence of which Indians had almost forgotten. The writings produced by European scholars, beginning in the eighteenth century, were formulated in terms of the ideological attitudes then dominant in Europe, and naturally these were significantly different from the indigenous tradition of ancient India. European ideologies entailed a set of attitudes towards India which were for the most part highly critical, though there were also some sympathetic historians. These ideologies continued to be influential even after Indian scholars began to write, since they often wrote in reply to earlier interpretations and were therefore still moulded by them. It has been only in recent years that the influence of ideologies on the interpretation of Indian history has been recognized. So whatever passes among the orthodox Indians now cannot therefore claim to represent the old values, and one must look into the old Indian literature to have an adequate conception.
As I believe that there are things of value in this tradition relevant to good living today, I believe that it is important for Indians to investigate their tradition and properly acquaint themselves with these values instead of blindly accepting that this ancient tradition has nothing to say to the present India as most people believe, a fact which explains neglect only. Of course what is needed is not just acquaintance. Most who know these books treat them as antiquities or as profound spiritual message that has no particular bearing on the day to day living process. A creative reconsideration of these values is to be done now, so that one is able to interpret them according to the needs of present circumstances. To say this is not to say that the ancient Indian tradition is the only valuable human tradition, or that only this tradition offers things of permanent value. I hold that all cultures and civilizations have things of permanent value in them. It is not intended to show that there is nothing of value to be found in the West. Human life is complex and cultures and civilizations are necessarily selective, emphasizing certain aspects of it at the cost of others, which are equally a part of human living. So life can be organized in different patterns by different cultures none of which can be said to be absolutely good or absolutely bad. All I want to say is that since there is a basic perception of life in Indian civilisation, in which
there are things of permanent value, there is no reason why the Indians should throw away these insights and adopt something quite different in search of good living. It is not that Indians are the only people to have held an organic world view. This view can be found in many so-called primitive cultures as also in the Taoist philosophy of China—embodied in their myths, rituals, social organizations, and so on. What is distinctive of the ancient India is that it tried to build a civilization around this view which was reflected in their thoughts regarding religion, philosophy, social values, and in their artistic creation and aesthetic theory. The modern Western civilization, whatever one may think its shortcomings are—and all civilizations have their shortcomings—is a great human achievement and there is no human culture anywhere in the world that can now ignore its attainments. This only means that Indians have to assimilate what they can of these values, not that they have to abandon everything pertaining to their own culture.

Nothing in human affairs is so entirely consistent as to enable us to pack all available ideas into one system. For example, Vedas and the Upanishads and even the Bhagavat Purana see creation as an expression of joy. Yet Sāṁkhya and Buddhism found that the most pervasive feature of life is suffering. This suffering doctrine appears to have triumphed over, at a certain stage of the development of ancient Indian thought. So we find
that the prayer of the Vedic man to be able to live up to a hundred years to savour the delights of life with all one's powers intact, gave way to the later Indian obsession with not wanting to be born again. This fact not only calls for compromise, but also opportunities to people, who are in a position to do so, to use the ideological structure in such a way as to change the character of the institution as originally conceived by the ideology. As a matter of fact there is always some gap between theory and practice, and the gap can be quite big. Social institutions change in their implications as a result of pressure of circumstances, they are also subject to corruption by people in power who use institutions for their own benefit. This is shown by the transformation of Varna into caste and the justification of caste in terms of Varna, despite the fact that in actual practice caste is atomistic and Varna organic inherent or structural. There are other examples of this nature to be found in history. A capitalist economic system may continue to justify itself in the name of the virtues of perfect competition, free market etc., which may have ceased to exist in any important way. A communist social system may continue to justify itself in terms of the virtues of a classless society while continuing to create new pockets of privileges which, whether or not to be called "classes" may be just as bad as far as creating a happy and free society is concerned. This is why it is essential for the health of an intellectual tradition that it should develop
a critical strand within its own boundaries, which can look at the performance of the society in the light of its own premises. The Indian tradition failed to do so, where social questions are concerned. Criticism of caste and ritualism, made by both the Cārvāka philosophy and Buddhism, unfortunately failed to give rise to a systematic critical tradition within Indian thoughts and culture.

As ancient Indian tradition primarily expreses the view — as of oneness of all existence, scholars often tend to overlook its rational quality and regard the culture to be mysticism. It is by many to be mysticism rather than anything that can be called by the name "rational" or "intellectual". So a contrast is made between the ancient Hindu and Greek cultures, one is said to be mystical, the other rational, by which is implied that the one is based on feeling and the other on the intellect.¹¹

The Pancatantra shows that Indian culture has an intellectual basis in the form of a world view which should have its name "rational". Actually ancient Indian culture makes a distinction between two types of intellectual comprehension, the one intuitive and the other rational and both are blended uniquely in the tradition.¹² The Pancatantra encompasses the second comprehension. It represents the aspect of the human
intellect, and is an instrument by means of which human beings speak of their experiences and make others aware of the hazards and the pitfalls of life and the ways to overcome them. The Pāñcatantra speaks on reality. It adds to our understanding as regards the scope of our life and its experiences. Though the Upaniṣadic culture claims that knowledge of ultimate reality is the higher still it admits the necessity of the knowledge of phenomenal reality.\(^{13}\) And in my opinion Indians should try to analyse their culture in this light.

However, it is true that the modern western tradition has developed self conscious rational methodology which Indians lacked. Their rational method was developed on the view that things are in the ultimate analysis separate from one another.\(^{14}\) This rational method enables one to study each thing in depth, as a thing on its own, in comparative isolation, and is the very opposite of the Indian view, which puts more stress on the oneness than on the individuality. But we find that the Pāñcatantra has fulfilled the want to some extent. The stress on individual can be seen in many slokas of the Pāñcatantra intermingled in stories, dialogues and morals. And it will be good for the Indian, if this methodology can be adopted for the understanding of the nature of things in the phenomenal sphere.

It is often said that the ancient Indian philosophy makes
one a fatalist because of its belief in rebirth according to Karma.\textsuperscript{15} And in this is found the explanation of the Indian inability to act with a view to changing his environment. Indeed it is not very clear what exactly is being claimed when it is said that the Indians are fatalists. No human being anywhere can possibly attempt to live on premise that whatever is going to happen to him is going to happen without his doing anything about it himself. From the teachings of the Panchatantra it is very much evident that a fatalist is not one who believes that what is going to happen is going to happen irrespective of his activities, he is one who believes that if certain things are fated not to happen they will not happen no matter how hard he tries,\textsuperscript{16} and he only comes to this conclusion after he has tried and failed, or when he finds that the limits of the circumstances do not even allow of his trying in certain directions. I have discussed this in detail in the previous chapters. It is thus a judgment after the event, so to say, and is more a mechanism of adjustment to what appears inevitable rather than a positive stance towards the world, one that orients one to inactivity. I therefore find the opinion that the doctrine of Karma and rebirth makes one a fatalist which leads to inactivity, thoroughly muddled and not very helpful as an explanation of the apathy of the Indian masses, which is in my opinion more a function of their poverty and ignorance rather than their philosophy. As a matter of fact the Panchatantra teachings say emphatically that it is the combination
of fate (possibilities determined by action in previous life) and action undertaken at the right moment in this life which decides what happens to people.\footnote{\textsuperscript{17}}

The Indian traditional belief about the oneness of existence has an intellectual function, particularly because it leads to the acceptance of phenomenal pluralities. And this is especially relevant in India where non-Hindu religious cultures, such as the Muslim, the Christian, the Jain, the Parsi, and so on co-exist with the Hindu, the non-Hindu religious models are just as acceptable as the Hindu. Saintly Hindus such as Ramakrishna and Gandhi in recent centuries not only said that this is the case, they also tried to live it by giving actual recognition in practice to other religious cultures. Gandhi read from the Koran and the Bible in his prayer meetings\footnote{\textsuperscript{18}} and Ramakrishna actually practised both Islam and Christianity for a short time.\footnote{\textsuperscript{19}} As the Hindus need not consider other religions as false or even as less true than their own, they ought to be able to participate actively in these cultures. According to the original definition, the term Hindu meant the people of India and their practices.\footnote{\textsuperscript{20}} It was not supposed to mean a particular religion. According to this broad definition of this term all cultures that have actually become a part of the Indian scene are parts of "Hindu" culture. Thus the active embracing of the Indian
World view, by the Hindus, can do a great deal to unify the people of India. The Indians at any rate can make the gesture.

According to the doctrine of Varna it is evident that all functions of society are inter-related and inter-dependent. The Varna scheme does not include the concept of untouchable castes or functions, which therefore should not exist as an institution according to this social ideal. But human beings performing these different functions were not conceived to be equal in their temperaments, needs, capabilities or even in the importance of the functions they perform for the total well-being of society. The Pauranic stories of Satyakama Jābāli, an illegitimate child of a servant woman who was accepted by an Upanisadic rishi as a brahman student on the strength of the quality of his character, and that of Viśvāmitra, a Keśariya who became brahman by changing his values and functions are indications of how the Varna idea was originally conceived and the support on this idea is to be found in the Pañcatantra stories. An open recognition of these differences was brought about by the Pañcatantra in its contempt and derision towards brahmans and monks like Brhatsphika, Jūtakarna, Āgādabhūti etc. The Pañcatantra is not ready to show blind veneration towards them without taking into consideration the actions they were performing. According to the Pañcatantra it seems that
hierarchical ordering of society depends on individual values or capabilities and it is not the same thing as hierarchical ordering of men according to birth and this was the principal of the Varna concept (See Chap. II).

So it frankly accepted that the lifestyles of the people performing same functions need not be the same or equal. But this unequal social order at the same time should include the idea of the responsibility of the privileged towards those who are not so privileged - so political administration was thought of as "the duty of the king" - and this is embodied in the concept of hierarchy of responsibility and not just of privilege. The brahman - and I am using this term to denote a function rather than as a hereditary concept - was to enjoy the highest social esteem in view of his spiritual and intellectual functions, which in this scheme was thought to be of greatest importance for the well-being of man. But the brahman, precisely because his concern was with the higher values of society, was not to aspire after a high degree of material comfort and luxury or ostentatious living. Indeed he was to live on gifts voluntarily given by society and not demand anything as his due. His standard of living was to be lower than that of people engaged in military, political and economic functions. And the same is true of the Sudra. The Kshatriya was expected to offer his own life for the
protection of the society, so society recognized his claim to a life of luxury and material ease. The Vaiśya, the producer of wealth, likewise was to enjoy a higher material life than the brahman or the Śūdra, but it was certainly his duty to be a liberal giver to social causes. The Śūdra, who is not equipped by natural capacity to contribute to the higher functions of the society - and this is not a question of parëntage (which I am repeating to emphasise the point) but of genetic constitution - was again not expected to enjoy a high material standard. These inequalities are inevitable in view of the fact that society does not produce enough wealth to enable everyone to live like a king. There had to be unequal distribution and the rationale behind it was the importance of the service rendered to society - among other things. The Śūdra's service was essential to society, but it was rated lower in value than others, so a simple material existence was thought proper for the Śūdra. This material simplicity was not thought to be a misfortune, one that divests life of all meaning, for the brahman too was to live a comparatively simple life, possibly in view of the high satisfaction he would get through the use of his spiritual abilities which should enable him to live happily with less material goods. Furthermore, anybody who renounced conventional social life, whether a Kṣatriya or a Vaiśya, was again to embrace a simple life, and this was thought to be quite consistent with living a life of high achievement and satisfaction. Simplicity was not something
to be preached only to the Śūdra, there were others in society from all walks of life who would live thus in practice.

The Śūdra's life style was expected to be simple, but not for that matter poverty stricken, one that had to be lived at the level of semi-starvation. The Pañcatantra do not give much account of Śūdra lives as they were actually being lived, yet from what we have, we find that Śūdras like fishermen, barbers, archers, carpenters or weavers are shown to have enough material means to be able to invite guests for meals and stay overnight. Indeed the lives of brāhmaṇas were equally poor if not worse. This is not to say that there were absolutely no really poor and destitute people in ancient India, only that, by and large, the system was not to function on the assumption that it was perfectly all right for the lower caste to starve. The economic arrangements of the society gave the Śūdra enough - but not what would now be reckoned as a high standard of living.

This doctrine also retains its importance in the moral sphere. As we find in the Pañcatantra moral equality means that each human being is entitled to a fundamental consideration as a person who is here to fulfil his own purposes, however humble these may appear to be, and not just the purposes of other human beings, however excellent they may be thought to be for some
reason or other (see the chapter 'Message of the Pañcatantra').

The Indian ideal of four ends and four stages of life again, I believe, embodies a very fruitful conception of the total scope of life. The idea that all of life should consist of renunciation, which is often presented as the Indian idea, is highly unrealistic and it is definitely not Indian. The Pañcatantra shows that it is perfectly legitimate for men to strive for pleasure, material prosperity, and righteousness or virtue as well as their eventual renunciation. And there is a time for everything, for acquiring discipline, knowledge and skill, for service to society through performing a distinct kind of function suited to one's abilities, whilst one is at the same time engaged in pursuit of pleasure and prosperity for oneself as well, and for renunciation. If we turn our attention to non-religious Sanskrit literature of which there is quite a good deal in the form of drama, poetry, legends, animal fables etc., this picture becomes very much evident. There the culture emerges which is that of ordinary human beings, interested in the day to day business of life, displaying ordinary human emotions and values.

The Pañcatantra, meaning treatise on the wise conduct of life, shows through animal fables a particular kind of attitude to living which is entirely this worldly and devoted to finding the maximum joy in life as lived by men in the society of other
The fables were widely known and they belong to the common intellectual repertoire of the ordinary men. The values, which, according to Panchatantra, are absolutely essential for good living, are security and freedom from anxiety and worry. Given these, the maximum enjoyment of life results from the use of one's powers, both intellectual and practical, along with friendship with congenial minds. A high value is placed on the power of intelligence and its active use in solving the problems of life. The stories preach that a ready wit, determination, shrewd and practical understanding of how to fit plans to situations, and resolute action, can cope with apparently insuperable difficulties, and their message is the very opposite of despair.

The view of life in these stories is shrewd but without any illusion, sympathetic to joys and sorrows of life but without any sentimentality, and realistic without pretension to high moral perfection. The stories say that a man can get real satisfaction out of life, hazardous though it may be, through an alert, discriminative and active use of his powers, and this combined with security, prosperity, learning and friendship with the likeminded and the worthy constitute good living. This sober unpretentious, realistic and active view of life is the very opposite of the picture drawn by so many of Indian culture as contemplative, life denying, apathetic and fatalistic. But man's
being extends beyond his instinctual and intellectual potentialities and the concept of his development must therefore include his spiritual possibilities. So in the third stage of life, man, after retirement from active life, devotes himself precisely to the task of this development. In all societies there is such a thing as retirement from an active life - that is, life devoted to self-advancement in the world of artha and kārma. But retirement need not be just a negative ideal, it can also be seen as a positive step - entrance into the goal of self overcoming. The Pañcatantra echoing the Gītā talks about the renunciation of the fruits of one's action and not of action itself. But this type of renunciation is possible only when one is engaged in activity aimed at self - overcoming, not one that is aimed at self - advancement. So if one takes the cue from the pañcatantra (actually the Gītā) where the key to liberation - the final and ultimate goal of human life - is disinterested action for the good of all, old age need no longer be thought of as a time for inactivity in retirement. It may instead become a time for the best kind of action that a human being is capable of performing. The vast masses of people in India are poor, illiterate, apathetic to sanitation and beauty, and totally dis-organized, being fragmented into innumerable castes. The retired people who had an opportunity for pleasure and prosperity in the world may very well engage themselves in the task of the re-construction of the Indian rural life or to the well - being of the poor in
general, whether in cities or villages. In this their experience, wisdom and talents acquired during a period of strife and competition, may fruitfully be engaged for the good of all in an atmosphere of peace and good will. It would make old age productive and meaningful, not just a time when one is simply waiting for death. I thus find that the old idea of renunciation is supremely meaningful and relevant. Its adoption by the old people may mean a solution of the most pressing need of Indian life - reconstruction of India's villages, into the bargain, in the old scheme of four ends, the last stage of life was supposed to be one of a wandering mendicant (pāribṛjya) who would not settle down at any place for more than three nights but would move around being a living example of detachment to the worldly; An active life which a wandering life certainly is, cannot thus be beyond the reach of the old. There have been many old people in India according to Indian myths and legends, - the Buddha, Gandhi and Vivekananda are historical examples - who had wandered round, spreading enlightenment.

Thus the Indian tradition accepts both material and spiritual values as equally legitimate. It obviously is not scientific but there is nothing in it which precludes the use of science either for an understanding of the constitution of the physical universe or for the betterment of the material conditions of living. But it would be opposed to the idea of accepting science as an exclusive god revered, nor would it accept that scientific understanding is the only kind of understanding that can grasp everything about
human beings, their lives and even their environment. Indian intellectual tradition does not object to what is called a rational approach to problems, any one who has doubts should read some Indian philosophy. It insists at the same time that reason can take us so far and no further in creating an understanding of the total scope of life. It advocates that intuition, both intellectual and yogic should be accepted as equally valid ways for the understanding of certain things that are important in the total living process.

The system of education which was introduced by the British, for its own purposes, taught the western conception of life, its methods and values being based on subjects developed in the West. Text books were written by western intellectuals. They did not have India and its cultures and tradition in mind in thinking about what to study, how to study them and what conclusions to come to regarding what can or cannot be done. The intellectual heritage of ancient India is not brought to bear on the education process at any point, at the level of either school or universities except for the fact that the subject like Sanskrit or Indian philosophy or culture is studied by a few people interested in Indian antiquities. And as this is taught in western universities as well, the Indians did not show any particular during in adopting this subject. It is hardly fair to deprive Indians of their cultural heritage, which can only come to them through the education
process. There is no need to force them to be acquainted with their heritage, but as it is basically ancient Indian culture, there is need for every Indian to know about it. It is impossible for the Indians to understand their culture and its values without acquaintance with such books as the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, the Gītā, the Purāṇas, the Fables and Folktales and the Epics,- to mention only the essential. These books are not narrowly religious, they are not theological treatises, and what they present is the whole intellectual stance of this culture, its world view, its methods of approach and its moral and spiritual principles. As the Pañcatantra suggests - however difficult the problem is one has to cope with it - to the extent of going to war for its solution, this means that we have to size present situations up and decide to adopt some definite course of action.

The present problem of the nation is lack of development. How can Indians learn to develop without coming to grips with the books where the ways can be found? These texts should therefore be of compulsory reading for the Indians - (even if they decide to reject these afterwards) in schools and widely taught at the universities. Unless this is done the whole concept of development, what to develop, how to develop, and what to develop for, will remain western in orientation and as long as it remains western the first thing the educated will ask for, is a high material standard of living which includes cultural phenomena like
entertainment etc. Other western values like discipline, efficiency, method, high intellectual and moral courage, self confidence and the like, unfortunately cannot be acquired from reading their books. A complete awareness of these values grows by understanding books like the Pañcatantra which originated and developed in Indian soil essentially for this purpose. It is the educated who form the establishment, and set the goals and standards of development. Naturally enough, they copy western aims, methods, organisations, etc. - irrespective of their suitability to the question of developing for the benefit of the poor. Unfortunately most of them have no respect for ancient Indian values or belief, that these values have any relevance to the question of development. This must not be taken to mean that the western aims and methods are not valid. The Indian tradition believes that there can be alternative ways of perceiving and of living and it does not claim that its own prescription is valid means and everybody should adopt it. What I am talking about is not something that will be imposed on everybody by a central authority. There is no reason why the whole world should live according to the same model, why there should not be a variety of ways of living. It is more fun for everyone if there is more variety in the world and everybody everywhere is not displaying the same characteristics. The fact is that a system is needed, especially one that can generate
conviction and through the emotional and psychological push, enough will is produced to act in a dedicated, disciplined manner. The adoption of the conception may not be absolute or scientific.

There may be many solutions to a problem and many interpretations, each with a right to be considered legitimate. One must therefore abandon the hope of being able to create a perfectly coherent society or completely consistent human beings. One is to learn to make do with something less than perfection - by manipulating institutions, whether they be religious, social, political or economic. For men can never survive without action.

As we have discussed before, traditional Indian thoughts and beliefs are different from those of the other countries of the world. Its philosophy does not consider economic problems as the only important human problems. It does not teach sacrifice of everything else in the life for the sake of economic security or affluence. It believes in the multiple possibilities of human nature. The Pañcatantra reflects this basic criteria of Indian culture. As it is a mirror of the society and philosophy of ancient India, in simple and flowing language, it reveals the inner depths of its people in general and brings out the complexities of human nature and its multiple facets. It makes us realize that there is no final and absolute solution to the human predicament. We should try to cope with problems which
appear to us urgent now. But solving all the world's problems
for all time to come is not possible. We have to adopt a system
with due regard for all relevant facts as well as our inevitable
human limitations. Though the idea of a system requires complete
coherence and consistency, the forcible elimination of all
conflicts and opposition will not make the country reach its
goal. We will have to try to contain existing conflicts and
contradictions within reasonable proportions so as to enable
the policy adopted to function with reasonable efficiency.

This of course makes life much more difficult. There is
no methodology available to come to a correct decision as to
what is a reasonable proportion of anything. So the Pāñcatantra
advises that all we have to use is human good sense. The lesson
of the Pāñcatantra is not to abide by any rigid rule. One can
say that this makes one person lose his decisiveness and easy
self assurance, as he cannot know all the answer. But here the
Pāñcatantra suggests self righteousness. His decisiveness grows
by understanding how human beings really function, their manifold
needs, facets and possibilities. He should have belief and
respect in himself and in his self righteousness. He should
insist that the particular package of needs he has devised as
genuine need, is the only correct one, but he must not show this
tendency to an excess.
The ancient Indian view of fourfold values emphasize the total scope of life - their ends being righteousness, pleasure, economic well being and liberation - 'dharma-rtha-kāmamokṣāh'. This doctrine recognizes the common sense that mankind has to eat before it can do anything else. This fact is emphasized in the Upaniṣada. In the chāṇḍogya, Śvetaketu was asked to starve for a few days in order to find out that in a state of starvation he was unable to think of Bhūmaṇ.23 The Pañcatantra in its numerous ślokas has recognized that a degree of economic security is absolutely essential to the living of good life. We see from the Pañcatantra that the Indian tradition explicitly claimed material well being as a legitimate human goal, but it was given the second rank in the hierarchy of values rather than the central position as has been discussed beforehand. The adoption of such an economic order will not be disastrous to Indian values if it can operate within the Indian world view of oneness, its fourfold scheme of values, including liberation, its ideas of four stages of life and its allowance of people to choose their own ways - once they accept the requirements of the economic order.

We can learn several things from the Pañcatantra. The most important thing the Pañcatantra can teach us is that by believing that certain things can be done, a great deal can be achieved - if one takes courage to think and act, one can do so. Many
countries of the world have already shown what conviction can do. Revolutions happen perhaps not because of its scientific validity but because a sufficient number of people feel inspired by a high ideal - helped by belief in a system and its truth in creating conviction - and act in a dedicated and concerted manner. If a sufficient number of people can be persuaded that the ancient Indian ideals are viable and that it is possible to act on them to bring about change of a nature that will benefit the poor and not just the rich, it is bound to prove fruitful. The idea of development according to the Pāṇcatantra (See Chap. II) is not to become 'modern' or 'progressive' but to enable the vast masses of the Indian people to live better - not a life of high material satisfaction which is unobtainable in India, but to have enough for the satisfaction of the essential needs. It says if money is necessary for social security, it is not an end, with a book of verse or a work on the marvels of the world, life can be rich though quiet and modest.

This sort of development can surely be brought about, if not on a total scale at one stroke within a limited period of time but gradually and over a long time. The people will still be there and the society does not exist in packages of five or ten years, so whatever can be done whenever it can be done
it is better to do than make plans and then despair that nothing has been achieved.

If the rich accept their responsibility as required by the varṇa conception - some village industries can be organised without the involvement of the government. Surely there must be some rich somewhere in India with some social conscience - it is a question of persuading them. The Pāñcatantra idea holds that producing wealth is an honourable activity (see chap.II). It does not say that it is essentially based on exploitation. The varṇa conception of India entrusts the rich with the responsibility of giving liberally to social causes - in the past they did finance digging of wells and tanks, construction of public rest houses, temples and monasteries as well as their upkeep and running expenses, of maintaining brāhmaṇas by gifts, and so on. If the rich could behave in this fashion in ancient India there is no reason why they could not be persuaded to act likewise now.

Village development would also require information. To develop a village one must know about the people and their skills. We are happy to acknowledge that nowadays much development has been achieved in this line. Committees organised by the government are making enquiries after the village people and their skills, which affect the use of human resources, the potentials for raw materials for developing industry, marketing
problems and so on. The scientists in India have also taken up the idea of development and help by way of creating small tools, techniques etc. for use in village industry.

The Pāñcatāṇtra text and the other popular literature of India proves that it is a mistake to think that puritanism and asceticism represent Indian philosophy. One look at ancient Indian sculpture on temple walls should divest one of this misconception. Treatises on Erotics like Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana raise sex to a science and an art. The author however never forgets the more inclusive horizon. He definitely states that Dharma is the highest and Kāma the lowest of the goals of man. The existence of kṣatriya class also amply shows that ancient Indian tradition was not non-violent, even if non-violence is required for spiritual development. Anyway, it does not mean that one must close one's eyes to the present realities, refusing all knowledge that has since been accumulated by mankind in the form of information, technique, method, organization and so on. Modern information and technique should be adopted along with the values that ancient Indian tradition held - to cope with the present problems of India. for this we have to acquire clear conception of our traditional culture but certainly not in a spirit of absolute reverence. Science and technology do not hurt Indian intellectual tradition. This tradition has extraordinary powers of assimilation and a
great deal can come in and become part of its structure.

For this purpose it is important to reintroduce Sanskrit folk and popular literature to modern Indian people, organise open-air folk theatres, recitals from epics and purāṇas, devotional singing after the day's work in the evenings, story telling and the like - all of which once existed as part of village cultural life. If we do not do this perhaps some other 'modern' men, scientists, industrialists or economists someday find this idea of development attractive. It should not be forced on people neat, but the point is this extensive literary evaluation of the Pancatantra text proves that to develop India the folk literature of ancient period may have some very correct intuitions.