The purpose of this thesis is to see if we can develop a new line of interpretation of the growth and development of civilisation and culture, of the dynamism of history on the basis of the three modes of the Sāṃkhyā philosophical system. Our ancient Indian thinkers have variously recognised the importance of the Sāṃkhyā ideas; some of them denounced it, while many others have upheld different aspects of the Sāṃkhyā philosophy. But none of them have ever thought of applying the ideas of the Sāṃkhyā to the understanding of the growth and development of society. The genius of the Indian people has shown exceptional brilliance in the development of religious ideas and understanding, and the supreme height of its spiritualism has yet to be surpassed. She has been the mother country of many important systems of philosophy on which we may still draw ideas for further culture and development, and her claims to glorious contributions to other branches of knowledge and science are well justified. But in developing social sciences the world looks to Greece for inspiration, and India's attention was not properly drawn earlier to the fact that it was possible to develop an objective philosophy of history.

The Sāṃkhyā is, properly speaking, a philosophy of liberation by knowledge. It reflects great credit on the Sāṃkhyā that it could unconditionally recognise at such an early period of history that knowledge is the supreme liberating force of man, the system being developed much earlier than the Buddha. In this connection it is well to remember the two important aspects of liberation earnestly preached by this system. The one aspect of liberation is that it means passing away to some other world of existence, it simply means cleansing oneself of all imperfections of errors and illusions, the right knowledge is what makes of him a man, its essence of man is power. The other aspect is that bondage is bondage to nature, is the limitations that nature coiled around the spirit of man. Man can free himself from this encircling darkness, from this bondage to nature only by knowing himself, only by overcoming these limitations by knowing himself. Freedom consists in ...
in complete power to overcome nature, and this power is knowledge. Nature represents tremendous mechanical power to misguide, enchant, beguile through her ever changing forms of triple mode. The deep spirit miserably suffers from the pangs of triple sorrow which may be mitigated but cannot be completely rooted out for good by means of traditional methods, not even by the Vedic sacrifices. The only means left to the individual is to rely on himself and acquire complete knowledge of himself and nature and to see through the difference between the spirit and nature. But the end to be realised is not as easy as it may appear on the surface since the ego, the many-faced source of deception, is difficult to overcome and the intellect however subtle is only a form of nature; it demands of the aspirant life-long devotion and undivided energy. However, if the nature is known through nature, the spirit is released, never to be deceived again; nature's charms work in vain on the spirit thus released by knowledge.

The Sāṅkhya has thus worked out a wonderful and brilliant theory of liberation of the entangled spirit by knowledge which can possibly be improved upon but cannot be passed by nor be thrown overboard. Its strongest point lies in the emphasis on knowledge, which remains an eternal message for mankind at large. Knowledge is power, a power that makes man lord of nature, can milk nature to yield him unending resources for enjoyment, bondage and sufferings or can release man through detachment, through withdrawal from desires to enjoy. Bondage is tāmasikṣa, when it results from ignorance, stupidity and grossness. The knowledge is rājasikṣa when it leads to bondage to abundance, acquisitiveness, creates the inflated ego that believes in having more. Even svatta may lead to hopeless bondage to desires for knowledge insatiable, attachment to futile knowledge, knowledge desired for fame, influence, for standing in society. Knowledge is a force liberating when it leads beyond the workings of the modes of nature, when it is light unbound that lets one see the limitations of natural things, a knowledge not dependent on the five senses, Parāvidya, pure intelligence.

But the knowledge the Sāṅkhya puts emphasis on is limited by its being seemingly confined to the problem of personal salvation.
shows in clear terms what one must do if one has grown eagerness to free oneself from the pains life in this world entails. But it shows an obvious concern for the general improvement of the conditions of the millions that possess no capacity for the highest knowledge but yearn for a life worth living, a cultured, enriched and more varied by devotion to higher purpose, by efforts creative, beautiful, balanced. Neither in these days nor in days of old, many have felt this world intolerable and sought release from here. It remains always a matter of the rare few of exceptional ability and Svāttik endowments. Others are only men of varying ability and intelligence classified in this discourse into the three categories of svāttta, rājaśana tamā. If one dislikes having old terms used in this context, there is no objection to categorizing them as (a) intellectual men, (b) men of power, (c) men for happiness. This change of terminology won't seriously affect the essence and cogency of the arguments here put forward, though the old terms have historically gained deeper connotation and more effectiveness. Thus, we see that except for a few highly svāttik men of a typical psychic bent, the problem of release is of little moment and that the word release itself must be differently explained for the vast majority of men who live social life and think and work for purposes other than seeking permanent release from this world of multiplicity, change and sufferings; for example, a highly intellectual man may conceive that his release lies really in making permanent contributions to the world of art, literature, science or philosophy, and may suffer intensely because he has so far failed to do anything of the sort; nothing different from or anything short of this will quench his thirst for release. A great philosophy wide and deep must therefore have to intellectually contain in its sweep the whole of society which is symbolic of a comprehensive sacrifice, compared with Viṣṇu, the vastness incarnate, because in its vastness, variety and complication society gives shelter to men like the Buddha as well as the common run of our people. The Classical Sāṃkhya remains therefore confined to a very limited scope of explaining the problems of a selected few with highly Svāttik endowments and comes to serve no purpose of a modern social scientist. One might say, in defence, that the Sāṃkhya is a highly specialized philosophy and cherishes no desire to be a comprehensive one, and like
a true scientific discipline strictly deals with the selected subjects matter leaving everything else out of its scope. The Śākhyā endeavoured to show by means of strict rational arguments assuming the dual reality of the Puruṣa and Prakṛti how it is possible for pure knowledge to give complete release from all sufferings. The merit of Śākhyā has to be assessed from this point, not from what it has not all attempted to do.

There is much point in this stance and one hardly reads the Śākhyā without being convinced of such an attempt at going vigorously to the conclusion from the assumed premises. We need not therefore much dispute this claim. What we are driving at is that on the very premises the Śākhyā assumed it was possible to develop a well knit social science which none of the Indian thinkers has so far done. They have been all these centuries discussing fairly well the possible merits and demerits of the Śākhyā philosophy without ever trying to see if the Śākhyā ideas can be further enriched and extended in order to build up on them secular sciences to study nature and society more analytically and creatively. We now know that many other Indian philosophies and some of the Puranas have engrafted ideas from the Śākhyā to serve their respective purposes, for example, one frequently comes across these ideas in the Mahābhārata and Śrimadbhāgavata, but torn away from proper context and adopted in foreign soil much of the potency of these ideas was lost. The only notable exception is provided by the Carakasāṃhitā which could on the basis of the Śākhyā develop a philosophy of medical science. Other Śastras that borrowed from the Śākhyā used these ideas for enriching their particular religious stands.

But the social scientists who want to look to the Śākhyā for deeper light may gainfully follow the lead of the Gītā which has of all Indian Śastras, adopted from the Śākhyā very thoroughly yet creatively. The Gītā being essentially a theistic philosophy could not absorb the whole body of the Śākhyā ideas. That is the reason why it changed or we may rather say, extended the meaning of some of basic ideas of the Śākhyā. In chapter four of this discourse we have shown somewhat elaborately how the Gītā adopted the Śākhyā ideas in the main corpus of its philosophical system. With this creatively extended meaning of its ideas, it is now possible for an orthodox Śākhyā...
thinker to see that the Samkhya system may remain atheistic as before though its horizon of applicability has much widened. In adopting the Samkhya cosmogenic theory the Gita very ingeniously expounds its famous theory of two natures and three Purusas. The nature remains, more or less the Samkhya's nature with this important modification that it becomes the manifestation of the highest truth on its material side. The Samkhya Purusa has now been shown as having two aspects. In its lower aspect, para-Prakriti, it is conditioned by the Ahamkara, and believes itself as the doer and enjoyer and thus believing becomes a part of the nature always in flux. Thus para Prakriti, the ego-self that suffers from continuous errors and a complex of illusions in the lower self or Ksara Purusa which is eternally subject to motion and instability until released. In the state of release, it knows itself as the immutable pure consciousness absolutely distinguished from the nature, the objective side, the materiality that ever assumes new forms under the tremendous motion of the fundamental motive force originating in the disquiet in the priyeval balance of the modes technically called Prakriti. This Aksara Purusa in a far deeper state of meditative realisation knows that both itself and the nature that constitutes the objective side of consciousness are really the two aspects of one still higher Purusa, called Purusottama and are held together in the supreme unity of one truth, light and bliss, that is, the highest truth in its infinite creative power of becoming manifest by way of divine and inconceivable sports as the Aksara and then Kasra and the Kasra Purusa, and the conscious knower, and the unconscious materiality of the vast mutable Prakriti that creates and by creating itself becomes known. The orthodox Samkhya thinker may now, if he so desires, exclude the idea of the Purusottama in order to maintain the purity of his system but can accept undemurred the idea of two purusas, one is ego-bound, the other is free. Some such suggestion is already contained, one may say, in the aphorism of the Samkhya Pravacana Sutra 6.54 and that of Samkhya Sarah 5.22 of Vijnanabhaikus. In both these aphorisms, it is suggested that the spirit bound by nature, Ahamkara or loosely Anthakaranas is in bondage and suffers from the results of works realises done by Ahamkara and is called jiva. Released from bondage by knowledge, the spirit regains its
The Karika (54) simply tells us that men are by nature rajas-dominated, though every thing of this world represents a particular combination of the three modes. But the Gītā has an extension of meaning of the possibilities of the three modes in every bit of things in this world divides men in the three categories of svatta, rajas and tamañ in accordance with the principle of dominance. Svatta-dominated, rajas-dominated and tamañ-dominated men. It may be observed that the general and psychic characteristics of the modes as summarised in the Karika are retained also in the Gītā but the hidden implications have been carefully brought out in making various divisions made by the Gītā. Social functions are divided into four fundamental categories, intellectual, political, economic and service functions or Brahmins, Kṣatra, Vaishya and Īdra functions. Modes ultimately determine which functions will suit which classes of the people. Svatta-dominated rajas will prefer intellectual activities; rajas-dominated svatta will prefer political activities, rajas-dominated tamañ will prefer economic activities and tamañ-dominated rajas will similarly prefer service to the three higher varnas. Thus the Lord says that he has divided society into four classes or Varnas on the basis of modes and functions. The Gītā has extensively used the Sāmkhya modes in characterising sacrifices, gifts, austerities, knowledge, works, the doers, understanding, concentration, happiness and even diets. The society as a whole may be guided, controlled and ruled by men of Daiva characteristics or it may be an Asuric society being guided, controlled and ruled at every level by men of Asuric qualities. Even the subject-matters of the Vedas (Karmalāndā) are determined by the three modes, and those who seek to be released must take shelter in knowledge and go beyond the actions of the three gunas. Thus we see how the Gītā by a creative extension of the connotations of the modes has brought the Sāmkhya from the personal cloister to the broad expanse of the social plane and differentiated, classified and characterised men, their functions and works on the basis of the modified and extended meanings of the modes, and has thus laid the true foundation on which to build up a vast, complex and ornate structure of a social philosophy by which to more clearly understand the organisation, nature and
functions of a society as well as the supreme purpose for which it works and the nature and evolution of the immanent motive force in society. It may also be said that the Gita forms a transitional stage in the development of a social science that will analytically observe and arrange the different constituent elements of a society and their interactional workings and will also dispassionately suggest on the basis of the truths discovered how a better, higher and more varied social system can be developed.

But the Gita, it would appear, like the Samkhya still remains essentially a spiritual Sastra preoccupied with the problems of liberation in the world beyond the intellect, the modes of nature, of light, bliss and power incomprehensible, through a highly integrated syncretic approach of work, devotion and knowledge. At the centre of this philosophy, as the ultimate foundation of the universe, the inspiration of works and dispensation of justice, the object of devotion and knowledge, there is the personal God, the infinite truth, beauty and quietude, vaster and subtler than anything human intelligence can comprehend. About the truth or otherwise of this wonderful synthesis of a philosophy, about the subtle texture of its spiritual overtone or the way it has influenced the life of the millions of Indian people through ages, we have practically nothing to say. Our purpose being different, we have had to depart from the Gita's interpretations of the Samkhya at many points and have been compelled accepting though the lead given by the Gita to put on new interpretations of the modes of the nature and their subtle implications. It would appear, we have not done anything entirely novel or introduced overdoses of extraneous elements in putting on these interpretations. We have endeavoured, as far as practicable, strictly to follow the classical Samkhya and the expository lead as found in the Gita. Since the Samkhya shows least social consciousness and remains entirely confined to the problems of personal liberation, and the exposition of the Samkhya by the Gita, its immense importance notwithstanding, is not found satisfactory enough viewed from our present interest, we have made slight departure from the tradition, given a turn and a little twist here and there so that the Samkhya tenets may be used effectively for the
interpretation of the history of the civilisation and culture of India. This demand is really something novel to make on the classical Sākhya theory, to bring it out from its native world of spiritual discussion of the problem of liberation for a secular analysis of society, its composition, workings, direction and purpose, for the analysis of the social forces that acting one upon the other continuously make history. Though the more involved modern society with its vast complex of institutions and laws and intricate ways of working is left out of the purview of our universe of analysis, still the weapon we have forged on the basis of the Sākhya ideas as interpreted by the Gita is quite dependable, we think, for a thorough analysis even of this society. In this connexion we like to point out that we have paid little attention to the liberated souls in so far as they do not have any bearing on the social movements. But the great luminous persons like the Buddha, the Christ or Caitanya have great importance because by their far-flung spiritual activities they deeply influence social life in many ways and have therefore claims to be regarded as great factors in history.

For the purpose of secular analysis and interpretation of the history of civilisation and culture of a country we have divided men, as the Gita has done, into svatta-dominated (Svāttik), raja-dominated (Rajāsik) and tama-dominated (Tamasik). In modern terminology, they respectively are intelligentsia, the men of power or politicians and the commoners or men for happiness. For the purpose of precise definition, a class is known by the persons, the typical ones, in whom the class characteristics have been clearly, forcefully expressed. In other members of a class, the characteristics are discernible but not clearly developed. For example, the Buddha, the Christ, Caitanya, Plato, Sākara, Hegel, Marx, Rabindranāth, Einstein, Sri Aurobindo and others typically represent the intellectual class. All of them have not equally developed or developed in the same direction. Still, there is no difficulty to understand that they belong essentially to the same class. Similarly, V. I. Lenin, Mahātma Gandhi, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh, J. Stalin, Adolf Hitler and others are all men of power and
typically belong to the class of politicians. The rest are common men and women happy if they have a smoothly sailing life.

It is an accepted truth of political science that wherever the ruler and ruled relation is established the state appears. It still remains a crucial problem for this science to explain how it is that a few only rule over the many and the many are compelled to obey the few willingly or grudgingly. The state is the highest power on earth socially organised, and the few have the authority to exercise this power and can compel the many to pay them allegiance on pain of being punished. The purpose of the state may be the good of the many or otherwise depending on the ideology of the few, conditioned ultimately by the aspirations of the many. These few are the king and his nobles in a really monarchical state, and the dictator and the coterie in a state where dictatorship obtains.

The question of how a leader creates a social or political movement, guide and control it effectively to serve his purpose and enhance his interests, or how he inspires fear, awe, reverence, wonder and enthusiasm in the popular mind or why the great mass of the people pay spontaneous homage, unquestioned obedience and allegiance to their leader; hundreds of people would lay down their lives if the leader so desires, and think it legi-
legitimate and fulfilment; even those who hate him know well that he is a man worth hating, a tremendous force, a power almost irresistible. He knows how to give a passionate call to his people, to boil them over with emotion and organise them into a stubborn nation-wide movement. His magnetic personality, his manners of speaking, approach to the problem, interpretation of the situation he has to face, his pose, stance and posture are all unique. The capacity to be popular, the power to ride on the crest of popular enthusiasm is the strongest point of the character of the politician, his unfailing stock of capital.

The Ksatriyas, men of power, in modern terminology the politicians, are essentially raja-dominated svatta-characters. Svatta gives intelligence and wisdom, and raja activity and restlessness. They show indomitable intelligent will and are men of great energy, action and movement. Since they are to deal with men, social and political problems, their intelligence takes the form of pragmatism, they are highly shrewd and wise. Speaking about the Ksatriyas, the Gita remarks (XVIII, 43) that these men are by nature of heroism, vigour, steadiness, resourcefulness, generosity and leadership, and do not flee from battle. Leadership is a mysterious product of intelligence and activity, svatta gives them intelligence, shrewdness and wisdom and makes them wily and resourceful, good at finding expedients. But their restless activity, heroism, vigour, steadiness, capacity to fight, spiritedness and the unflagging power to hit hard and relentlessly come from the dominance of rajas in them. They are great activists and must constantly work, face hazards and brave dangers, create difficult problems and organise great movements to solve them, they can not rest, nor can they allow people to live peaceful and quiet life because they must let people feel the importance of their leaders, they must always be in the forefront of social performance and political game, in the limelight of public glory and glamour, pomp and prominence. The Ksatriyas of all ages clearly understand the importance of publicity which they creatively use to make their personalities in new dimensions, heighten their position, uphold their policy and strike down the enemies. They are great fighters for power, they must fight ceaselessly and bitterly to acquire and retain power. The state is power pure and simple, the politicians are defined by their activities to acquire and
retain this power. Limited power is really no power at all and power hedged with conditions loses virulence and effectiveness. This was well known to our ancients, and even the Ṛgvedic Kings aspired to become Samrāt, Viśvasya Bhūvanasya rājā. The King, for that matter any Ksatriya, must therefore aspire after having absolute power, retaining it in his hands for life and transferring it to his children if possible. This aspiration was one of the factors that originated hereditary monarchy.

The fathers of the constitution of the U.S.A. knew the nature of power, devised limited Government and introduced the principle of checks and balances and based their constitution on the theory of separation of powers. The lesser Swiss politicians organize in self defence by excluding men of uncommon qualities from holding public offices. Pericles declared that the price of liberty was permanent vigilance and the modern political thinkers believe that the best safeguard of liberty against the detritions caused by the desires of the politicians is conscious public opinion ready to fight for liberty which really means that the politicians must be ever ready to divide power among themselves as equally as possible consistently with good government. Obedience to authority seems to have been ingrained in the habits of Indian people, and our charismatic leaders have easier chance to become gods themselves and acquire absolute power. But this cannot last long even in India with many politicians already in the field each desiring as much share in power as possible. Limited or absolute, they must organise for power, ruthlessly fight for it, must remain ever ready to outwit the rivals and defeat them at all possible battles. In this cruel game of power politics, the consideration of abstract ethical values or fear of God can have no respectable berth and counts for little. Aurangzeb, it is said, was a saint of an emperor and his personal needs for material goods were negligible. But his love for power was boundless and indomitable, and if there was a real challenge to his authority he could be as cruel and pitiless as a holocaust. The stubborness of the egoist Duryodhana to retain his absolute power and the determination of the Pándavas guided by the infinite resourcefulness of Śrīkrṣṇa to have their legitimate royal share in power led to the great Bāhrata was that resulted in almost complete annihilation of the Ksatriyas in India. In our time the inter-party rivalry and
intra-party struggle for power give the politician little time to rest, to feel a sense of security or to nurture a mood of complacency, and demand of him incessant struggle to keep the real or possible pretenders at bay.

It is said that Janaka of Videha was a philosopher king, and Plato concluded in favour of a government by the philosopher king. We do not know how large the kingdom of Videha was or how intricate politics of those days happened to be. But the complicacy of politics nowadays has come to such a pass that the days of the amateur politicians are already past and modern statesmen find little time to cultivate philosophy or understand science. Even the actual administration of the state now is left to an expert army of rajasik people who by virtue of the nature of their jobs can never be mass leaders though always have to exercise political power. Politics today is the specialized business of the whole-time professional politicians on who depends the nature of political direction of the country, whose activities are the matters of history tomorrow, who lead the people and guide and control the administration and bear the supreme responsibility for making the destiny of the nation.

In the social field, in the realms of culture and religion, we often meet with people who build up organizations, run their administration and have a say in matters of culture and religion. They are important rajasik people and possess impressive personality, intelligence, leadership, and good organizing capacity, and in important ways determine the character of the nation. A keen observation of the way they work will certainly convince one that they have in them the makings of politicians. Yet, curiously enough, some of them discreetly keep themselves aloof from actual politics, although others may be in close covert link with the politicians. Since they do not come out for actual politics, do not aspire after real power, braving all risks, we may be tempted to say, without minimizing the role they play in social life, that these are less developed rajasik people. We cannot explain away their deficiency by saying that circumstances did not permit them to indulge in politics because, we know, the rajas in a real politician will compel him to plunge deep into politics, no matter how he suffers or how he makes other suffer; it is an urge welling up from within.

In dealing with the Vaiśyas we have to some extent deviated from
the stand the Gita has taken. The Gita has recognised three classes of men and four Varnas. That means the Vaisyas must have rajya-dominated tomas in them. They functionally are agriculturists, breeders of cattle and traders. It seems that the Gita has not attached much importance to the Vaisyas and Sudras and has described them externally, functionally without pointing out their psychological traits and proneness. In treating with the higher classes more importance has been put on psychological characteristics. If it had more carefully analysed the psychological aspects of the Vaisyas the Gita would have known that the Vaisyas have inner qualities more akin to those of the Ksatriyas. For reasons unknown, the Gita seems to have thought that the greatness of society depended on the activities of the two upper classes, Brahmans and Ksatriyas, though it had to assure that one could attain perfection by doing his socially assigned duties with earnestness and devotion (XVIII, 45). The works done by each of the Varnas were important to the general well-being of society and helped develop the qualities of the individual; otherwise it would have been pointless to speak of liberation by doing one's assigned duties, but the Gita appears all through to have insisted on the theory that the well-being of society, the growth and development of society in the higher spiritual sense, depended on the manifold, highly cultivated activities of the Brahmans and the Ksatriyas. When the Kuru-Pancalas prided themselves on the culture they had so assiduously built up, it only reflected great credit upon the achievements their Brahmans and Ksatriyas had attained. This also holds good of the Hellenic people who regarded others as nothing better than a pack of barbaric races. We also have maintained in this thesis that a better, higher and more varied development of a civilisation depends on the Brahmans and the Ksatriyas of the country. But in those old days the Vaisyas had not much scope for showing their real talents, for developing their potentialities to the full. From the post-Vedic literature one gather that the agriculture made a good headway; the Atharvaveda, Vajasaneyi, Taittiriya Brashman etc., speak of plough drawn even by twenty-four oxen. A network of canal irrigation was developed under the auspices of the Ksatriya kings who understood the well-being of their subjects; dams, tanks and wells were also used for the purpose and they knew well the use of manure. The land thus cultivated yielded good harvest and
the farmers are a wealthy community, but agriculture as an art of self-culture suffers from a number of inherent defects, it involves repetition of the same process year after year, generation after generation, giving the farmers little scope for further inward developments; even the problems they face remain more or less the same for ages, it makes heavy demand on their time, the farmers having no leisure for intellectual and spiritual culture, the svatta andrajnas in them are kept down and the tamas tends to come up producing a kind of happy, complacent mood, a kind of rusticity. They lose the capacity even for innovations, let alone the question of higher technological inventions; modern agricultural developments, it may be noted, owe primarily to sources outside the farmers themselves. After the Brahmanic period no technological improvement seems to have been made in respect of agriculture, and the farmer vaishyas forfeited their right to study the vedas. Industry had also developed variously. But industries were generally small-scale cottage industries, though we hear of some kind of factory system in Mauryan times, and it might not have been quite unknown in the period represented by the Gita. The kind of industries that were known then did not give the craftsmen and workers much scope for higher development, though they must have been somewhat better than the farmers in this respect. There was scope for further development for men of various occupations and professions, especially for the artisans, painters, artists, musicians, jewellers and weavers; beauty and novelty are the spirit of the works these men did. Still the scope does not seem to have been very great. External inspiration came from the extension of the market. The local market being limited, most of these men of arts and industries did not much develop, thrive, and remained in comparative poverty. The Bathakura, once a respectable member of Aryan society, was a Sudra in the Brahmanic Age for whom Taittiriya Brahmana prescribes formulas for laying sacrificial fire, though Aitareya Brahmana regarded Sudras as fit for being expelled or killed at will, and having no property right. To deny the Sudras the right to enjoy the fruits of their labour is clearly to invite chaos in social life. Since we do not have any respectable evidence of the Kshatriya kings practising large-scale oppression on the subjects, the Santiparva of the Mahabharata tells different stories and in the Mauryan times the Sudras were actually cultivators of land,
the opinion of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa seems to have been the private opinion of a school of thinkers. Be it as it may, the market incentives to industrial workers came most probably from the commercial Vaiśyās who traded with different commercial centres within the country and sent goods abroad through land and sea routes, and were a very wealthy section of the people. These Vaiśyās also practised some sort of banking, money-lending having become a flourishing business in those days of the Brāhmaṇas.

The Vaiśyās were certainly very intelligent, courageous, risk-taking sort of people and gave leadership to industrial and manufacturing activities and also to agriculture indirectly. In later period, larger manufactories, workers' co-operatives and trade guilds became common things. "By the time of the composition of the Buddhist scriptures guilds certainly existed in every important Indian town, and embraced almost all trades and industries. We even read of a guild of thieves." (A.L. Basham. The wonder that was India. P. 219). The office was headed by a Chief usually called the "Elder" or Jyesthaka and was hereditary and it was held by the richest member of the guild having influence at the palace and often counselling the king. The guild controlled prices and qualities of products and its regulations, recognised by the state, had the force of law binding its members. But these were of later developments, and in the period represented by the Gita the wealthy merchants were fewer in number and craftsmen, traders and workmen seem to have been less organised. It is not then unusual that the Gita would give less importance to the Vaiśyās and ignore their social and political role. For one thing, these rich merchants and prosperous craftsmen in India were never as respected and honoured and powerful as the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas.

In defining the Vaiśyās and determining the role they play in social and political life we cannot entirely ignore the later developments in history, though these do not strictly belong to the scope of our present study.

In the Maurya period and the period immediately following it, the usual practice was to pay the officials of the state their salaries in cash. "After the Mauryan period it became usual for kings to pay their officers and favourites not with cash, but with the right to collect revenue from a village or a group of villages. Such a right after carried
other privileges, and usually made the recipients the intermediary be­
 tween king and taxpayer", (A.L. Basham ibid, p. 97). The big officers pre­
 fered gifts of land, villages or districts from kings in lieu of cash
 payments because this gave them greater economic security, power and
 influence in society, and in some cases made them kings though on a
 smaller scale, and could be transferred to the heirs. Thus even in the an
 cient Indian system appeared that created a class of powerful people
 who were economically Vaiyayas having large landed property but were po
 litically Ksatriyas having interests and say in the highest determi-
 nation of the political governance of the state. This system became in co-
urse of time highly developed and entrenched in the Muslim period of
 the Indian history when the jagir system came to be a recog nised part of
 the governance of the country, and could not be abolished though
 emperor Akbar and some others thought of permanently abolishing it.
 Sultana Beziya of Delhi learnt at the cost of her life that it was
 impossible to rule unless the maliks and amirs, most of whom held ja-
girs under the sultans, paid allegiance to or at least acquiesced in
 the regime of a king. Most of the leaders of the Indian National Con­
 gress during the days of India's struggle for freedom against British Rule
 came of Zaminder families or were big land-holders. The king of Engla-
 nd was called "Lord of the Lords", the king himself being a land-Lord.
 These lords were landed aristocrats but exercised real political powe-
 rs. Laws were made by the king with the assent of the Lords spiritual
 and Temporal. How powerful these Lords were learnt by king John as
 he was compelled to sign in 1215 the Great Magna Carta which gave the
 baronage as much privileges as they could extract from the king. This
 was feudalism resting real political power in the landed aristocracy,
 and the ruling class desired land estates because land was then the
 principal source of income. The church also had large landed property,
 and the archbishops and bishops were more political persons protect­
ing their economic interests than spiritual. But the commercial revolu-
 tion of the 16th and 17th centuries and the subsequent industrial
 resolution of the 18th century brought a new class of economic interests
 to the forefront demanding a share in the political power of the country.
 The desire of this new class of commercial and industrial interests,
the bourgeoisie, for a share in the political power to protect their economic interests resulted in the various political revolutions of Europe such as the glorious Revolution of England 1688 and the French Revolution 1789, and the result of these revolutions was the gradual emergence of what is generally known as the capitalist society in which industry, trade, commerce and finance became jointly the principal source of national income, and in which the interests of the landed aristocracy and those of the bourgeoisie became inseparably confused to give a joint leadership in the political directions of the state. Till 1902 when Lord Salisbury resigned a large number of the Prime Ministers came from the House of Lords, and until the Parliamentary Act of 1911 was passed the Lords exercised co-ordinate powers with the Commons. The Parliament Act of 1911 amended in 1949 has grossly curtailed the legislative powers of the Lords, but the Lords are none the worse for this cut in their powers because this has least affected their real powers, economic powers. "Over one third of them (Lords) are directors (some multiple) of the staple industries of the nation. One third of them also own very large estates. Many of them are related by marriage, birth and business connections with the conservative members of the House of Commons." (H. Finer, The Theory and Practice of Modern Government, Pt. 407-408). Even the ruling clique of the U.S.A., it may be observed, comes from the highly propertied class of that country.

From the very brief resume of the rise of the Vaiṣṇavas in different countries in social status as the real ruling power of the state ever since the time of the Gītā, it appears that the definition of them given by the Gītā (XVIII 44) has not taken their full potentialities into account and has been consequently very simplistic, and needs radical change. This we have done in chapter IV of this thesis and have tried to show there that the Vaiṣṇavas and Kṣatriyas, though different in many respects, really belong to the same genus. They are both Raja-dominated sattva. But if the Kṣatriyas are more svāttik, the Vaiṣṇavas have more tama in them. That is the reason why the Vaiṣṇavas proper can not see beyond immediate concrete economic gains and can at best be leaders of large industrial corporations and commercial enterprises but can not make the macro-political decisions of the state.
and lead the nation.

Critics may disagree with our reconstruction and say that the distinction between the Ksatriyas and the Vaiśyas is rather artificial; and that the Vaiśyas have been ruling since at least the period following the Maurya rule in India; the state power is always exercised generally in the interest of the economically powerful section of society.

In whose interests the state power is exercised is quite a different set of problems and depends on factors with which we have not specially concerned ourselves here. Our special problem here is to see who really exercise the state power and why they can rise to that position. We have all along maintained that the rajay-dominated svatta, that is, the Ksatriyas alone can properly exercise state power. And those people may come of the Vaiśya families, but the Vaiśyas proper have never really run the Government; that is beyond their capacity and interests. Not all the maliks and amirs were powerful, dominant politicians at the royal court in Delhi. Malik Kafur, a slave, became the de facto ruler of Delhi after the death of Alaudin Khilji, though his royal court abounded with maliks, amirs and Khans. A detailed study of the English history is not necessary to show that only a few of the Lords and capitalists take practical interest in politics; they are satisfied if Parliament does not pass Bills heavily damaging their interests. Ramsay Muir once called the House of Lords "Common fortress of wealth", but the Lords do not evince much interest in being regularly present in that fortress. On average not more than 70 out of about 630 members attend the sittings of House, a quorum being constituted by the presence of only three members, though the passing of a Bill requires the presence of at least thirty members.

In our country only a few of the Zaminders directly participated in the freedom movement and became leaders. Thus it is always possible to distinguish between the Ksatriyas and the Vaiśyas by these characteristic features that the Ksatriyas actively participate in the politics of the state even at the risk of their life, try to acquire and retain state power and give necessary leadership to their people, whereas the Vaiśyas are interested in economic power and develop agriculture, industry, commerce, trade and financial institutions and
give leadership in the limited economic aspect of social life. The
union of Soviet Socialist Republics has abolished private owner­
ship of the major means of production (Art 10) and is a socialist
state of workers, peasants and intelligentsia. Even in that state,
if we apply our modified version, it is not at all difficult to
find out the Ksatriyas and the Vaisyas.

The definition of the Brāhmans or intelligentsia as given in
the Gītā (XVIII 42) may be accepted with minor changes in the conno­
tation of the term. These are svatta-dominated raja people in the world
of art, literature, philosophy, science. This class may also include
priests, teachers, lawyers, physicians, engineers and publicists. But
their characteristic feature is that they are men of ideas, feel more
at home in the world of ideas than in the world of activities;
and that they can not remain satisfied with what has already been known
and expressed, must ever strive for newer aspect of truth, sub­
limier beauty and deeper sense of good.

This has great risk, and the process and result both constantly
may invite dangers, repressions and death. In this askesis the seeker
sacrifices himself to light the lamp, to see, express and realises. The eternal urge of immorality, the desire to overcome death,
adds a new dimension to the askesis the seeker performs, of communicat­ing to others the results of the strivings; society bears the
fruits. It may be that some seekers may rise to such a height and
realize so great a truth that they become absolutely silent and find
little urge to communicate anything to others. We have not thing to say
about these men; they are too great for comment. But a secular social
science as we have here striven to build up has the great responsi­
bility to discuss dispassionately and faithfully all those truths that
have social bearings. So we cannot exclude the great activities of
men like the Buddha. The information about these "silent men" is useful since it saves us from being too secular.

Because of this urge to communicate, the seeker may have to face
dangers from the state and society. The progress of society no
doubt depends on our stock of knowledge and incessant activities,
but very few of us can bear undisturbed the shock of the newly died
beauty of the truth. The
denuded beauty of the truth. The people entrenched in power are sure to hit hard with blood and iron if their interests are badly bruised; the story of Socrates, the Christ and many other seekers bears witness to this aspect of our social life. It is always difficult to make the conservatively moving society accept something new; it may instead receive the explorer back home with torrents of criticisms, hostilities and insults too painful for one to bear, and may thus send himsهوeous emotionally unbalanced as the finale of Rousseau's biography shows. Excessive bestowal of honours, rewards and recognition may inebriate the Sannyasi and breed in him a nostalgic mood to be violent to check; the ascetic now becomes builder of sweet home and a tamasik indweller. Thus we see the life of the intellectual is not less in danger, less strewn with uncertainty, anxiety and pitfalls than that of a politician. The Gita says that the Brahman's life (XVIII 42) is of serenity, self-control, austerity, purity, forbearance and uprightness, wisdom, knowledge and faith in religion. This may be true in some cases, and the call of the truth may reach one with such a passion that one may well forget the needs of the lower self. But then we know many geniuses whose life represents one of these moral qualities, yet they have created sublime beauty and explained aspects of truth with amazing finesse of intellectual ability. The moral qualities we have not therefore stressed too far but have constantly fixed our eyes on the inner urge to go forward to still higher level, forgetful of oneself, of truth, beauty and good, to know and express the mysterious secrets of the world of ideas.

The rest are common people, the conservative slow-moving tamas, as sub-stratum of society or the real corpus of society which the politicians move by their movement and the intellectuals enlighten by their light of ideas. They represent an idea of continuity of social life, a solidarity of communal living, a concreteness of moving forward through ages of history with institutions, laws, customs and folkways, mores, ethical values and the sense of unity of religious consciousness. The sense in which tenas and tamasik are used here differs in shades of meaning from that in which these are used in the Saékhya and the Gita though at the core they main-
maintain their identity. We have only further explained their sig-
nificance, expanded their possibilities that remained hitherto un-
known and undeveloped. The Gita did in its time a great service in elucidating the categories of the Sāṇkhya, but further elucidation is now felt necessary in the light of the accumulated experi-
ence of mankind.

What we have called here common people need not be ignorant, slathful, ugly, vulgar and rustic. Education and improved standard of living will bring great change in them and will surely lead them to higher understanding of life. live mor cultured life.

But they remain none the less tamā-dominated raja force. That is the reason why we have called them men for happiness; they are happy and satisfied if they have a secure, undisturbed smooth-sail-
ing life. They cannot be Brahmans deeply absorbed in the world of abstract ideas or the Kāṣṭriyas ceaselessly fighting for power, controlling the life of the people and giving leadership to the na-
tion.

The tāmasik, common people, the materiality of social life, are a tremendous potential force which a leader can wield, and constitute in their collective capacity great receptacle and reservoir of ideas that reveal themselves to the svāttik, intelligence of the Brahmans.

The modified, we have used the Sāṇkhya categories of svāttik, kāṣṭriya and tāmasik for the explanation of the history of ancient India, the growth and development of civilisation and culture.

It may be observed that we have constantly taken recourse to the economic interpretation of history to better serve our own purpose. We have nowhere been guided by bias, superstition or prejudice in our reasoning, the purpose being the revelation of the truth and have always found the economic method a powerful intellectual tool for the interpretation of history. We are not un-
conscious of its inherent limitations and have not therefore accep-
ted it as the exclusive guide in this great adventure of ours. We have found Hegel's Idealistic interpretation of history less helpful. That is why we have nowhere in this thesis utilised that method to serve our purpose. This is not to be taken as passing
judgement on Hegel's philosophy of history; it may have many im-
portant purposes to serve. But so far as the history of India is
concerned his theory reveals nothing, illumines no dark corner,
and confuses more than once.

With regard to the anatomical layout of this book, let us
state that the book consists of five chapters and an introduction.

The first chapter gives an objective and faithful statement of the
history of India from the palaeolithic age when men emerged as
tool-making anthropoids to the Upanishadic period when men disso-
vered the ways and necessity of knowing the meditative truth supram-

me. To this great cultural movement of men in India from the in-
choate state to a very high level of development we have tried
to show how various racial groups and civilisations have greatly
made their contributions and how they acted and reacted to build
up in a resultant way what we call the composite Hindu culture.

In the second chapter we have dispassionately applied the economic
method to see how far it helps rationally to understand the gro-

wth and development of the civilisation and culture of India. We have
realised once more how powerful is this method, and understood
that with the help of this method one can more clearly appreciate
the dynamics of Indian society. We have also observed there that
the method has a number of basic limitations and cannot therefore
be completely relied upon. In the third chapter we have compared,
though in a limited way, the Samkhya with the systems of Hegel,
Marx, Saṅkara and the Gītā, and have tried to show the more scien-
tific approach of the Samkhya and how this system excels and how
this system, notwithstanding some critical defects, may be made
the basis of a powerful social science, all known philosophies suff-
tering from their respective critical defects. In the fourth chap-
ter, we have expanded the Samkhya categories of svattva, Rajas and
Tāmas with the help of the Gītā, with a view to developing a
scientific social science for the purpose of interpretation of the
history of the civilisation and culture of India. In the fifth
chapter we have actually applied this theory to show how better
this theory helps understand Indian history. We have seen there
that it is the only theory that has the capacity to explain all the aspects of the civilization and culture of India, since it contains the best elements of all known theories and surpasses them all in its sweep and precise applicability. This theory possesses the capacity to explain any society whatsoever.

Plato in his theory of the ideal state emphasised the role of the Ksatriya class and suggested the rule of the philosopher king and the communism of wives and properties among the Ksatriyas only. His theory of the ideal state is obviously limited and the philosopher king is rare, if ever born. Marx's theory was developed on the study of the European history and emphasised the role of the Vaisyas and the Sudras. Lenin later on discovered the necessary role the Ksatriyas play in society. It is not clear if Marx's theory of history applies to countries outside the pale of the strictly European culture. Since in this theory we have taken into account the fundamental constitution of man and nature outside, it will apply to all society irrespective of time and place.

The caste-ridden Hindu society has the great defect that it disproportionately emphasises the fact of birth and denies social mobility and penalises the individual because he did not intelligently choose the family to be born in. The importance of the family and its social connections cannot be denied as determining factors of the life-process of the individual. This social fact was emphasised by the Gita when it remarked (VI, 41, 42) that the fallen Yajin is born again in the house of the cultured rich or of the intellectuals. It is always difficult for a man not born in a family well connected and highly placed in society to shine in life. Still it is not impossible. In chapter I of this thesis we had occasion to show that many rsis came of the Sudra families of non-Aryan stock. In ancient Greece and Rome a person born as a slave remained a slave for life. But in India the history of Qutb-ud-din Aibek and others show that some of the slaves, given adequate opportunities, could become kings, powerful, virulent and good at giving high-styled government of their subjects. It is certainly unscientific to believe that given adequate opportunities everyone would rise in life. Yet, logically speaking we cannot help giving all equal opportunities. Since Karma inexorably
works and its ways are unpredictable, we cannot recognise birth as the exclusive determinant of the course of life of an individual; a Brahman may very well be born in the Sudra family.

The free-enterprise capitalist society is far better than the caste-divided society, because it abolished many of the superstitions and hindrances of the Medieval age and gives greater opportunities for development in accordance with the gunas of the individual. But it soon forgot its early promises and the vested-interests raised an artificial albeit indirect hindrance of wealth to the full development of the individual. The socialist society is therefore a better system than the capitalist society, giving all opportunities for development in accordance with their respective endowments of the gunas. But in its existing form, it seems being tilted against giving full play to the spirits of the Brâhmans and the Ksatriyas. This is artificial, and is not likely to last long. The society must change until it can extend full opportunity to all the development as their gunas permit.

From what has been said above, it is now possible to define an ideal society to be one which gives full scope for development to every individual in accordance with his endowment of the gunas, and social justice accordingly means the placement of the individual in society harmoniously with the development of gunas.