CHAPTER-III

Râmâyana and the Idea of Nationalism

Maharâja Vâlmîki composed the Râmâyana in verses full of rhetorical devices, but in different later periods many incidents and episodes have been added to it. In the extant form of the Râmâyana, there are seven parts and 24000 ślokas.¹ The Râmâyana is universally acclaimed as a classic creation of Indian poetic genius. Even after the long gap of two thousand years, the influence, excercised by this incomparable epic, on the lives and cultures, literatures and thoughts of the people of different countries of Asia is quite unbelievable.

The Story in the Râmâyana:

Râma was the eldest son of Daśaratha, the king of Ayodhyâ; when all the measures for the coronation of Râma as the heir-apparent had been taken, suddenly as a result of the conspiracy of Kaikeyî the second wife of the king, Râma had to go to exile for a period of fourteen years. The king’s second son, Bharata was then selected to succeed the throne. Râma’s wife Sîî and his younger brother Lâkshmana accompanied him in his exile. The incident of Râma’s exile broke the heart of king Daśaratha and
he expired. Bharata, during all these developments was staying at his maternal uncle’s house. He came back and refused to ascend the throne. He went out in search of Râma, and when they met, he requested Râma to come back to Ayodhyâ and ascend the throne rightfully. But Râma refused to come back and convinced Bharata to go back to the kingdom; Bharata brought with him Râma’s footwear as the latter's representative. Râma promised to take over the throne only on his return after fourteen years. While in exile, the possibility of conflict between Râma and the Râkâsas, who tormented the people and obstructed the religious rites and meditations of the sages, arose. Because of the barbarous acts of Sûrpañakhâ and the punishment Lakâmana gave her, the conflict became inevitable. Sûrpañakhâ’s brother Râvana, who was the king of Laṅkâ, kidnapped Sîå from Râma’s hut and took her to Laṅkâ. Râma and Lakâmana conducted a vigorous search for Sîå and then they went to Kiśkindhâ, where Râma entered into a treaty with Sugriva, brother of Vâli, the monkey-king of Kiśkindhâ. Râma killed Vâli and bestowed the kingship on Sugriva. With the help of Sugriva's army of monkeys Râma collected the whereabouts of Sîå and by constructing a bridge across the sea went to Laṅkâ and invaded Râvana’s kingdom. The younger brother of Râvana, Vibhâsa, joined Râma’s side. There ensued a grim and lasting war in which Râvana himself, all the sons of Râvana and all his kins and soldiers were killed. Râma returned to Ayodhyâ with Sîå. But Râma, being afraid of public criticism because of Sîå’s stay in Râvana’s palace, deserted her. In her exile in the hermitage of Vasîsha, Sîå gave birth to
two sons, Lava and Kuśa. Rāma arranged the Aśvamedha yajña. At last, after bestowing the kingdom of Kośala on Kuśa and Uttarakośala on Lava, Rāma and his brothers Bharata and Śatrughna and all the important ones of Ayodhya went to heaven; Lakṣmaṇa had already expired.

**Features of the Rāmāyaṇa:**

Maharṣi Vālmīki presented the Rāmāyaṇa as a kāvya, a work of history, a tale in verse. In this epic there are discussions on religion, economics and eroticism. As an example of a full-fledged epic the Rāmāyaṇa is indeed peerless. All the features of a great epic are at once found in it. The style of composition is simple, sweet and charming to the mind and the ear. Obsolete words and compound sentences have never hindered the natural flow of the development of the story; and there is an artistic combination of the Vā, Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa rasas.

Vālmīki picturised nature in the epic in a realistic manner. Trees and plants, hills and mountains, rivers and streams, seas and oceans, clouds, sun-rise and sun-set have been beautifully delineated; in the description of the shrines of the sages, given in the Rāmāyaṇa, one can visualize same life-like sketches. The epic poet Vālmīki intended to portray a faultless life and a faultless character. He has represented Rāma as such a noble and ideal character that he has become the image of self-sacrifice, duty, pity and preserver of justice. Different other characters have also been represented as ideals with individual, social and national qualities as the yardsticks. Vālmīki himself, with a view to evaluating the greatness
and spontaneity of this epic, said –

याबत् स्थाय्यान्ति गिरय: सर्विनेच महीतले।
ताबत् रामायणीकथा लोकेकु प्रचरिष्यति॥ २

Two important aspects of a literary work – realism and romanticism – have also been given adequate weight in the Rāmāyaṇa. The characters are at once human and superhuman. Some characters like Vāli and Hanumān and a few others have been portrayed as forest-dwellers with superb human qualities. The Rāmāyaṇa may be regarded as a religious book which imparts lessons on moral laws, values and duties. In the epic, eternal principles or ‘Sanātana Dharma’ have been illustrated. Good conduct is the foundation-stone or base of this Dharma. The Rāmāyaṇa also imparts lessons on politics, governance, diplomatic battle, sense of nationalism, preservation of the subjects and the tenets of religion, brotherhood, security of the state, etc. In other words good governance, democratic values and the ideals of statecraft, which are the features of ‘Rāma-rājya’ (ideal state), have been clearly illustrated in this epic. The Rāmāyaṇa is also regarded as a book on ethics, in which such qualities as simplicity, humanity, self-control, loyalty, humanism, nationalism have been emphasized.

**Culture in the Rāmāyaṇa:**

In the Rāmāyaṇa, the various facts and features of a faultless life have been picturized. We are accustomed to the desire to escape from the monotony of busy daily life and prefer a life in exile. In this secluded life
in exile, a calm of mind and mental balance may be attained by meditation and self-discovery. But the Râmâyana did not confine itself to this partial view or attitude. It kept an eye on the aesthetic aspects and the virtue of discipline. Râma has been placed before us as the apex of noble qualities; he is regarded as a special appearance of God, one who appeared as the keeper of ‘dharma’. It has been shown in the epic how Râma and the other major characters expressed their reactions in times of prosperity or calamities and how they overcame the most difficult situations without falling off from the highest principles of a noble, religious life. Râma established himself as the very symbol of the best of men by engaging himself in the arduous task of delivering the common people from the tyrannical rule of Râvana. He was dedicated to the protection and welfare of the people and to keeping himself above all sorts of impious acts, thereby achieving the status of the ideal ruler. Vâmâki gave the poetic expression of the glorious, incomparable and divine character of Râma, which inspired the succeeding generations for thousands of years and which still remains a perennial source of inspiration for the entire mankind.

**Prosperity of Ayodhyâ:**

All the succeeding kings belonging to the Ikṣvâku Dynasty worked for the welfare of all their subjects; especially, Ayodhyâ ascended the summit of development during the long reign of king Daśaratha, Vâmâki has repeatedly mentioned that the city of Ayodhyâ was exceedingly prosperous in all respects; there were horses and other cattles, food stuffs
and other forms of wealth. The people of different classes in the society were engaged in their respective jobs and responsibilities under the expert governance of Daśaratha. Sense of ethical values of the king and the officials, the sense of cultural values of the subjects were fully established. The capital of the kingdom was the centre of attraction; the streets were wide, clean and safe; foodstuffs were pure; there was sweet potable water. Affectionate and careful glance was kept on the peasants and the traders and merchants; they were given adequate security. Merchants in great numbers used to assemble in Ayodhya with their goods, because all sorts of security were provided to them. The shopkeepers opened their shops in rows, laden with goods for sale.

**Nationalistic Ideas in the Rāmāyaṇa:**

There are such jewels of books in every civilized land in which we find the conjunction of national culture, glory of religion and philosophical thoughts. Such books are the identifiers of the eternally flowing current of the life of the nation. Poets and other writers, who love their land, collect the sweet essence from those books and then, with their idealistic sense and individual talent, create such works of art which help enrich the literature of the country, and character of the people and instil in them the sense of nationalism. These works, create in the people love for the country, sense of dutifulness, sense of glory for the country and its culture, pride for the land and the nation. Such things are essential for preserving the freedom of the country and for its allround growth and development.
Vâlmîki has, in a cultured and appealing language, described and revealed the whole glorious life of Râma, the hero of the epic.

**Characteristics of an Ideal State:**

The sensitiveness of the epic-poet about the total development of the country is notable and suggestive. King Aja, the father of Daśaratha belonged to the thirty-third generation in the lineage of Emperor Ikṣvâku of the dynasty of Sûrya. Daśaratha reigned over the kingdom of Kosâla situated on the banks of the river Sarajû.³ In the northern part of the kingdom the capital city of Ayodhyâ of the Ikṣvâku dynasty was situated. The beauty and wealth of Ayodhyâ was peerless. This city was called Ayodhyâ because no enemy could ever attack it.⁴ King Daśaratha, who lived in this city, was learned in the Vedas, full of vitality and was the object of love of all the subjects, whether they lived in the urban or the rural abodes.⁵ He was able to fight alone against ten thousand great charioteers, devoed to rituals and dharma, had control over the senses and passions was comparable to Maharâjas, was a Rajarâṣ and was famous throughout the earth, heaven and nether region.⁶ He could inflict defeat on many enemies quite easily. He could be compared with Indra and Kubera in wealth, accumulated and acquired.⁷ He was the follower of the three principles – Dharma-Artha-Kâma. As Indra ruled over and reared Amaravatîsa Daśaratha, the seeker of truth, ruled over and reared Ayodhyâ.⁸ The inhabitants of this peerless city were religious and scholarly, greedless and contented with what they earned.⁹ As Manu was the keeper
of the whole world, so Daśaratha was the keeper of his kingdom and subjects.\textsuperscript{10}

In this description the great epic poet Vālmīki has drawn the picture of an ideal state. We can say that this has been presented before the kings of other kingdoms of this extensive country as an unmatched and unmatchable ideal. The readers feel inspired to build up this sort of ideal state which is the very image of all sorts of welfare. Indeed, the desire for the welfare of the state, all the constructive works undertaken with this ideal in mind, all the steps taken to achieve the standard of well-being – all these signify the sense of nationalism in the minds of the ruler and the ruled.

**King's Main Concern – Welfare of the Subjects:**

About the reigns of king Daśaratha and Rāma, Vālmīki holds the view that during their times the subjects were rich in every sphere – national wealth, wealth of mind and heart and spirit. Those who lived in that peerless city were all religious and learned. In Ayodhyā no licentious, no nasty and niggardly and heartless man lived.\textsuperscript{11} In this beautiful city nobody ate impure food. Everybody was charitable, everybody wore armlet, there was none devoid of self-knowledge.\textsuperscript{12} There was nobody who did not perform sacrifice; evil-minded people and thieves could not even be seen. The Brahmins in Ayodhyā had command over the sense-organs for they had entire support for the glory of the state; they were always engaged in performing works demanded by the sense of duty. These Brahmins, who
were engaged in reading and learning and teaching, were greedless in accepting gifts.¹³ No Brahmin was a ‘nâ stic’ or a liar. They were highly educated; no Brahmin was envious or weak or illiterate.¹⁴ Everyone of them had mastery over the six branches of the Vedas – Śīkṣâ, Kalpa, Byākaraṇa, Chhanda, Jyotiṣ and Nirukta. None who did not perform the ‘bratas’ or recoiled from giving, poor, madly stirred and melancholy lived there.¹⁵ All the people, who were firmly devoted to religion and truth, enjoyed long life.¹⁶ All the four classes of people, Brahmins, Kâatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śúdras – served the gods and guests. The Kâatriyas were obedient to the Brahmins, the Vaiśyas to the Kâatriyas and the Śúdras to the other three – and thus they performed their duties.¹⁷

When Bharata went to the forest to take Râma back to Ayodhyâ, the eldest brother asked questions relating to good governance Râma made queries about whether the subjects in the kingdom were happy with their wealth, whether they enjoyed the greater blessings of the gods, whether the mines and sources of water were free from the fear of ferocious animals and bad people, whether the peasants and owners of cattle were under the strong rule of the king and whether they were conscious of their profession, whether all sorts of unjust and illegal activities, exploitation, oppression of women had been stopped under the governance of the king. Râma advised Bharata to go back to Ayodhyâ and devote himself to pleasing the subjects, obviously by undertaking appropriate welfare measures – 'अयोध्यां गच्छ भरत प्रकृतिसुरुजय।'¹⁸ In fact, the subjects constitute the body of a nation. The idea of welfare of the people, the idea of the sense of ethical
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values and the desire to achieve the goal of full, all-round development of the subjects — these point to the sense of nationalism. The state is not merely a landmass, and so the development and advancement of the state means the advancement and enhancement of the well-being of the people – this has been greatly emphasized in the Rāmāyaṇa. So in the 'Adi karṇa' Vālmīki draws a picture of Rāma's kingdom where there is no fear of hunger or thieves, where the cities and villages are prosperous with abundant wealth as well as agricultural products, where all the subjects are gleeful as if they were living in the Satyayuga. This concern of the king for the subjects, as portrayed in the Rāmāyaṇa, amply demonstrates the spirit of nationalism which guided the rulers of Ayodhyā to formulate effective policies for the safety, security as well as all-round material prosperity and moral development of the subjects living in the kingdom.

**Concern for the Nation's Security:**

As the moon controls the stars, so the mighty king Daśaratha reared the whole world. Appropriately called the city of Ayodhyā, the people in Ayodhyā never marched for the battle-field. Mighty like Indra, king Daśaratha drove the government machinery with such expertise that the city of Ayodhyā was as secure as the whole state governed by the greatest man of the ancient times, Manu. Vālmīki has stated it very explicitly that the king should rule over the state with the idea of comprehensive welfare of the state in mind. For the security of the country the chief instrument is the army. Vālmīki laid emphasis on the security of the state
by emphasizing the security measures that ought to be taken by the army and thus tried to make the people conscious about national security and at the same time, laid emphasis on spreading the idea of national culture. The spread of the idea of national culture will strengthen the idea of nationalism of the people; a united and unified national life will be developed on the basis of the national and cultural values – this is what the poet really intended to suggest.

Well-trained armed forces were engaged in the interest of the security of the state. The army was kept in forts and they were supplied adequate wealth, foodstuff, water, salt, molasses, arms and weapons, machines and technicians. Strong contingent of army was stationed in capital city. The capital was a big centre of knowledge and culture. There were thousands of charioteers and infantry soldiers in the country. This army, armed with bows and arrows, was very powerful. They never debunked themselves by attacking the fleeing enemies or by breaking the rules of warfare. They were, from their own realization of the virtues of duty and honour, dutiful and loyal and their loyalty was to the king and the subjects of the kingdom. They were enthused by the idea of providing security and welfare to the people – qualities which are the root of nationalistic attitude.

Vālmīki also held that the ministers of king Daśaratha of the Ikṣvāku dynasty were all devoted to nationalistic ideas and had expertise in political governance; they could guess of other’s intentions from mere hints. They were all ever ready to perform welfare deeds. They were famous, doers of pious deeds, and always devoted to works of
governance. They ministers, hereditarily appointed, performed the works of governance under the occasional guidance of the Brahmarshis like Suyajña, Jābâli, Kāsyapa, Gautama, Mārkaṇḍeya et al. They were famous for dispensing justice and for demonstrating great spirit and forgiving. They collected information through their secret agents about what had happened or were going to happen. The ministers earnestly worked for collecting wealth for the king’s coffers and also for recruiting soldiers for the kingdom’s security. They never oppressed the doers of good deeds. They collected wealth for the king’s coffers without resorting to coercive methods. Peace reigned over the whole kingdom. The ministers accepted the advice of the elders, collected information about foreign lands. As the sun shines with its beams, so king Daśaratha shone with his loyal, strong and skilful ministers.

**Emphasis on Good Qualities of Rulers:**

It has been foregrounded from what Vâlmâki wrote that the importance of the council of ministers for the safety and advancement of the country was great. The poet categorically said that the role of the ministers for efficient governance by means of intelligence and courage and by collecting secret information was immensely important. The council of ministers used to convict and sentence the guilty/culprits after scrutinising their guilt/offence, misuse of power etc. There was no liar, wicked or adulterer in the society and the country due to the good administrative policies adopted by noble, intelligent, wise and prudent
council of ministers. There prevailed peace and tranquility in the society. It also comes out from the epic that the king should hand over the governance of the land to his progeny, when he became old and this would help the advancement of the land.

Vālmīki’s speculations about the welfare and advancement of the land have come out beautifully from the Rāmāyaṇa. When king Daśaratha decided to bestow upon Rāma the reign of Ayodhyā, he told the people of the kingdom that he had reared the kingdom as his son. He had looked after his subjects and their welfare, following the ways showed by his ancestors. He was still living after ruling over the kingdom for a very long period; he had ruled over the kingdom in accordance with the sanctions of Dharma, but then he was tired. So he desired to hand over the rule of the kingdom to his eldest son Rāma. He was sure that after Rāma’s coronation, all the three worlds would be more secure. Rāma had much greater qualities than any other, belonging to the house of Ikṣvāku. He was immensely dear to the people for his prowess. As Rāma was always devoted to truth and had divine qualities, so he was the only shelter of the people. He was like the moon in the matter of wealth and happiness of the subjects. In forgiveness he was comparable with the earth, in intellect he was like Vṛhaspati and in prowess like Indra, husband of Śāchī. He knew what constituted Dharma. He had all the qualities necessary for administering the state. He was forgiving, solacing in other’s sorrows, grateful, well-doing, unenvious, a conqueror over the passions. He served the wise, Brahmmins and the old people, for which his fame and
power had been continually increasing. He was an expert in handling the weapons used by the Gods, Asuras and human beings. He knew the four Vedas including the six Vedâṅgas. He earned fame in battles and used to keep Lakṣmaṇa as his companion whenever he went to the battlefields, to cities and towns. As the father collected information about his sons, so Râma collected information about his subjects. He had sheltered himself in Dharma, he was eager to do good and he had no taste for uncivilized talks. In the Ayodhyâkânḍa of the Râmâyana, it has been said—

दियेपुर्णे: शक्रसभो राम: सत्यपराक्रमः।
इश्वाकुपृषोधि सर्वभयो द्वातिरिक्तो विनाशये।।

All the heads of states must have control over passions. Râma never became restless even in the matter of enjoying the objects of pleasure. His anger and contentment never failed. He awarded death to those who deserved death and he never killed those who did not deserve this punishment. As the sun shines because of its own rays, so Râma shone brightly because of his own incomparable qualities. He subdued the enemies effectively and so he was so popular amongst the subjects. The earth aspired for a king like Râma who had all the good qualities, was truthful and powerful. There was none else in the world who had all such qualities.

The reflections of the Adikavi on the qualities that a true ruler must possess for doing welfare of his subjects also made it clear that the expert ruler never underestimated the enemy, worked for the growth and
development of education, commerce and agriculture, always helped to
develop the forest resource,\textsuperscript{48} cattle resource and other resources; collected
reasonable amount of taxes from the people, never misused the wealth of
the state; never slighted and debunked the highly respected people;
maintained a proper balance in attending upon virtue (dharma), earning
of wealth (artha) and enjoying pleasure (kâma); always protected the truth
and path of dharma and never acted without due consideration of time
and space;\textsuperscript{49} prudently employed the principles of Sâma etc.; kept careful
eyes on and remained vigilant about the security and welfare of the country.
Such a man was entitled to be called the ideal king in an ideal state. From
that vintage point, Râma was the ideal king or the head of the state. All
these qualities and achievements of Râma have been elaborately described
in the Ayodhyâkânda of the epic. The way the epic poet put emphasis on
the good qualities of a ruler through affording elaborate description by
means of referring to Râma's excellent qualities indicates the concern of
the sagacious poet for the welfare of the nation or in other words his
sense of nationalism.

**Security of the Capital City :**

Vâlmâki cast a glance on what should be the security arrangements
of the capital city. The length of the city of Ayodhyâ was twelve yojanas;
the breadth was three yojanas.\textsuperscript{50} There were high walls on all the four
sides of the capital, ponds of water and inaccessible canals. The high
walls could not be easily crossed, the gate of the city had impregnable
iron doors which could withstand the hits of rocks and could resist the advancement of big hostile armies. Various machines and weapons were stored up there.⁵¹ This city, inaccessible to enemies, had horses and elephants, cattle, camels and donkeys.⁵²

The armed guards lived in the city. The guards could kill powerful lions and tigers and were armed with unfailing, sharp weapons. Thus Daśaratha lived in the city guarded by thousands of great fighters.⁵³ The king of Ayodhya built the forts and citadels following the principles of security as mentioned in the ancient books of Arthasāstra. Manu says —

भन्तुद्गो महातुर्गयाम्बुर्गो ब्राह्मणेऽव।

तुतुद्गो गदिर्गुरो वा समाहिष्ठित वसेतु पुरुष॥ ⁵⁴

The forts were full with wealth, foodstuffs, weapons, water, machines, artists and archers.⁵⁵ The king had the architects build a livable abode for himself in the centre of the fort in which were constructed rooms for women, arsenal, temples and which was encircled by moats and fenced by rows of trees.⁵⁶

The descriptions given by Vālmīki on the elaborate defence arrangements of the cities of Ayodhya and also of Lākaś, shows the utmost concern of the royal personages for proper defence of the capital city. Concern and endeavours for the defence of the cities and villages in the kingdom, points out to the nationalist thoughts of the statesmen of the period of the epic. The city contained thousands of Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and gentle people who had conquered passions.⁵⁷ Even the people belonging to the lowest strata of the society like the peasants and milkmen
lived happily in the city; the people who were engaged in trade also found security there. The people who tried to achieve their goals and who abstained from doing harm to others were all provided security by the king. Indeed, high standard of moral behaviour of the people of a particular country facilitates all-round development of the nation. Vâlmîki, through narration of the qualities of the citizens of Ayodhyâ, seems to highlight the prerequisites of national development.

Vâlmîki tried to rouse nationalistic fervour in the hearts of the people through presentation of the salient features of ancient Indian cultural and ethical values.

**Protection and Welfare of the People of Bhârata:**

If we analyse the causal connection between the incidents and episodes described in the Râmâyana, we will realise that the conflict described in the epic is not between individuals, but between two cultures; they have been described as human race and Râkṣasa race. This conflict was also between two countries. We find that at the instance of the king of Lâṅkâ, Râvana, Râkṣasas like Khara and Dûśana invaded the southern part of India and established a colony there. A vast army of ogres were stationed in the janasthâna of Daṇḍakârânya. The agents of colonialism, through their army, interfered with the right to worship of the Indians, attacked the hermitages and Gurukulas and killed a number of sages. Interference with the performance of yajñas, killing the sages, looting
and squandering and putting the hermitages to fire were the misdeeds, frequently done by the Râkâsasas. But the ogres did not have the courage to attack the kingdom of powerful Vâli, the king of Vânaras and the hermitages of such sages as Agastya, Sutâkâna etc. who were influential and had expertise in the use of weapons.

Sugrâva, Hanumâna, Ari gada and other ‘Vânara’ fighters of South India were actually human beings who inhabited the forests. Vâlmâki, while describing them, used the word ‘Vanaukasaliḥ (dwellers in the woods or forest-dwellers) again and again; they were inspired by the thought of resisting and repulsing the foreign attacks on the mainland of South India (of the epic period) and so came forward to help Râma.

Vâlmâki spoke of the conflict between the human race and Râkâsas race in the light of his own senses of nationality. In the section ‘Viśvâmitra-Daśaratha Sâm vâda’ it is seen that Viśvâmitra came to Daśaratha in order to take Râma to his hermitage for defeating the Râkâsasas like Mârêa, Subâhu, Tâdakâ etc. who frequently trespassed upon India, who were hostile to human race and who tried to disturb the performance of sacrifices by the sages. The epic poet highlighted the fact that it was the duty of the king or every heroic person of the land to come forward to resist the intruders and offensive oppressors of indigenous or foreign origin who disturbed public peace and security and interfered with the religious right of the people as well as honour and dignity of the motherland.

Vâlmâki also very clearly foregrounded the idea that if national thoughts were to be translated into practice and the peace, honour and
dignity of the nation were to be protected, one had to be devoted to truth and virtue. Whenever Visvâmitra prepared to perform a yajña, two very powerful demons, Mârêa and Subâhu appeared there to cause disturbance to the yajña.\textsuperscript{69} Visvâmitra requested the great king Daśaratha to allow his eldest son Râma to accompany him and assured the king that he would protect his sons.\textsuperscript{64} The sage announced that he could himself destroy the demons, who wanted to destroy the yajña, performed for the welfare of the country; but he wanted Râma to be famous in the three worlds by killing the demons.\textsuperscript{62} But the tender-hearted Daśaratha said that as Râma was only fifteen, he could not consider the boy worthy to fight against the demons.\textsuperscript{63} As he refused to send Râma to kill the demons, Visvâmitra said that to break the promise was to sacrifice Dharma.\textsuperscript{64} Ultimately, Daśaratha agreed to send Râma with the sage. Lakṣmaṇa also accompanied Râma and the sage.\textsuperscript{65} Indra gave names of Malada and Karûśa to two countries which flourished and remained rich for long years.\textsuperscript{66} Later on a yakâ, named Tâ dakâ, who could assume any shape and had the strength of a thousand elephants, came there.\textsuperscript{67} Sunda was the husband of Tâ dakâ and Mârêa was her son and she busied herself in damaging the two countries. Nobody could control and resist her. When she tried to eat up sage Agastya, he became angry and cursed her to be transformed into a Râkasî, i.e., a men-eating repulsive-looking demoness. She angrily began destroying the place of meditation of sage Agastya. Visvâmitra inspired Râma, the descendent of Raghu to kill the yakâ, who was a doer of evil and thus to do welfare to the world by protecting the cattles and Brahmins.\textsuperscript{68} He said
to Râma that there was nobody else in the three worlds who is capable of keelling this cursed yakṣa.\textsuperscript{69}

The ruler of the land might have at times to do things which are cruel and appeared as immoral, but such deeds needed be performed for the welfare of the subjects. The Râkṣasī Tâdakâ had not a single virtue in her character, and so deserved to be killed for the protection of the people and for the welfare of the society. It is said that in the ancient times when Mantharâ, daughter of Virocana, tried to destroy the earth, Indra himself destroyed her; when the wife of sage Vîgu, mother of Sûkra-cârya, aspired for the heaven of Indra, God Visnu killed her. This means that the followers of vices and perpetrators, even if they are women, should be killed without any hesitation.

Having heard the inspiring words of Visâmitra, Râma with folded arms said that he was prepared to obey the sage for the well-being of the cattle and Brahmins and for the good of the country.\textsuperscript{70} As soon as he put the arrow on the string of the bow, Tâdakâ raised a storm of sand and enveloped Râma and Laksmâna whereas other Râkṣasas mightily attacked; Râma resisted them with the `Sabdavedî arrow.\textsuperscript{71} At this Tâdakâ attacked like a hungry reptile, and Râma shattered her breast with sharp arrows; Tâdakâ fell down and died. Indra, the king of gods, congratulated Râma for this valiant deed. Râma was praised by the gods and the semi-gods called Siddhas for killing the yakṣinī Tâdakâ.\textsuperscript{72}
Rāmāyaṇa War – An Outcome of Conflict of Two Races:

It comes out from this story that Viśvāmitra made Rāma conscious about how the Rākṣasas had been misleading the human race and even the saints and sages who had renounced the domestic life and accepted the life of meditation in the forest. It may be surmised that Rāma’s going to the forest was essential to destroy the Rākṣasas. Rāma had taken the vow that he would totally destroy the Rākṣasas to restore peace to the life of the people of the main land and to establish the right of the people to worship and to defend the dignity of women in the society. Rāma's vow and subsequent actions aimed at destroying the foreign aggressors and oppressors actually demonstrates Rāma's nationalistic fervour, which inspired him to undertake the arduous task of uprooting the oppressive regime of Laṅka thereby ensuring the safety, security and dignity of his countrymen.

On the other side, we find that Śūrpaṇakhā had planted rage in the mind of Khara telling him that Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, being the representatives of human race, were the enemies of the entire Rākṣasa race. Śūrpaṇakhā was excited over the fact that she was refused by Rāma when she approached him to become his wife; she was repulsed and punished when she begged for Lakṣmaṇa’s love and so she instigated her brother to take revenge against Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. Śūrpaṇakhā angrily told Rāma that he had not shown her any respect as he loved an ugly-looking, unfaithful, mean Śīṣṭā and tried to jump upon Śīṣṭā to kill...
her. At this Râma asked Lakṣmaṇa to take action against Śūrpaṇakhaḥ, and Lakṣmaṇa cut off her ears and nose. Śūrpaṇakhaḥ cried out furiously and fell on the ground like a thunderbolt. Khara became angry to see the blood-smeared sister and sent an army of fourteen thousand soldiers to kill Râma and Lakṣmaṇa. Râma was certain of his victory and defeat of Khara and sent away Sīhâ and Lakṣmaṇa to a cave in the mountain. Râma was surrounded by the Râkṣasas and looked like the sun surrounded by cloud. The gods, Gandharvas and sages became sad to see this. But Râma killed Trishira and Dûṣana and immediately after engaged Khara in a grim combat. Râma easily threw him out of his chariot and told him that he had killed the virtuous people, for which he with his army would follow them. The great and noble sages who had been killed by Khara would see Khara’s death and his journey to hell. In the battle Khara was completely shattered; he fell on the ground, burnt by the fire of Râma’s arrow. Râma loudly and sharply said to the Râkṣasa that the fruits of sins came fast.

After arriving at Janasthâna, this was Râma's first incident of conflict with the ogres. It becomes evident that Râma was prepared to face any adverse situation and tough challenge since he was motivated with a mission in the form of affording his countrymen a safe society to live in. The spirit of nationalism indeed inspired him to risk even most fearful prospects. When Śūrpaṇakhaḥ saw the defeat and death of Khara and Dûṣana and other Râkṣasas, she tried to instigate Râvaṇa, the king of the Râkṣasas against Râma in the name of the honour of Râkṣasas race.
Râvaṇa became influenced by the gift of the gab of Súrpanakhâ. He made the plan of kidnapping Sîâ to show the inferiority of the human race.\textsuperscript{83} He met Mârêa with a view to making the plan of kidnapping of Sîâ successful and strengthening the position of the Râkṣasas race.\textsuperscript{84} He made him assume the shape of the golden deer.\textsuperscript{85} Râvaṇa assured Mârêa that by seeing the latter in the form of a golden deer, Sîâ would certainly tell Râma and Lakṣmana to catch it. Both of them would go away from their forest-abode to catch the golden deer and Râvaṇa would be able to kidnap Sîâ without any resistance.\textsuperscript{86}

Mârêa tried his best to dissuade Râvaṇa from the suicidal path the latter wished to follow. Mârêa tried to convince Râvaṇa that what he wanted to do would being only unhappiness to the Râkṣasas and may even lead to their extinction.\textsuperscript{87} Mârêa mustered courage to point out that only the vicious, sinful, evil-mind, characterless king did what Râvaṇa was doing to destroy himself and his kith and kin.\textsuperscript{88} Mârêa also observed that it would be much better for Râvaṇa to give up the plan of kidnapping Sîâ if he really wanted to live a happy and prosperous life.\textsuperscript{89} Mârêa fearlessly counselled that Râvaṇa must know that if he kidnapped Sîâ with the help of Mârêa, neither he, nor Mârêa, nor Laṅkâ, nor the Râkṣasas would be saved.\textsuperscript{90} The advices, afforded by Mârêa, demonstrates his love for his country and his own race. The urge for the nation's welfare was so dominant in Mârêa's mind that he dared speak against the declared intention of the lord of Râkṣasas.

But Râvaṇa paid no heed to the advice of Mârêa. His sense of the
superiority of his own race was hurt by Râma and Lakṣmaṇa and so he wanted to take revenge against them. Then Mârâja agreed to obey Râvana’s orders and helped him to steal away Sîtâ. Thus, Râvana sowed the seed of the destruction of his own race though he justified his misdeed in the name of upholding racial honour and self-respect. Even though Râvana acted as a pervert, his way of justifying his misdeed exposed his own way of upholding the glory of his race. Sentiment of nationalism was the driving force behind all his adventurous deeds – during his victory-march across the three worlds and during his endeavours against Râma, the prowessed prince of Ayodhyâ. The thoughts of sustaining the supremacy of Râkṣasa race always stirred Râvana to act rightly or in a wrong way.

**Efforts for Upholding National Interests:**

With a view to saving Lâṅkâ from destruction, one of the wives of Râvana called Dhânyamâlini, tried to remove Râvaṇa’s mind from Sîtâ, telling him that Sîtâ was only a female-human being. On the other hand, the Râkṣasa maid servants instigated Sîtâ to reject human identity and enjoy happiness and love as Râvaṇa’s wife. Here also the poet foregrounded the idea of nationalism. Sîtâ firmly replied that a human female being cannot destroy her identity by becoming the wife of a Râkṣasa. This also proves the sense of self-respect, idealism and feeling of national pride, which inspired Sîtâ to withstand all pressures for accepting the king of ogres as her husband.
Sīṭā also said that a kingdom, even though rich, would be destroyed if the king was corrupt and illiterate. As Rāvana was the king of Laṅkā, this rich kingdom would be destroyed for his sinful acts. She would not be lured by wealth and pomp and grandeur. As brightness cannot be separated from the sun, so she could not be separated from Rāma. Another Rākṣasī Vikatā by name, also instigated Sīṭā to become Rāvana’s wife and threatened her that if she disagreed, she would not remain alive.

The characteristic feature of the race of Rākṣasas was to belittle the human race and this was indeed the favourite pastime of Rāvana. He slighted the human race and wanted to put obstacles on the way of their progress and to destroy them. All the Rākṣasas except only Vibhaṅga had the same mindset. By noticing the condition of Laṅkā after the incident of the kidnapping of Sīṭā, Kumbhakarṇa very angrily told Rāvana that he should have discussed the matter with them before kidnapping Sīṭā. The river Yamuna had filled the lake Yamunā before appearing on earth, but it was not possible for the river to come back once it fell into the sea. Rāvana kidnapped Sīṭā as soon as she saw her. So this advice would not be applicable to him. Before committing all these unjust crimes Rāvana ought to have discussed with them. The king who acted by following the principles of morality and justice, would not be required to repent his works. The works which were done unjustly and immorality gave the opposite result. Of course, later on because of his loyalty to the lord of his race, i.e., the Rākṣasas, Kumbhakarṇa agreed to fight for Rāvana and said that he would bring victory for Rāvana by killing Rāma. Here, we
find that though Kumbhakarna did no approve the sinful act of Râvaṇa, he was ready to join the battle for the sake of his own country and the king. Here, Kumbhakarna's sense of nationalism and also his urge for protecting national honour have been amply illustrated.

But Vibhâna told Râvaṇa point blank that none of Kumbhakarna, Indrajit, Mahâpârsa, Mahodara, Nikubha and Kumbha was worthy of opposing Râma in the battle. He also observed that as it was impossible to cross the seas with boat, so it was impossible to attain welfare with the help of ‘adharma’ or without ‘dharma’. And so the destruction of the Râkṣasa race was a certainty. Indeed, Vibhâna felt the urge to restrain Râvaṇa from sinful deeds due to his desire for the safety and welfare of Râkṣasa race. He observed that the ministers, supporting Râvaṇa are indeed enemies in the garb of friends and are appeasing him for the destruction of the Râkṣasa race. The mother of Râvaṇa and one of his old ministers told Râvaṇa for his welfare and for the welfare of the Râkṣasas to send back Śîṅhâ to Râma, with due honour for the sake of the welfare of his own kingdom. The world had witnessed the might of Râma. But Râvaṇa did not agree with these observations. In the meantime Hanumâna crossed the sea, discovered the place where Śîṅhâ was kept captive, then Râma with his army of monkey-soldiers crossed the sea and with the sound of conch marched towards Laṅkâ. Having observed all these developments, Râvaṇa’s maternal grand-father, Mâlyavan, advised Râvaṇa to sign a treaty with Râma with a view to safeguarding the country and the culture of the Râkṣasas. Here also the thoughts of national welfare
inspired Mâlyavân to speak. He knew that if a king was weaker than the enemy or as strong as the enemy, he should sign a treaty with the enemy king. The king should fight only if he is really more powerful than the enemy.¹⁰⁰

Râvaṇa’s grand-father also advised him that only a king, who had expertise in the fourteen branches of knowledge and who followed the principles of political science, could compel the enemies to submit to him and rule over them and achieve eternal glory.¹⁰¹ A king, who signed a treaty with the enemy considering the time achieved prosperity. So it would be advisable for Râvaṇa to have peace with Râma by reaching a treaty. He should submit Sêś back to Râma for he was charged with the kidnapping of Sêś.¹⁰² The gods and sages and Gandharvas all wish victory for Râma.¹⁰³ Brahmâ, the Grand-father, and the gods side with ‘dharma’ while Asuras and Râkṣasas side with ‘adharma’.¹⁰⁴ Râvaṇa had destroyed ‘dharma’ and embraced ‘adharma’.¹⁰⁵ He should reach a compromise with Râma while still there was time. In this place, Mâlyavân used the language which expresses the sense of nationalism. Mâlyavân wanted that Râvaṇa should abjure the path of animosity with Râma for ensuring the security of the Râkṣas race. It can be seen that Vibhâsana, Mâlyavân, Râvaṇa’s mother etc. gave good advice to Râvaṇa and wanted him to avoid the way to destruction, of his race and they were really inspired by the desire for the welfare of the Râkṣas race. These characters defied the policy of blind submission to the king of the Râkṣasas only in the interest of their race. All the readers can clearly feel that these characters
in the epic had the welfare of their race and nation in mind.

Râma, the defender of Indian nationalism, sent Aṅgada as his ambassador to Râvana to deliver the last warning to the lord of ogres. Aṅgada delivered the message of Râma to the king of ogres and asked him to hand over Sûryâ to her husband. He further said that otherwise Râma would destroy Râvana, the thorn (enemy) of the sages (who belonged to human race). Here Râma's determination to exterminate the tormentors of the sages and common people of India has been revealed. Before the war commenced, Râma ensured that the soldiers of his country or nation do not suffer due to mistaken identity. Many scholars have opined that the Vânara, Golaṅgula etc. were forest-dwelling tribes of South India who used totem in the form of tails, masks etc. The commands made by Râma in the ministers’ conference as narrated in the ‘Yuddha kânda’ also substantiate the observation of those scholars.

Before the actual war of Laṅkâ began, Râma opined in the council of his ministers that only seven great fighters would go to the battlefield in the human forms, so that the monkey fighters might not kill soldiers of their own army due to mistaken identity. These seven were Râma, Lakâmaṇa, Vibhâmaṇa and his four Râkâsa ministers.106 All other warriors would fight in the forms of monkeys and this would be their identifying mark –

न चौवं मानुषः रूपं कायम् हरिहिभिरहवेः।107

Thus Râma ensured that by this tactics the soldiers of his side would not attack and injure the soldiers of their own camp. Moreover, by wearing
the sign of totem of their race, the monkey soldiers would be inspired to fight for their own race and own country – this intention was also there.

During the war, when Vibhāraṇa engaged himself in a combat with the Rākṣasa known as Śatrughna, even Meghanāda tried to win him over to the side of Rāvaṇa by telling him about the glory of the Rākṣasa race. But though Vibhāraṇa belonged to the Rākṣasa race, he spoke of his dislike for the Rākṣasa culture and displayed himself as the supporter and follower of the universal and eternal Indian culture. In the war Rāvaṇa’s son, Indrajit, bound Rāma and Lakṣāna by shooting arrows that could find and hit the enemy accurately. They were relieved from pain by Garuḍa. The fierce combat between Lakṣāna and Indrajit was described by Vālmīki as the combat between the best of men and the best of Rākṣasas. In the war, when the Rākṣasas were being constantly and continuously massacred, the Rākṣasa women, afraid of the total demolition of the race, became terrified and panicky. Even Rāvaṇa’s wife, Mandodarī, lost her senses by thinking of the inevitable destruction of the Rākṣasa race in the hands of a human being. She described the defeat of Rāvaṇa in the hands of Rāma, as dishonour of the Rākṣasa race. It signifies that in the war between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, the victory of Rāma's army means the victory of the human race, including the forest-dwelling tribes of South India and the defeat of the Rākṣasa race. The two races were identified by the two distinct cultures and cultural traits. These expressions of immense grief and deep anguish by the Rākṣasa women, apprehending
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defeat, dishonour and destruction of their own race are indicative of their strong sense of nationalism.

**Pan-Indian Nationalism:**

The epic poet characterised the war between Râma and Râvana as the war between two countries. We see in the epic that when Hanumân was crossing the sea, the gods, Gandharvas and Siddhas, with a view to examining his strength, asked Surâsa, who was as mighty as the sun, to resist his advance. We find, how Hanumân, with a view to winning over Surâsa to his side, put arguments that he was the envoy of Râma and was going to Sêla at his orders and Surâsa herself belonged to Râma’s country and so she also should help Râma. This suggests that Surâsa was requested not to put on obstacle on Hanumân’s journey to Lanksâ in the interest of her own country —

तस्या: सकारः दूतोजहि गमिष्ये रामशासनात्।
कन्तुर्महिसर रामस्य साहं विषयवासिन्॥ १११

Surâsa, too, addressing Hanumân as a noble and the best among the Vânaras, asked him to go happily and bring back Sêla to Râma. ११२

It is worth telling that after Râma killed Vâli, the defeated and falled Vâli, told Râma in a note of repentance that he was indifferent to Râma and had done him no wrong and yet the prince of Ayodhyâ had used his might against the Vânara hero. ११३ Sî Râma replied —

इश्वाकृणामिहं भूमि: सातील-वन-कानना।
मृगशिशुविनवाणि निग्रहनुप्रहेद्वपि॥ ११४
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(This land with all the mountains and forests and gardens belongs to the kings of the Ikṣvāku dynasty and so the kings of that dynasty had the right to reward or punish all the beasts and birds and humans living there.)

Bharata, who was devoted to truth, strong in character and religious minded ruled over this land. Through these words Râma beautifully foregrounded Indian national consciousness. In the Viṣṇupurâṇa, the vast landmass from the Himalayas to the Indian Ocean has been described as our motherland – India that is Bhârat; in the śloka of the Râmâyana we find the reflection of the same national consciousness. North India and South India were even then the parts of an undivided Indian national consciousness and the whole landmass was under the rule of the kings of the Ikṣvâku dynasty — this idea comes out from what Râma contended. This is the idea of an undivided India and an indivisible national identity irrespective of diverse religious faiths, region, geographical features and social customs.

Râma also argued that Bharata was now the king, in him existed politics and humility as well as devotion to truth; he was mighty and had the ability to judge. Râma and other kings had been roaming over the whole earth, pursuant to the orders of Bharata, to preserve and spread the eternal life-values and culture.\textsuperscript{115} They punished the offenders who were removed from ‘dharma’, in keeping with the orders of Bharata and the principles laid down in the scriptures.\textsuperscript{116} Râma wondered who would act against ‘dharma’ when the great king Bharata, who was devoted to
‘dharma’, was ruling over the whole earth. In fact, Râma asserted that in this sacred land, the forces and agents of ‘adharma’ and the people who were against ‘dharma’ would not be allowed to live.

From the Himalayas in the north to the ocean in the south — the entire land was within the empire of the king of Ayodhyâ — in these words uttered by Râma the concept of one country — one nationality has been expressed. Probably, in those days, the boundary of India was extended to a particular landmark in the sea-shore and this is the point where Hanumân met Surasâ.

The epic poet has given a few hints at the conception of one and unified country or nation. Hanumân went to Sârâ at the orders of Râma to convey to her the news of victory after the death of Râvanâ in the battlefield. On behalf of Râma it was also conveyed to Sârâ that the rule of Râma had been established in Lârikâ. Here ‘Lârikâ’ obviously implies the whole country entitled Lârikâ.

One more hint is that before Râma was returning to Ayodhyâ he asked Sugrâva to go to Kîśkindhâ; but told Vibhâsana to stay back in his own country which had been handed over to him.

The significant thing is that Râma did not direct Sugrâva to go back to his own country though he was the king of Kîśkindhâ. The implication is that Kîśkindhâ falls within the empire of Bhârata. So Sugrâva was only
the king under the rulership of the emperor while Vibhāṣaṇa was the independent king of a different country. Though Rāma captured Laṅkâ, he handed over the responsibility of administering the people of Laṅkâ as an independent king to Vibhāṣaṇa. It is because of this that Rāma told Vibhāṣaṇa to stay back in his own country, but could not say the same thing to Sugr̥va, for his kingdom was a part of the empire of Bharata.

All these facts and evidence lead to the conclusion that Rāma-Rāvaṇa war was a war between two countries or two nations. Here the monkey soldiers under their king Sugr̥va fought against Laṅkâ, inspired by the sense of oneness with Rāma and his empire. Rāma had Rāvaṇa’s cousin Labanāsura was killed by his younger brother Śatrughna, because Labanāsura had opposed the eternal values of Indian culture and spread the terror of Rākṣasa culture.

The aforementioned discussion gives us a clean picture of Indian nationalism of the Rāmāyaṇa period. In those days, the influence of Indian culture was so deep-rooted in the entire country known as Bhārata that the Vānara soldiers of Sugr̥va fought for Rāma to preserve that culture against Rāvaṇa and Rākṣasa culture. Under the influence of value-based Indian culture and also being fostered, nurtured and reared by the sublime thoughts and benign tradition of this culture, all the people, living in one and unified Bhāratavarṣa, fought against the forces hostile to this culture, which were represented by Rāvaṇa and his followers. Ultimately, the hedonistic Rākṣasa culture and the oppressive torch-bearers of that culture was destroyed and the people of both north and south India heaved a sigh
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of relief from the offensive policies of Rāvan; the dignity of women, the freedom and peace of common people and the freedom of faith with its pristine glory were re-established throughout this vast country. The spirit of nationalism could effectively bind the people of the entire country with the bond of unity, based on common culture and life-values as well as devotion to the motherland and the champions of anarchy and oppression, hailing from another country, were served a decisive blow.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~
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