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CASTES IN INDIA

Many of us, I dare say, have witnessed local, national or international expositions of material objects that make up the sum total of human civilization. But few can entertain the idea of there being such a thing as an exposition of human institutions. Exhibition of human institutions is a strange idea; some might call it the wildest of ideas. But as students of Ethnology I hope you will not be hard on this innovation, for it is not so, and to you at least it should not be strange.

You all have visited, I believe, some historic place like the ruins of Pompeii, and listened with curiosity to the history of the remains as it flowed from the glib tongue of the guide. In my opinion a student of Ethnology, in one sense at least, is much like the guide. Like his prototype, he holds up (perhaps with more seriousness and desire of self-instruction) the social institutions to view, with all the objectiveness humanly possible, and inquires into their origin and function.

Most of our fellow students in this Seminar, which concerns itself with primitive versus modern society, have ably acquitted themselves along these lines by giving lucid expositions of the various institutions, modern or primitive, in which they are interested. It is my turn now, this evening, to entertain you, as best I can, with a paper on “Castes in India: Their mechanism, genesis and development”

I need hardly remind you of the complexity of the subject I intend to handle. Subtler minds and abler pens than mine have been brought to the task of unravelling the mysteries of Caste; but unfortunately it still remains in the domain of the “unexplained”, not to say of the “un-understood” I am quite alive to the complex intricacies of a hoary institution like Caste, but I am not so pessimistic as to relegate it to the region of the unknowable, for I believe it can be known. The caste problem is a vast one, both theoretically and practically. Practically, it is an institution that portends tremendous consequences. It is a local problem, but one capable of much wider mischief,
for “as long as caste in India does exist, Hindus will hardly intermarry or have any social intercourse with outsiders; and if Hindus migrate to other regions on earth, Indian caste would become a world problem.” Theoretically, it has defied a great many scholars who have taken upon themselves, as a labour of love, to dig into its origin. Such being the case, I cannot treat the problem in its entirety. Time, space and acumen, I am afraid, would all fail me, if I attempted to do otherwise than limit myself to a phase of it, namely, the genesis, mechanism and spread of the caste system. I will strictly observe this rule, and will dwell on extraneous matters only when it is necessary to clarify or support a point in my thesis.

To proceed with the subject. According to well-known ethnologists, the population of India is a mixture of Aryans, Dravidians, Mongolians and Scythians. All these stocks of people came into India from various directions and with various cultures, centuries ago, when they were in a tribal state. They all in turn elbowed their entry into the country by fighting with their predecessors, and after a stomachful of it settled down as peaceful neighbours. Through constant contact and mutual intercourse they evolved a common culture that superseded their distinctive cultures. It may be granted that there has not been a thorough amalgamation of the various stocks that make up the peoples of India, and to a traveller from within the boundaries of India the East presents a marked contrast in physique and even in colour to the West, as does the South to the North. But amalgamation can never be the sole criterion of homogeneity as predicated of any people. Ethnically all people are heterogeneous. It is the unity of culture that is the basis of homogeneity. Taking this for granted, I venture to say that there is no country that can rival the Indian Peninsula with respect to the unity of its culture. It has not only a geographic unity, but it has over and above all a deeper and a much more fundamental unity—the indubitable cultural unity that covers the land from end to end. But it is because of this homogeneity that Caste becomes a problem so difficult to be explained. If the Hindu Society were a mere federation of mutually exclusive units, the matter would be simple enough. But Caste is a parcelling of an already homogeneous unit, and the explanation of the genesis of Caste is the explanation of this process of parcelling.

Before launching into our field of enquiry, it is better to advise ourselves regarding the nature of a caste I will therefore draw upon a few of the best students of caste for their definitions of it:

(1) Mr. Senart, a French authority, defines a caste as “a close corporation, in theory at any rate rigorously hereditary: equipped with a certain traditional and independent organisation, including a chief and a council, meeting on occasion in assemblies of more or less plenary

authority and joining together at certain festivals: bound together by common occupations, which relate more particularly to marriage and to food and to questions of ceremonial pollution, and ruling its members by the exercise of jurisdiction, the extent of which varies, but which succeeds in making the authority of the community more felt by the sanction of certain penalties and, above all, by final irrevocable exclusion from the group”.

(2) Mr. Nesfield defines a caste as “a class of the community which disowns any connection with any other class and can neither intermarry nor eat nor drink with any but persons of their own community”.

(3) According to Sir H. Risley, “a caste may be defined as a collection of families or groups of families bearing a common name which usually denotes or is associated with specific occupation, claiming common descent from a mythical ancestor, human or divine, professing to follow the same professional callings and are regarded by those who are competent to give an opinion as forming a single homogeneous community”.

(4) Dr. Ketkar defines caste as “a social group having two characteristics: (i) membership is confined to those who are born of members and includes all persons so born; (ii) the members are forbidden by an inexorable social law to marry outside the group”.

To review these definitions is of great importance for our purpose. It will be noticed that taken individually the definitions of three of the writers include too much or too little: none is complete or correct by itself and all have missed the central point in the mechanism of the Caste system. Their mistake lies in trying to define caste as an isolated unit by itself, and not as a group within, and with definite relations to, the system of caste as a whole. Yet collectively all of them are complementary to one another, each one emphasising what has been obscured in the other. By way of criticism, therefore, I will take only those points common to all Castes in each of the above definitions which are regarded as peculiarities of Caste and evaluate them as such.

To start with Mr. Senart. He draws attention to the “idea of pollution” as a characteristic of Caste. With regard to this point it may be safely said that it is by no means a peculiarity of Caste as such. It usually originates in priestly ceremonialism and is a particular case of the general belief in purity. Consequently its necessary connection with Caste may be completely denied without damaging the working of Caste. The “idea of pollution” has been attached to the institution of Caste, only because the Caste that enjoys the highest rank is the priestly Caste: while we know that priest and purity are old associates. We may therefore conclude that the “idea of pollution” is a characteristic of Caste only in so far as Caste has a religious flavour.
Mr. Nesfield in his way dwells on the absence of messing with those outside the Caste as one of its characteristics. In spite of the newness of the point we must say that Mr. Nesfield has mistaken the effect for the cause. Caste, being a self-enclosed unit naturally limits social intercourse, including messing etc. to members within it. Consequently this absence of messing with outsiders is not due to positive prohibition, but is a natural result of Caste, i.e. exclusiveness. No doubt this absence of messing originally due to exclusiveness, acquired the prohibitory character of a religious injunction, but it may be regarded as a later growth. Sir H. Risley, makes no new point deserving of special attention.

We now pass on to the definition of Dr. Ketkar who has done much for the elucidation of the subject. Not only is he a native, but he has also brought a critical acumen and an open mind to bear on his study of Caste. His definition merits consideration, for he has defined Caste in its relation to a system of Castes, and has concentrated his attention only on those characteristics which are absolutely necessary for the existence of a Caste within a system, rightly excluding all others as being secondary or derivative in character. With respect to his definition it must, however, be said that in it there is a slight confusion of thought, lucid and clear as otherwise it is. He speaks of Prohibition of Intermarriage and Membership by Autogeny as the two characteristics of Caste. I submit that these are but two aspects of one and the same thing, and not two different things as Dr. Ketkar supposes them to be. If you prohibit intermarriage the result is that you limit membership to those born within the group. Thus the two are the obverse and the reverse sides of the same medal.

This critical evaluation of the various characteristics of Caste leave no doubt that prohibition, or rather the absence of intermarriage—endogamy, to be concise—is the only one that can be called the essence of Caste when rightly understood. But some may deny this on abstract anthropological grounds, for there exist endogamous groups without giving rise to the problem of Caste. In a general way this may be true, as endogamous societies, culturally different, making their abode in localities more or less removed, and having little to do with each other are a physical reality. The Negroes and the Whites and the various tribal groups that go by name of American Indians in the United States may be cited as more or less appropriate illustrations in support of this view. But we must not confuse matters, for in India the situation is different. As pointed out before, the peoples of India form a homogeneous whole. The various races of India occupying definite territories have more or less fused into one another and do possess cultural unity, which is the only criterion of a homogeneous population. Given this homogeneity as a basis, Caste becomes a problem altogether new in character and wholly absent in the situation constituted by the mere propinquity of endogamous social or
tribal groups. Caste in India means an artificial chopping off of the population into fixed and definite units, each one prevented from fusing into another through the custom of endogamy. Thus the conclusion is inevitable that Endogamy is the only characteristic that is peculiar to caste, and if we succeed in showing how endogamy is maintained, we shall practically have proved the genesis and also the mechanism of Caste.

It may not be quite easy for you to anticipate why I regard endogamy as a key to the mystery of the Caste system. Not to strain your imagination too much, I will proceed to give you my reasons for it.

It may not also be out of place to emphasize at this moment that no civilized society of today presents more survivals of primitive times than does the Indian society. Its religion is essentially primitive and its tribal code, in spite of the advance of time and civilization, operates in all its pristine vigour even today. One of these primitive survivals, to which I wish particularly to draw your attention is the Custom of Exogamy. The prevalence of exogamy in the primitive worlds is a fact too wellknown to need any explanation. With the growth of history, however, exogamy has lost its efficacy, and excepting the nearest blood-kins, there is usually no social bar restricting the field of marriage. But regarding the peoples of India the law of exogamy is a positive injunction even today. Indian society still savours of the clan system, even though there are no clans; and this can be easily seen from the law of matrimony which centres round the principle of exogamy, for it is not that Sapindas (blood-kins) cannot marry, but a marriage even between Sagotras (of the same class) is regarded as a sacrilege.

Nothing is therefore more important for you to remember than the fact that endogamy is foreign to the people of India. The various Gotras of India are and have been exogamous: so are the other groups with totemic organization. It is no exaggeration to say that with the people of India exogamy is a creed and none dare infringe it, so much so that, in spite of the endogamy of the Castes within them, exogamy is strictly observed and that there are more rigorous penalties for violating exogamy than there are for violating endogamy. You will, therefore, readily see that with exogamy as the rule there could be no Caste, for exogamy means fusion. But we have castes; consequently in the final analysis creation of Castes, so far as India is concerned, means the superposition of endogamy on exogamy. However, in an originally exogamous population an easy working out of endogamy (which is equivalent to the creation of Caste) is a grave problem, and it is in the consideration of the means utilized for the preservation of endogamy against exogamy that we may hope to find the solution of our problem.

Thus the superposition of endogamy on exogamy means the creation of caste. But this is not an easy affair. Let us take an imaginary group that desires to make itself into a Caste and analyse what means it will have to adopt to
make itself endogamous. If a group desires to make itself endogamous a formal injunction against intermarriage with outside groups will be of no avail, especially if prior to the introduction of endogamy, exogamy had been the rule in all matrimonial relations. Again, there is a tendency in all groups lying in close contact with one another to assimilate and amalgamate, and thus consolidate into a homogeneous society. If this tendency is to be strongly counteracted in the interest of Caste formation, it is absolutely necessary to circumscribe a circle outside which people should not contract marriages.

Nevertheless, this encircling to prevent marriages from without creates problems from within which are not very easy of solution. Roughly speaking, in a normal group the two sexes are more or less evenly distributed, and generally speaking there is an equality between those of the same age. The equality is, however, never quite realized in actual societies. At the same time to the group that is desirous of making itself into a caste the maintenance of equality between the sexes becomes the ultimate goal, for without it endogamy can no longer subsist. In other words, if endogamy is to be preserved conjugal rights from within have to be provided for, otherwise members of the group will be driven out of the circle to take care of themselves in any way they can. But in order that the conjugal rights be provided for from within, it is absolutely necessary to maintain a numerical equality between the marriageable units of the two sexes within the group desirous of making itself into a Caste. It is only through the maintenance of such an equality that the necessary endogamy of the group can be kept intact, and a very large disparity is sure to break it.

The problem of Caste, then, ultimately resolves itself into one of repairing the disparity between the marriageable units of the two sexes within it. Left to nature, the much needed parity between the units can be realized only when a couple dies simultaneously. But this is a rare contingency. The husband may die before the wife and create a surplus woman, who must be disposed of, else through intermarriage she will violate the endogamy of the group. In like manner the husband may survive his wife and be surplus man, whom the group, while it may sympathise with him for the sad bereavement, has to dispose of, else he will marry outside the Caste and will break the endogamy. Thus both the surplus man and the surplus woman constitute a menace to the Caste if not taken care of, for not finding suitable partners inside their prescribed circle (and left to themselves they cannot find any, for if the matter be not regulated there can only be just enough pairs to go round) very likely they will transgress the boundary, marry outside and import offspring that is foreign to the Caste.

Let us see what our imaginary group is likely to do with this surplus man and surplus woman. We will first take up the case of the surplus woman.
She can be disposed of in two different ways so as to preserve the endogamy of the Caste.

First: burn her on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband and get rid of her. This, however, is rather an impracticable way of solving the problem of sex disparity. In some cases it may work, in others it may not. Consequently every surplus woman cannot thus be disposed of, because it is an easy solution but a hard realization. And so the surplus woman (= widow), if not disposed of, remains in the group: but in her very existence lies a double danger. She may marry outside the Caste and violate endogamy, or she may marry within the Caste and through competition encroach upon the chances of marriage that must be reserved for the potential brides in the Caste. She is therefore a menace in any case, and something must be done to her if she cannot be burned along with her deceased husband.

The second remedy is to enforce widowhood on her for the rest of her life. So far as the objective results are concerned, burning is a better solution than enforcing widowhood. Burning the widow eliminates all the three evils that a surplus woman is fraught with. Being dead and gone she creates no problem of remarriage either inside or outside the Caste. But compulsory widowhood is superior to burning because it is more practicable. Besides being comparatively humane it also guards against the evils of remarriage as does burning; but it fails to guard the morals of the group. No doubt under compulsory widowhood the woman remains, and just because she is deprived of her natural right of being a legitimate wife in future, the incentive to immoral conduct is increased. But this is by no means an insuperable difficulty. She can be degraded to a condition in which she is no longer a source of allurement.

The problem of surplus man (= widower) is much more important and much more difficult than that of the surplus woman in a group that desires to make itself into a Caste. From time immemorial man as compared with woman has had the upper hand. He is a dominant figure in every group and of the two sexes has greater prestige. With this traditional superiority of man over woman his wishes have always been consulted. Woman, on the other hand, has been an easy prey to all kinds of iniquitous injunctions, religious, social or economic. But man as a maker of injunctions is most often above them all. Such being the case, you cannot accord the same kind of treatment to a surplus man as you can to a surplus woman in a Caste.

The project of burning him with his deceased wife is hazardous in two ways: first of all it cannot be done, simply because he is a man. Secondly, if done, a sturdy soul is lost to the Caste. There remain then only two solutions which can conveniently dispose of him. I say conveniently, because he is an asset to the group.
Important as he is to the group, endogamy is still more important, and the solution must assure both these ends. Under these circumstances he may be forced or I should say induced, after the manner of the widow, to remain a widower for the rest of his life. This solution is not altogether difficult, for without any compulsion some are so disposed as to enjoy self-imposed celibacy, or even to take a further step of their own accord and renounce the world and its joys. But, given human nature as it is, this solution can hardly be expected to be realized. On the other hand, as is very likely to be the case, if the surplus man remains in the group as an active participator in group activities, he is a danger to the morals of the group. Looked at from a different point of view celibacy, though easy in cases where it succeeds, is not so advantageous even then to the material prospects of the Caste. If he observes genuine celibacy and renounces the world, he would not be a menace to the preservation of Caste endogamy or Caste morals as he undoubtedly would be if he remained a secular person. But as an ascetic celibate he is as good as burned, so far as the material well-being of his Caste is concerned. A Caste, in order that it may be large enough to afford a vigorous communal life, must be maintained at a certain numerical strength. But to hope for this and to proclaim celibacy is the same as trying to cure atrophy by bleeding.

Imposing celibacy on the surplus man in the group, therefore, fails both theoretically and practically. It is in the interest of the Caste to keep him as a Grahastha (one who raises a family), to use a Sanskrit technical term. But the problem is to provide him with a wife from within the Caste. At the outset this is not possible, for the ruling ratio in a caste has to be one man to one woman and none can have two chances of marriage, for in a Caste thoroughly self-enclosed there are always just enough marriageable women to go round for the marriageable men. Under these circumstances the surplus man can be provided with a wife only by recruiting a bride from the ranks of those not yet marriageable in order to tie him down to the group. This is certainly the best of the possible solutions in the case of the surplus man. By this, he is kept within the Caste. By this means numerical depletion through constant outflow is guarded against, and by this endogamy morals are preserved.

It will now be seen that the four means by which numerical disparity between the two sexes is conveniently maintained are: (1) burning the widow with her deceased husband; (2) compulsory widowhood—a milder form of burning; (3) imposing celibacy on the widower and (4) wedding him to a girl not yet marriageable. Though, as I said above, burning the widow and imposing celibacy on the widower are of doubtful service to the group in its endeavour to preserve its endogamy, all of them operate as means. But means, as forces, when liberated or set in motion create an end. What then is the end that these means create? They create and perpetuate endogamy, while caste and
endogamy, according to our analysis of the various definitions of caste, are one and the same thing. Thus the existence of these means is identical with caste and caste involves these means.

This, in my opinion, is the general mechanism of a caste in a system of castes. Let us now turn from these high generalities to the castes in Hindu Society and inquire into their mechanism. I need hardly premise that there are a great many pitfalls in the path of those who try to unfold the past, and caste in India to be sure is a very ancient institution. This is especially true where there exist no authentic or written records or where the people, like the Hindus, are so constituted that to them writing history is a folly, for the world is an illusion. But institutions do live, though for a long time they may remain unrecorded and as often as not customs and morals are like fossils that tell their own history. If this is true, our task will be amply rewarded if we scrutinize the solution the Hindus arrived at to meet the problems of the surplus man and surplus woman.

Complex though it be in its general working the Hindu Society, even to a superficial observer, presents three singular uxorial customs, namely:

(i) Sati or the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband.

(ii) Enforced widowhood by which a widow is not allowed to remarry.

(iii) Girl marriage.

In addition, one also notes a great hankering after Sannyasa (renunciation) on the part of the widower, but this may in some cases be due purely to psychic disposition.

So far as I know, no scientific explanation of the origin of these customs is forthcoming even today. We have plenty of philosophy to tell us why these customs were honoured, but nothing to tell us the causes of their origin and existence. Sati has been honoured (Cf. A. K. Coomaraswamy, Sati: A Defence of the Eastern Woman in the British Sociological Review, Vol. VI, 1913) because it is a “proof of the perfect unity of body and soul” between husband and wife and of “devotion beyond the grave”, because it embodied the ideal of wifehood, which is well expressed by Uma when she said, “Devotion to her Lord is woman’s honour, it is her eternal heaven: and O Maheshvara”, she adds with a most touching human cry, “I desire not paradise itself if thou are not satisfied with me!” Why compulsory widowhood is honoured I know not, nor have I yet met with any one who sang in praise of it, though there are a great many who adhere to it. The eulogy in honour of girl marriage is reported by Dr. Ketkar to be as follows: “A really faithful man or woman ought not to feel affection for a woman or a man other than the one with whom he or she is united. Such purity is compulsory not only after marriage, but even before marriage, for that is the only correct ideal of chastity. No maiden could be considered pure if she feels love for a man other than the one
to whom she might be married. As she does not know to whom she is going to be married, she must not feel affection for any man at all before marriage. If she does so, it is a sin. So it is better for a girl to know whom she has to love before any sexual consciousness has been awakened in her.” Hence girl marriage.

This high-flown and ingenious sophistry indicates why these institutions were honoured, but does not tell us why they were practised. My own interpretation is that they were honoured because they were practised. Any one slightly acquainted with rise of individualism in the 18th century will appreciate my remark. At all times, it is the movement that is most important; and the philosophies grow around it long afterwards to justify it and give it a moral support. In like manner I urge that the very fact that these customs were so highly eulogized proves that they needed eulogy for their prevalence. Regarding the question as to why they arose, I submit that they were needed to create the structure of caste and the philosophies in honour of them were intended to popularize them, or to gild the pill, as we might say, for they must have been so abominable and shocking to the moral sense of the unsophisticated that they needed a great deal of sweetening. These customs are essentially of the nature of means, though they are represented as ideals. But this should not blind us from understanding the results that flow from them. One might safely say that idealization of means is necessary and in this particular case was perhaps motivated to endow them with greater efficacy. Calling a means an end does no harm, except that it disguises its real character; but it does not deprive it of its real nature, that of a means. You may pass a law that all cats are dogs, just as you can call a means an end. But you can no more change the nature of means thereby than you can turn cats into dogs; consequently I am justified in holding that, whether regarded as ends or as means, Sati, enforced widowhood and girl marriage are customs that were primarily intended to solve the problem of the surplus man and surplus woman in a caste and to maintain its endogamy. Strict endogamy could not be preserved without these customs, while caste without endogamy is a fake.

Having explained the mechanism of the creation and preservation of Caste in India, the further question as to its genesis naturally arises. The question or origin is always an annoying question and in the study of Caste it is sadly neglected; some have connived at it, while others have dodged it. Some are puzzled as to whether there could be such a thing as the origin of caste and suggest that “if we cannot control our fondness for the word ‘origin’, we should better use the plural form, viz. ‘origins of caste’ ”. As for myself I do not feel puzzled by the Origin of Caste in India for, as I have established before, endogamy is the only characteristic of Caste and when I say Origin of Caste I mean The Origin of the Mechanism for Endogamy.

The atomistic conception of individuals in a Society so greatly popularised—I was about to say vulgarized—in political orations is the greatest humbug. To say that individuals make up society is trivial; society is always composed of classes. It may be an exaggeration to assert the theory of class-conflict, but the existence of definite classes in a society is a fact. Their basis may differ. They may be economic or intellectual or social, but an individual in a society is always a member of a class. This is a universal fact and early Hindu society could not have been an exception to this rule, and, as a matter of fact, we know it was not. If we bear this generalization in mind, our study of the genesis of caste would be very much facilitated, for we have only to determine what was the class that first made itself into a caste, for class and caste, so to say, are next door neighbours, and it is only a span that separates the two. A Caste is an Enclosed Class.

The study of the origin of caste must furnish us with an answer to the question—what is the class that raised this “enclosure” around itself? The question may seem too inquisitorial, but it is pertinent, and an answer to this will serve us to elucidate the mystery of the growth and development of castes all over India. Unfortunately a direct answer to this question is not within my power. I can answer it only indirectly. I said just above that the customs in question were current in the Hindu society. To be true to facts it is necessary to qualify the statement, as it connotes universality of their prevalence. These customs in all their strictness are obtainable only in one caste, namely the Brahmins, who occupy the highest place in the social hierarchy of the Hindu society; and as their prevalence in non-Brahmin castes is derivative of their observance is neither strict nor complete. This important fact can serve as a basis of an important observation. If the prevalence of these customs in the non-Brahmin Castes is derivative, as can be shown very easily, then it needs no argument to prove what class is the father of the institution of caste. Why the Brahmin class should have enclosed itself into a caste is a different question, which may be left as an employment for another occasion. But the strict observance of these customs and the social superiority arrogated by the priestly class in all ancient civilizations are sufficient to prove that they were the originators of this “unnatural institution” founded and maintained through these unnatural means.

I now come to the third part of my paper regarding the question of the growth and spread of the caste system all over India. The question I have to answer is: How did the institution of caste spread among the rest of the non-Brahmin population of the country? The question of the spread of the castes all over India has suffered a worse fate than the question of genesis. And the main cause, as it seems to me, is that the two questions of spread and of origin are not separated. This is because of the common belief among scholars that the caste system has either been imposed upon the docile
population of India by a law-giver as a divine dispensation, or that it has
grown according to some law of social growth peculiar to the Indian people.

I first propose to handle the law-giver of India. Every country has its
law-giver, who arises as an incarnation (avatar) in times of emergency to set
right a sinning humanity and give it the laws of justice and morality. Manu,
the law-giver of India, if he did exist, was certainly an audacious person. If
the story that he gave the law of caste be credited, then Manu must have
been a dare-devil fellow and the humanity that accepted his dispensation
must be a humanity quite different from the one we are acquainted with. It
is unimaginable that the law of caste was given. It is hardly an exaggeration
to say that Manu could not have outlived his law, for what is that class that
can submit to be degraded to the status of brutes by the pen of a man, and
suffer him to raise another class to the pinnacle? Unless he was a tyrant
who held all the population in subjection it cannot be imagined that he
could have been allowed to dispense his patronage in this grossly unjust
manner, as may be easily seen by a mere glance at his “Institutes”. I may
seem hard on Manu, but I am sure my force is not strong enough to kill
his ghost. He lives, like a disembodied spirit and is appealed to, and I am
afraid will yet live long. One thing I want to impress upon you is that Manu
did not give the law of Caste and that he could not do so. Caste existed
long before Manu. He was an upholder of it and therefore philosophised
about it, but certainly he did not and could not ordain the present order of
Hindu Society. His work ended with the codification of existing caste rules
and the preaching of Caste Dharma. The spread and growth of the Caste
system is too gigantic a task to be achieved by the power or cunning of an
individual or of a class. Similar in argument is the theory that the Brahmins
created the Caste. After what I have said regarding Manu, I need hardly
say anything more, except to point out that it is incorrect in thought and
malicious in intent. The Brahmins may have been guilty of many things,
and I dare say they were, but the imposing of the caste system on the non-
Brahmin population was beyond their mettle. They may have helped the
process by their glib philosophy, but they certainly could not have pushed
their scheme beyond their own confines. To fashion society after one’s own
pattern! How glorious! How hard! One can take pleasure and eulogize
its furtherance, but cannot further it very far. The vehemence of my attack
may seem to be unnecessary; but I can assure you that it is not uncalled
for. There is a strong belief in the mind of orthodox Hindus that the Hindu
Society was somehow moulded into the framework of the Caste System and
that it is an organization consciously created by the Shastras. Not only does
this belief exist, but it is being justified on the ground that it cannot but
be good, because it is ordained by the Shastras and the Shastras cannot
be wrong. I have urged so much on the adverse side of this attitude, not
because the religious sanctity is grounded on scientific basis, nor to help
those reformers who are preaching against it. Preaching did not make
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the caste system neither will it unmake it. My aim is to show the falsity of
the attitude that has exalted religious sanction to the position of a scientific
explanation.

Thus the great man theory does not help us very far in solving the spread
of castes in India. Western scholars, probably not much given to hero-
worship, have attempted other explanations. The nuclei, round which have
“formed” the various castes in India, are, according to them: (1) occupation;
(2) survivals of tribal organizations etc.; (3) the rise of new belief; (4) cross-
breeding and (5) migration.

The question may be asked whether these nuclei do not exist in other
societies and whether they are peculiar to India. If they are not peculiar to
India, but are common to the world, why is it that they did not “form” caste
on other parts of this planet? Is it because those parts are holier than the
land of the Vedas, or that the professors are mistaken? I am afraid that
the latter is the truth.

In spite of the high theoretic value claimed by the several authors for
their respective theories based on one or other of the above nuclei, one
regrets to say that on close examination they are nothing more than filling
illustrations—what Matthew Arnold means by “the grand name without
the grand thing in it”. Such are the various theories of caste advanced by
Sir Denzil Ibbetson, Mr. Nesfield, Mr. Senart and Sir H. Risley. To criticise
them in a lump would be to say that they are a disguised form of the Petition
Principii of formal logic. To illustrate: Mr. Nesfield says that “function and
function only. . . was the foundation upon which the whole system of Castes
in India was built up”. But he may rightly be reminded that he does not very
much advance our thought by making the above statement, which practically
amounts to saying that castes in India are functional or occupational, which
is a very poor discovery! We have yet to know from Mr. Nesfield why is it
that an occupational group turned into an occupational caste? I would very
cheerfully have undertaken the task of dwelling on the theories of other
ethnologists, had it not been for the fact that Mr. Nesfield’s is a typical one.

Without stopping to criticize those theories that explain the caste system
as a natural phenomenon occurring in obedience to the law of disintegration,
as explained by Herbert Spencer in his formula of evolution, or as natural
as “the structural differentiation within an organism”—to employ the
phraseology of orthodox apologists—, or as an early attempt to test the laws
of eugenics—as all belonging to the same class of fallacy which regards the
caste system as inevitable, or as being consciously imposed in anticipation
of these laws on a helpless and humble population, I will now lay before
you my own view on the subject.

We shall be well advised to recall at the outset that the Hindu society, in
common with other societies, was composed of classes and the earliest known
are the (1) Brahmins or the priestly class; (2) the Kshatriya, or the military class; (3) the Vaishya, or the merchant class and (4) the Shudra, or the artisan and menial class. Particular attention has to be paid to the fact that this was essentially a class system, in which individuals, when qualified, could change their class, and therefore classes did change their personnel. At some time in the history of the Hindus, the priestly class socially detached itself from the rest of the body of people and through a closed-door policy became a caste by itself. The other classes being subject to the law of social division of labour underwent differentiation, some into large, others into very minute groups. The Vaishya and Shudra classes were the original inchoate plasm, which formed the sources of the numerous castes of today. As the military occupation does not very easily lend itself to very minute sub-division, the Kshatriya class could have differentiated into soldiers and administrators.

This sub-division of a society is quite natural. But the unnatural thing about these sub-divisions is that they have lost the open-door character of the class system and have become self-enclosed units called castes. The question is: were they compelled to close their doors and become endogamous, or did they close them of their own accord? I submit that there is a double line of answer: Some closed the door: Others found it closed against them. The one is a psychological interpretation and the other is mechanistic, but they are complementary and both are necessary to explain the phenomena of caste-formation in its entirety.

I will first take up the psychological interpretation. The question we have to answer in this connection is: Why did these sub-divisions or classes, if you please, industrial, religious or otherwise, become self-enclosed or endogamous? My answer is because the Brahmins were so. Endogamy or the closed-door system, was a fashion in the Hindu society, and as it had originated from the Brahmin caste it was whole-heartedly imitated by all the non-Brahmin sub-divisions or classes, who, in their turn, became endogamous castes. It is “the infection of imitation” that caught all these sub-divisions on their onward march of differentiation and has turned them into castes. The propensity to imitate is a deep-seated one in the human mind and need not be deemed an inadequate explanation for the formation of the various castes in India. It is so deep-seated that Walter Bagehot argues that, “We must not think of . . . imitation as voluntary, or even conscious. On the contrary it has its seat mainly in very obscure parts of the mind, whose notions, so far from being consciously produced, are hardly felt to exist; so far from being conceived beforehand, are not even felt at the time. The main seat of the imitative part of our nature is our belief, and the causes predisposing us to believe this or disinclining us to believe that are among the obscurest parts of our nature. But as to the imitative nature
of credulity there can be no doubt."\textsuperscript{3} This propensity to imitate has been made the subject of a scientific study by Gabriel Tarde, who lays down three laws of imitation. One of his three laws is that imitation flows from the higher to the lower or, to quote his own words, "Given the opportunity, a nobility will always and everywhere imitate its leaders, its kings or sovereigns, and the people likewise, given the opportunity, its nobility."\textsuperscript{4} Another of Tarde's laws of imitation is: that the extent or intensity of imitation varies inversely in proportion to distance, or in his own words "The thing that is most imitated is the most superior one of those that are nearest. In fact, the influence of the model's example is efficacious inversely to its distance as well as directly to its superiority. Distance is understood here in its sociological meaning. However distant in space a stranger may be, he is close by, from this point of view, if we have numerous and daily relations with him and if we have every facility to satisfy our desire to imitate him. This law of the imitation of the nearest, of the least distant, explains the gradual and consecutive character of the spread of an example that has been set by the higher social ranks."\textsuperscript{5}

In order to prove my thesis—which really needs no proof—that some castes were formed by imitation, the best way, it seems to me, is to find out whether or not the vital conditions for the formation of castes by imitation exist in the Hindu Society. The conditions for imitation, according to this standard authority are: (1) that the source of imitation must enjoy prestige in the group and (2) that there must be "numerous and daily relations" among members of a group. That these conditions were present in India there is little reason to doubt. The Brahmin is a semi-god and very nearly a demi-god. He sets up a mode and moulds the rest. His prestige is unquestionable and is the fountain-head of bliss and good. Can such a being, idolised by scriptures and venerated by the priest-ridden multitude, fail to project his personality on the suppliant humanity? Why, if the story be true, he is believed to be the very end of creation. Such a creature is worthy of more than mere imitation, but at least of imitation; and if he lives in an endogamous enclosure, should not the rest follow his example? Frail humanity! Be it embodied in a grave philosopher or a frivolous housemaid, it succumbs. It cannot be otherwise. Imitation is easy and invention is difficult.

Yet another way of demonstrating the play of imitation in the formation of castes is to understand the attitude of non-Brahmin classes towards those customs which supported the structure of caste in its nascent days until, in the course of history, it became embedded in the Hindu mind and hangs there to this day without any support—for now it needs no prop but belief—like

\textsuperscript{3} Physics and Politics, 1915, p. 60.
\textsuperscript{4} Laws of Imitation, Tr. by E.C. Parsons, 2nd edition, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. 224.
a weed on the surface of a pond. In a way, but only in a way, the status of a
caste in the Hindu Society varies directly with the extent of the observance of
the customs of Sati, enforced widowhood, and girl marriage. But observance
of these customs varies directly with the distance (I am using the word in
the Tardian sense) that separates the caste. Those castes that are nearest
to the Brahmins have imitated all the three customs and insist on the strict
observance thereof. Those that are less near have imitated enforced widowhood
and girl marriage; others, a little further off, have only girl marriage and
those furthest off have imitated only the belief in the caste principle. This
imperfect imitation, I dare say, is due partly to what Tarde calls “distance”
and partly to the barbarous character of these customs. This phenomenon
is a complete illustration of Tarde’s law and leaves no doubt that the whole
process of caste-formation in India is a process of imitation of the higher by
the lower. At this juncture I will turn back to support a former conclusion
of mine, which might have appeared to you as too sudden or unsupported.
I said that the Brahmin class first raised the structure of caste by the
help of those three customs in question. My reason for that conclusion was
that their existence in other classes was derivative. After what I have said
regarding the role of imitation in the spread of these customs among the
non-Brahmin castes, as means or as ideals, though the imitators have not
been aware of it, they exist among them as derivatives; and, if they are
derived, there must have been prevalent one original caste that was high
enough to have served as a pattern for the rest. But in a theocratic society,
who could be the pattern but the servant of God?

This completes the story of those that were weak enough to close their
doors. Let us now see how others were closed in as a result of being closed out.
This I call the mechanistic process of the formation of caste. It is mechanistic
because it is inevitable. That this line of approach, as well as the psychological
one, to the explanation of the subject has escaped my predecessors is entirely
due to the fact that they have conceived caste as a unit by itself and not as
one within a System of Caste. The result of this oversight or lack of sight has
been very detrimental to the proper understanding of the subject matter and
therefore its correct explanation. I will proceed to offer my own explanation
by making one remark which I will urge you to bear constantly in mind. It
is this: that caste in the singular number is an unreality. Castes exist only
in the plural number. There is no such thing as a caste: There are always
castes. To illustrate my meaning: while making themselves into a caste, the
Brahmins, by virtue of this, created non-Brahmin caste; or, to express it in my
own way, while closing themselves in they closed others out. I will clear my
point by taking another illustration. Take India as a whole with its various
communities designated by the various creeds to which they owe allegiance,
to wit, the Hindus, Mohammedans, Jews, Christians and Parsis. Now,
barring the Hindus, the rest within themselves are non-caste communities.
But with respect to each other they are castes. Again, if the first four enclose themselves, the Parsis are directly closed out, but are indirectly closed in. Symbolically, if Group A wants to be endogamous, Group B has to be so by sheer force of circumstances.

Now apply the same logic to the Hindu society and you have another explanation of the “fissiparous” character of caste, as a consequence of the virtue of self-duplication that is inherent in it. Any innovation that seriously antagonises the ethical, religious and social code of the Caste is not likely to be tolerated by the Caste, and the recalcitrant members of a Caste are in danger of being thrown out of the Caste, and left to their own fate without having the alternative of being admitted into or absorbed by other Castes. Caste rules are inexorable and they do not wait to make nice distinctions between kinds of offence. Innovation may be of any kind, but all kinds will suffer the same penalty. A novel way of thinking will create a new Caste for the old ones will not tolerate it. The noxious thinker respectfully called Guru (Prophet) suffers the same fate as the sinners in illegitimate love. The former creates a caste of the nature of a religious sect and the latter a type of mixed caste. Castes have no mercy for a sinner who has the courage to violate the code. The penalty is excommunication and the result is a new caste. It is not peculiar Hindu psychology that induces the excommunicated to form themselves into a caste; far from it. On the contrary, very often they have been quite willing to be humble members of some caste (higher by preference) if they could be admitted within its fold. But castes are enclosed units and it is their conspiracy with clear conscience that compels the excommunicated to make themselves into a caste. The logic of this obdurate circumstance is merciless, and it is in obedience to its force that some unfortunate groups find themselves enclosed, because others in enclosing, themselves have closed them out, with the result that new groups (formed on any basis obnoxious to the caste rules) by a mechanical law are constantly being converted into castes to a bewildering multiplicity. Thus is told the second tale in the process of Caste formation in India.

Now to summarise the main points of my thesis. In my opinion there have been several mistakes committed by the students of Caste, which have misled them in their investigations. European students of Caste have unduly emphasised the role of colour in the Caste system. Themselves impregnated by colour prejudices, they very readily imagined it to be the chief factor in the Caste problem. But nothing can be farther from the truth, and Dr. Ketkar is correct when he insists that “All the princes whether they belonged to the so-called Aryan race, or the so-called Dravidian race, were Aryas. Whether a tribe or a family was racially Aryan or Dravidian was a question which never troubled the people of India, until foreign scholars came in and began to draw the line. The colour of the skin had long ceased to be a matter of
importance."\(^6\) Again, they have mistaken mere descriptions for explanation and fought over them as though they were theories of origin. There are occupational, religious etc., castes, it is true, but it is by no means an explanation of the origin of Caste. We have yet to find out why occupational groups are castes; but this question has never even been raised. Lastly they have taken Caste very lightly as though a breath had made it. On the contrary, Caste, as I have explained it, is almost impossible to be sustained: for the difficulties that it involves are tremendous. It is true that Caste rests on belief, but before belief comes to be the foundation of an institution, the institution itself needs to be perpetuated and fortified. My study of the Caste problem involves four main points: (1) that in spite of the composite make-up of the Hindu population, there is a deep cultural unity; (2) that caste is a parcelling into bits of a larger cultural unit; (3) that there was one caste to start with and (4) that classes have become Castes through imitation and excommunication.

Peculiar interest attaches to the problem of Caste in India today; as persistent attempts are being made to do away with this unnatural institution. Such attempts at reform, however, have aroused a great deal of controversy regarding its origin, as to whether it is due to the conscious command of a Supreme Authority, or is an unconscious growth in the life of a human society under peculiar circumstances. Those who hold the latter view will, I hope, find some food for thought in the standpoint adopted in this paper. Apart from its practical importance the subject of Caste is an all absorbing problem and the interest aroused in me regarding its theoretic foundations has moved me to put before you some of the conclusions, which seem to me well founded, and the grounds upon which they may be supported. I am not, however, so presumptuous as to think them in any way final, or anything more than a contribution to a discussion of the subject. It seems to me that the car has been shunted on wrong lines, and the primary object of the paper is to indicate what I regard to be the right path of investigation, with a view to arrive at a serviceable truth. We must, however, guard against approaching the subject with a bias. Sentiment must be outlawed from the domain of science and things should be judged from an objective standpoint. For myself I shall find as much pleasure in a positive destruction of my own ideology, as in a rational disagreement on a topic, which, notwithstanding many learned disquisitions is likely to remain controversial forever. To conclude, while I am ambitious to advance a Theory of Caste, if it can be shown to be untenable I shall be equally willing to give it up.

\(^6\) History of Caste, p. 82.
Having regard to these close resemblances between Grahasthashram and Vanaprastha and between Vanaprastha and Sannyas it is difficult to understand why Manu recognized this third ashram of Vanaprastha in between Grahasthashram and Sannyas as an ashram distinct and separate from both. As a matter of fact, there could be only three ashrams: (1) Bramhacharya, (2) Grahasthashram and (3) Sannyas. This seems to be also the view of Shankaracharya who in his Brahma Sutra in defending the validity of Sannyas against the Purva Mimansa School speaks only of three ashramas.

Where did Manu get this idea of Vanaprastha Ashram? What is his source? As has been pointed out above, Grahasthashram was not the next compulsory stage of life after Brahmacharya. A Brahmachari may at once become Sannyasi without entering the stage of Grahasthashram. But there was also another line of life which a Brahmachari who did not wish to marry immediately could adopt namely to become Aranas or Aranamanas. They were Brahmacharies who wish to continue the life of Study without marrying. These Aranas lived in hermitages in forests outside the villages or centres of population. The forests where these Arana ascetics lived were called Aranyakas. It is obvious that Manu's Vanaprastha is the original Arana with two differences (1) he has compelled Arana to enter the marital state and (2) the arana stage instead of being the second stage is prescribed as the third stage. The whole scheme of Manu rest in the principle that marriage is compulsory. A Brahmachari if he wishes to become a Sannyasi he must become a Vanaprastha and if he wishes to become a Vanaprastha he must become a Grasthashrami i.e., he must marry. Manu made escape from marriage impossible. Why?

RIDDLE NO.18

MANU'S MADNESS OR THE BRAHMANIC EXPLANATION OF THE ORIGIN OF THE MIXED CASTES

A reader of the Manu Smriti will find that Manu for the purposes of his discussion groups the various castes under certain specific heads namely (1) Aryan Castes, (2) Non-Aryan Castes, (3) Vratya Castes, (4) Fallen Castes and (5) Sankara Castes.

By Aryan Castes he means the four varnas namely Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. In other words, Manu regards the system of Chatur-varna to be the essence of Aryanism. By Non-Aryan Castes he means those
communities who do not accept the creed of Chaturvarna and he cites the community called Dasyu as an illustration of those whom he regards as a Non-Aryan community. By Vratyas he means those castes who were once believers in the Chaturvarna but who had rebelled against it. The list of Vratyas given by Manu includes the following castes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vratya Brahmanas</th>
<th>Vratya Kshatriyas</th>
<th>Vratya Vaishyas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Dravida.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is about 20-page MS on the origin of the mixed castes. Through the original typed MS several handwritten pages are inserted by the author and the text has been modified with several amendments pasted on the pages.—Ed.

In the list of Fallen Castes Manu includes those Kshatriyas who have become Shudras by reason of the disuse of Aryan rites and ceremonies and loss of services of the Brahmin priests. They are enumerated by Manu as under:

1. Paundrakas
2. Cholas
3. Dravidas
4. Kambhojas
5. Yavananas
6. Sakas
7. Paradas
8. Pahlivas
9. Chinas
10. Kiratas
11. Daradas

By Sankara Castes Manu means Castes the members of which are born of parents who do not belong to the same caste.

These mixed castes he divides into various categories (1) Progeny of different Aryan Castes which he subdivides into two classes (a) Anuloma and (b) Pratiloma, (2) Progeny of Anuloma and Pratiloma Castes and (3) Progeny of Non-Aryan and the Aryan Anuloma and Pratiloma Castes. Those included by Manu under the head of mixed castes are shown below under different categories:
1. PROGENY OF MIXED ARYAN CASTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Progeny known as</th>
<th>Anuloma or Pratiloma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Ambashta</td>
<td>Anuloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Nishad (Parasava)</td>
<td>Anuloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Suta</td>
<td>Pratiloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Ugra</td>
<td>Anuloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Vaidehaka</td>
<td>Pratiloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Magadha</td>
<td>Pratiloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Karana</td>
<td>Anuloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Chandala</td>
<td>Pratiloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Ksattri</td>
<td>Pratiloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
<td>Pratiloma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROGENY OF ARYAN CASTES WITH ANULOMA-PRATILOMA CASTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Progeny Known As</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brahman</td>
<td>Ugra</td>
<td>Avrita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brahman</td>
<td>Ambashta</td>
<td>Dhigvana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brahman</td>
<td>Nishada</td>
<td>Kukutaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shudra</td>
<td>Abhira</td>
<td>Abhira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PROGENY OF MIXED MARRIAGES BETWEEN ANULOMA AND PRATILOMA CASTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Progeny known as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vaideha</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
<td>Maitreyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nishada</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
<td>Margava (Das)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaivarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nishada</td>
<td>Vaideha</td>
<td>Karavara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vaidehaka</td>
<td>Ambashta</td>
<td>Vena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vaidehaka</td>
<td>Karavara</td>
<td>Andhra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vaidehaka</td>
<td>Nishada</td>
<td>Meda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chandala</td>
<td>Vaideha</td>
<td>Pandusopaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nishada</td>
<td>Vaideha</td>
<td>Ahindaka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Manu's list of Sankar (mixed) Castes additions have been made by his successors. Among these are the authors of Aushanas Smriti, Baudhayana Smriti, Vashishta Smriti, Yajnavalkya Smriti and the Suta Sanhita.

Of these additions four have been made by the Aushanas Smriti. They are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the mixed caste</th>
<th>Father's caste</th>
<th>Mother's caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pulaksa</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yekaj</td>
<td>Pulaksa</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Charmakarka</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Venuka</td>
<td>Suta</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following four are added by the Baudhayana Smriti:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the mixed caste</th>
<th>Father's caste</th>
<th>Mother's caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kshatriya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brahmana</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vaina</td>
<td>Vaidehaka</td>
<td>Ambashta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shvapaka</td>
<td>Ugra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vashishta Smriti adds one to the list of Manu, namely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Mixed caste</th>
<th>Father's caste</th>
<th>Mother's caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaina</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Yajnavalkya Smriti adds two new castes to Manu's list of mixed castes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of mixed caste</th>
<th>Father's caste</th>
<th>Mother's caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Murdhavasika</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mahisya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Additions made by the author of the Suta Sanhita are on a vast scale. They number sixty-three castes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the mixed caste</th>
<th>Father's caste</th>
<th>Mother's caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ambashteya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Urdhvanapita</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Katkar</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kumbhkar</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kunda</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Married Brahmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Golaka</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Brahmin Widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chakri</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Daushantya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Daushantee</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pattanshali</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pulinda</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bahyadas</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bhoja</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mahikar</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Manavika</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mleccha</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Shalika</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Shundika</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Shulikha</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Saparna</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Agneyanartaka</td>
<td>Ambashta</td>
<td>Ambashta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Apitar</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Daushanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Ashramaka</td>
<td>Dantakevala</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Udabandha</td>
<td>Sanaka</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Karana</td>
<td>Nata</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Karma</td>
<td>Karana</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Karmakar</td>
<td>Renuka</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Karmar</td>
<td>Mahishya</td>
<td>Karana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Kukkunda</td>
<td>Magadha</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Guhaka</td>
<td>Swapach</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Charmopajivan</td>
<td>Vaidehika</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Chamakar</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Charmajivi</td>
<td>Nishad</td>
<td>Karushi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Taksha</td>
<td>Mahishya</td>
<td>Karana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Takshavriti</td>
<td>Ugra</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Dantakavelaka</td>
<td>Chandala</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dasyu</td>
<td>Nishad</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Drumila</td>
<td>Nishad</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Second Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nata</td>
<td>Picchalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Napita</td>
<td>Nishada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Niladivarnavikreta</td>
<td>Ayogava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Piccahalla</td>
<td>Malla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pingala</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bhaglabdha</td>
<td>Daushanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Bharusha</td>
<td>Sudhanva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Bhairava</td>
<td>Nishada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Matanga</td>
<td>Vijanma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Madhuka</td>
<td>Vaidehika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Matakar</td>
<td>Dasyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Maitra</td>
<td>Vijanma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Rajaka</td>
<td>Vaideha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Rathakar</td>
<td>Mahishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Renuka</td>
<td>Napita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Lohakar</td>
<td>Mahishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vardhaki</td>
<td>Mahishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Varya</td>
<td>Sudhanva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Vijanma</td>
<td>Bharusha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Shilp</td>
<td>Mahishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Shvapach</td>
<td>Chandala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Sanaka</td>
<td>Magadha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Samudra</td>
<td>Takashavrati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Satvata</td>
<td>Vijanma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sunishada</td>
<td>Nishad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the five categories of castes it is easy to understand the explanation given by Manu as regards the first four. But the same cannot be said in respect of his treatment of the fifth category namely the Sankar (mixed) caste. There are various questions that begin to trouble the mind. In the first place Manu’s list of mixed castes is a perfunctory list. It is not an exhaustive list, stating all the possibilities of Sankar.

In discussing the mixed castes born out of the mixture of the Aryan castes with the Anuloma-Pratiloma castes, Manu should have specified the names of castes which are the progeny of each of the four Aryan castes with each of the 12 Anuloma-Pratiloma castes. If he had done so we should have had a list of forty-eight resulting castes. As a matter of fact he states only the names of four castes of mixed marriages of this category.
In discussing the progeny of mixed marriages between Anuloma-Pratiloma castes given the fact that we have 12 of them, Manu should have given the names of 144 resulting castes. As a matter of fact, Manu only gives a list of 11 castes. In the formation of these 11 castes, Manu gives five possible combinations of 5 castes only. Of these one (Vaideha) is outside the Anuloma-Pratiloma list. The case of the 8 are not considered at all.

His account of the Sankar castes born out of the Non-Aryan and the Aryan castes is equally discrepant. We ought to have had first a list of castes resulting from a combination between the Non-Aryans with each of the four Aryan castes. We have none of them. Assuming that there was only one Non-Aryan caste—Dasyu—we ought to have had a list of 12 castes resulting from a conjugation of Dasyus with each of the Anuloma-Pratiloma castes. As a matter of fact we have in Manu only one conjugation.

In the discussion of this subject of mixed castes Manu does not consider the conjugation between the Vratyas and the Aryan castes, the Vratyas and the Anuloma-Pratiloma castes, the Vratyas and the Non-Aryan castes.

Among these omissions by Manu there are some that are glaring as well as significant. Take the case of Sankar between Brahmins and Kshatriyas. He does not mention the caste born out of the Sankar between these two. Nor does he mention whether the Sankar caste begotten of these two was a Pratiloma or Anuloma. Why did Manu fail to deal with this question. Is it to be supposed that such a Sankar did not occur in his time? Or was he afraid to mention it? If so, of whom was he afraid?

Some of the names of the mixed castes mentioned by Manu and the other Smritikaras appear to be quite fictitious.

For some of the communities mentioned as being of bastard origin have never been heard of before Manu. Nor does any one know what has happened to them since. They are today non-existent without leaving any trace behind. Caste is an insoluble substance and once a caste is formed it maintains its separate existence, unless for any special reason it dies out. This can happen but to a few.

Who are the Ayogava, Dhigvana, Ugra, Pukkasa, Svapaka, Svapacha, Pandusopaka, Ahindaka, Bandika, Malta, Mahikar, Shalika, Shundika, Shulika, Yekaj, Kukunda to mention only a few. Where are they? What has happened to them?

Let us now proceed to compare Manu with the rest of Smritikars. Are they unanimous on the origin of the various mixed castes referred to by them? Far from it compare the following cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smriti</th>
<th>Father's caste</th>
<th>Mother's caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 AYOGAVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Aushanas</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yajnavalkya</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Baudhayana</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Agni Purana</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UGRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Aushanas</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yajnavalkya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Vashishtha</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Suta</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>III NISHADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Aushanas</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Baudhayana</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yajnavalkya</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Suta</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Suta</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Vashishta</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IV PUKKASA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Nishada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Brihad-Vishnu</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Brihad-Vishnu</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>V MAGADHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Suta</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Baudhayana</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yajnavalkya</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Brihad Vishnu</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Brihad Vishnu</td>
<td>Shudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Brihad Vishnu</td>
<td>Vaishya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VI RATHAKAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If these different Smritikaras are dealing with facts about the origin and genesis of the mixed castes mentioned above how can such a wide difference of opinion exist among them? The conjugation of two castes can logically produce a third mixed caste. But how the conjugation of the same two castes produce a number of different castes? But this is exactly what Manu and his followers seem to be asserting. Consider the following cases:

I. Conjugation of Kshatriya father and Vaishya mother.
   1. Baudhayana says that the caste of the progeny is Kshatriya.
   2. Yajnavalkya says it is Mahishya.
   3. Suta says it is Ambashta.

II. Conjugation of Shudra father and Kshatriya mother—
   1. Manu says the Progeny is Ksattri.
   2. Aushanas says it is Pullaksa.
   3. Vashishta says it is Vaina.

III. Conjugation of Brahmana father and Vaishya mother.
   1. Manu says that the progeny is called Ambashta.
   2. Suta once says it is called Urdhava Napita but again says it is called Kumbhakar.

IV. Conjugation of Vaishya father and Kshatriya mother—
   1. Manu says that the progeny is called Magadha.
   2. Suta states that (1) Bhoja, (2) Mleccha, (3) Shalik and (4) Pulinda are the Progenies of this single conjugation.

V. Conjugation of Kshatriya father and Shudra mother—
   1. Manu says that the progeny is called Ugra.
   2. Suta says that (1) Daushantya, (2) Daushantee and (3) Shulika are the progenies of this single conjugation.

VI. Conjugation of Shudra father and Vaishya mother—
   1. Manu says the progeny is called Ayogava.
   2. Suta says the progeny is (1) Pattanshali and (2) Chakri. Let us take up another question. Is Manu's explanation of the genesis of the mixed castes historically true?

To begin with the Abhira. According to Manu the Abhiras are the bastards born of Brahmin males and Ambashta females. What does history say about them?
History says that the Abhiras (the corrupt form of which is Ahira) were pastoral tribes which inhabited the lower districts of the North-West as far as Sindh. They were a ruling independent tribe and according to the Vishnu Purana the Abhiras conquered Magadha and reigned there for several years.

The Ambashtasays Manu are the bastards born of Brahmana male and Vaishya female. Patanjali speaks of Ambashtyas as those who are the natives of a country called Ambashta. That the Ambashtas were an independent tribe is beyond dispute. The Ambashtas are mentioned by Megasthenes the Greek Ambassador at the Court of Chandragupta Maurya as one of the tribes living in the Punjab who fought against Alexander when he invaded India. The Ambashtas are mentioned in the Mahabharata. They were reputed for their political system and for their bravery.

The Andhrasays Manu are bastards of second degree in so far as they are the progeny of Vaidehaka male and Karavara female both of which belong to bastard castes. The testimony of history is quite different. The Andhras are a people who inhabited that part of the country which forms the eastern part of the Deccan Plateau. The Andhras are mentioned by Megasthenes. Pliny the Elder (77 A.D.) refers to them as a powerful tribe enjoying paramount sway over their land in the Deccan, possessed numerous villages, thirty walled towns defended by moats and lowers and supplies their king with an immense army consisting of 1,00,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants.

According to Manu the Magadhas are bastards born of Vaishya male and Kshatriya female, panini the Grammarian gives quite a different derivation of 'Magadha'. According to him "Magadha" means a person who comes from the country known as Magadha. Magadha corresponds roughly to the present Patna and Gaya districts of Bihar. 'The Magadhas have been mentioned as independent sovereign people right from the earliest times. They are first mentioned in the Atharva-Veda. The famous Jarasandha was the king of Magadha who was a contemporary of the Pandavas.

According to Manu the Nishadas are the bastards born caste from Brahmin males and Shudra females. History has quite a different talc to tell. The Nishadas were a native tribe with its own independent territory and its own kings. They are a very ancient tribe. The Ramayana mentions Guha as the King of Nishadas whose capital was Sringaverapura and who showed hospitality to Rama when he was undergoing excile in the forest.

As to the Vaidehaka Manu says that they are the bastards born of Vaishya Male and Brahmin female. Etymologically Vaidehaka means a person who is a native of the country called Videha Ancient Videha corresponds to the modern districts of Champaran and Darbhanga in Bihar. The country and its people have been known to history from a very remote antiquity. The Yajur-Veda mentions
them. Ramayana refers to them. Sita the wife of Rama is the daughter of Janak who was the king of Videha and whose capital was Mithila.

Many more cases could be examined. Those that have been are quite sufficient to show how Manu has perverted history and defamed the most respectable and powerful tribes into bastards. This wholesale bastardization of huge communities Manu did not apply to the Vratyas. But his successors carried the scheme further and bastardized the Vratyas also. Kama in Manu is Vratya. But the Brahma Vaivarta Purana makes them Bastards and says that they are the progeny of Vaishya father and Shudra mother. Paundraka in Manu is Vratya. But in the Brahma Vaivarta Purana he is a bastard born of Vaishya father and Chundi mother. Malla in Manu is Vratya. But in the Brahma Vaivarta Purana he is a bastard horn of Letta father and Tibara mother. The Vhrijakautakas are Vratya Brahmanas according to Manu. But in the Gautama Sanhita they are bastards born from a Brahman father and Vaishya mother. The Yavanas were declared by Manu as Vratya Kshatriya. But in Gautama Sanhita they are shown as bastards born of a Kshatriya father and Shudra mother.

The Kiratas are according to Manu Vratya Kshatriyas. But the Ballalacharitta makes them bastards horn from Vaishya father and Brahmin mother.

It is quite clear that some of the communities mentioned by Manu as being bastard in origin far from being bastard were independent in origin and yet Manu and the rest of the Smratikara’s call them Bastards. Why this madness on their part? Is there a method in their madness?

Having regard to all these considerations it is a riddle why Manu at all raised the question of mixed castes and what he wanted to say about them?

It is possible that Manu had realized that the Chaturvarna had failed and that the existence of a large number of castes which should neither be described as Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras was the best proof of the break down of the Chaturvarna and that he was therefore called upon to explain how these castes who were outside the Chaturvarna came into existence notwithstanding the rule of Chaturvarnas.

But did Manu realize how terrible is the Explanation which he has given? What does his explanation amount to?

What a reflection on the character of men and particularly of women. It is obvious that the unions of men and women must have been clandestine because prohibited by the rule of Chaturvarna. Such clandestine unions could take place only here and there. They could not have taken place on a wholesale scale. But unless one assumes a wholesale state of promiscuity how can one justify the origin of the Chandals or untouchables as given by Manu.

The caste of Chandala is said by Manu to be the progeny of illegitimate intercourse between a Shudra male and a Brahman female. Can this be true? It
means that Brahmin women must have been very lax in their morality and must have had special sexual attraction for the Shudra'. This is unbelievable.

So vast is the Chandala population that even if every Brahmin female was a mistress of a Shudra it could not account of the vast number of Chandalas in the country.

Did Manu realize by propounding his theory of the origin of the mixed castes he was assigning an ignoble origin to a vast number of the people of this country leading to their social and moral degradation. Why did he say that the castes were mixed in origin, when as a matter of fact they were independent in their existence?

RIDDLE NO. 19

THE CHANGE FROM PATERNITY TO MATERNITY. WHAT DID THE BRAHMINS WISH TO GAIN BY IT?

Mr. Mayne in his treatise on Hindu law has pointed out some anomalous features of the rules of Kinships. He says:

"No part of the Hindu Law is more anomalous than that which governs the family relations. Not only does there appear to be a complete break of continuity between the ancient system and that which now prevails, but the different parts of the ancient system appear in this respect to be in direct conflict with each other. We find a law of inheritance, which assumes the possibility of tracing male ancestors in an unbroken pedigree extending to fourteen generations; while coupled with it is a family law, in which several admitted forms of marriage are only euphemisms for seduction and rape, and in which twelve sorts of sons are recognized, the majority of whom have no blood relationship to their own father." The existence of this anomaly is a fact and will be quite clear to those who care to study the Hindu Law of marriage and paternity.


The Brahma marriage is the gift of a daughter, clothed and decked to a man learned in the Veda, whom her father voluntarily invites and respectfully receives. The Daiva marriage consists of the giving of the daughter by father to the family priest attending a sacrifice at the time of the payment of the sacrificial fee and in lieu of it.

Arsha marriage is characterized by the fact that the bridegroom has to pay a price for the bride to the father of the bride.

Prajapatya form of marriage is marked by the application of a man for a girl to be his wife and the granting of the application by the father of the girl.
The difference between Prajapatya and Brahma marriage lies in the fact that in the latter the gift of the daughter is made by the father voluntarily but has to be applied for. The fifth or the Asura form of marriage is that in which the bridegroom having given as much wealth as he can afford to the father and paternal kinsmen and to the girl herself takes her as his wife. There is not much difference between Arsha and Asura forms of marriage. Both involve sale of the bride. The difference lies in this that in the Arsha form the price is fixed while in the Asura form it is not.

Gandharva marriage is a marriage by consent contracted from nonreligious and sensual motives. Marriage by seizure of a maiden by force from her house while she weeps and calls for assistance after her kinsmen and friends have been slain in battle or wounded and their houses broken open, is the marriage styled Rakshasa.

Paisacha marriage is marriage by rape on a girl either when she is asleep or flushed with strong liquor or disordered in her intellect.


The Aurasa is a son begotten by a man himself upon his lawfully wedded wife.

Pautrikaputra means a son born to a daughter. Its significance lies in the system under which a man who had a daughter but no son could also have his daughter to cohabit with a man selected or appointed by him. If a daughter gave birth to a son by such sexual intercourse the son became the son of the girl's father. It was because of this that the son was called Putrikaputra. Man's right to compel his daughter to submit to sexual intercourse with a man of his choice in order to get a son for himself continued to exist even after the daughter was married. That is why a man was warned not to marry a girl who had no brothers.

Kshetraja literally means son of the field i.e., of the wife. In Hindu ideology the wife is likened to the field and the husband being likened to the master of the field. Where the husband was dead, or alive but impotent or incurably diseased the brother or any other sapinda of the deceased was appointed by the family to procreate a son on the wife. The practice was called Niyoga and the son so begotten was called Ksheiraja.

If an unmarried daughter living in the house of her father has through illicit intercourse given birth to a son and if she subsequently was married the son before marriage was claimed by her husband as his son. Such a son was called Kanina.
The *Gudhaja* was apparently a son born to a woman while the husband had access to her but it is suspected that he is born of an adulterous connection. As there is no proof by an irrebuttable presumption so to say the husband is entitled to claim the son as his own. He is called *Gudhaja* because his birth is clouded in suspicious. *Gudha* meaning suspicion.

*Sahodhaja* is a son born to a woman who was pregnant at the time of her marriage. It is not certain whether he is the son of the husband who had access to the mother before marriage or whether it is the case of a son begotten by a person other than the husband. But it is certain that the *Sahodhaja*, is a son born to a pregnant maiden and claimed as his son by the man who marries her.

*Punarhhava* is the son of a woman who abandoned by her husband and having lived with others, re-enters his family. It is also used to denote the son of a woman who leaves an impotent, outcaste, or a mad or deceased husband and takes another husband. *Parasava* is the son of a Brahmin by his Shudra wife. The rest of the sons are adopted sons as distinguished for those who were claimed as sons.

*Dattaka* is the son whom his father and mother give in adoption to another whose son he then becomes.

*Kratrima* is a son adopted with the adoptee’s consent only. *Krita* is a son purchased from his parents.

*Apavidhda* is a boy abandoned by his parents and is then taken in adopted and reckoned as a son.

*Svayamadatta* is a boy bereft of parents or abandoned by them seeks a man shelter and presents himself saying 'Let me become thy son ' when accepted he becomes his son.

It will be noticed how true it is to say that many forms of marriage are only euphemisms for seduction and rape and how many of the sons have no blood relationship to their father. These different forms of marriage and different kinds of sons were recognized as lawful even up to the time of Manu and even the changes made by Manu are very minor. With regard to the forms of marriage Manu does not declare them to be illegal. All that he says that of the eight forms, six, namely, Brahma, Daiva, Arsha, Prajapatya, Asura, Gandharva, Rakshasa and Paisachya are lawful for a Kshatriya, and that three namely Asura, Gandharva and Paisachya are lawful for a Vaishya and a Shudra.

Similarly he does not disaffiliate any of the 12 sons. On the contrary he recognises their kinship. The only change he makes is to alter the rules of inheritance by putting them into two classes (1) heirs and kinsmen and (2) kinsmen but not heirs. He says:

159. "The legitimate son of the body. the son begotten on a wife. the son adopted, the son made, the son secretly born, and the son east off (are) the six
heirs and kinsmen."

160. "The son of an unmarried damsel, the son received with the wife, the son bought, the son begotten on a remarried woman: the son self-given and the son of a Sudra female (are) the six (who are) not heirs, (but) kinsmen."

162. "If the two heirs of one man be a legitimate son of his body and a son begotten on his wife, each (of the two sons), to the exclusion of the other, shall take the estate of his (natural) father."

163. "The legitimate son of the body alone (shall be) the owner of the paternal estate: but, in order to avoid harshness, let him allow a maintenance to the rest."

There is another part of the law of consanguinity which has undergone a profound change but which has hardly been noticed by anybody. It relates to the determination of the Varna of the child. What is to be the Varna of the child? Is it to be the father's Varna or the mother's Varna? According to the law as it prevailed in the days before Manu the Varna of the child was determined by the Varna of the father. The Varna of the mother was of no account. A few illustrations will suffice to prove the thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father Name</th>
<th>Father Varna</th>
<th>Mother Name</th>
<th>Mother Varna</th>
<th>Child Name</th>
<th>Child Varna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shantanu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Ganga</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Bhishma</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parashara</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
<td>Matsyagandha</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>Krish</td>
<td>Dwaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vashishta</td>
<td>Brahmana</td>
<td>Akshamala</td>
<td>Payan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Shantanu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Matsyagandha</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>Vichitravirya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vishwamitra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Menka</td>
<td>Apsara</td>
<td>Shakuntala</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Yayati</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Devayani</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Yadu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Yayati</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Sharmishta</td>
<td>Asuri</td>
<td>Druhya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jaratkari</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>Jaratkari</td>
<td>Naga</td>
<td>Astika</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does Manu do? The changes made by Manu in the law of the child's Varna are of a most revolutionary character. Manu lays down the following rules:

5. "In all castes (varna) those (children) only which are begotten in the direct order on wedded wives, equal (in caste) and married as (virgins) are to be considered as belonging to the same caste (as their fathers)."

6. "Sons, begotten by twice-born men on wives of the next lower castes, they declare to be similar (to their fathers, but) blamed on account of the fault (inherent) in their mothers."

14. "Those sons of the twice-born, begotten on wives of the next lower castes, who have been enumerated in due order, they call by the name Anantaras (belonging to the next lower caste) on account of the blemish (inherent) in their
41. "Six sons, begotten (by Aryans) on women of equal and the next lower castes (Anantara), have the duties of twice-born men: but all those born in consequence of a violation of the law are, as regards their duties, equal to Sudras." Manu distinguishes the following cases:

(1) Where the father and mother belong to the same Varna.

(2) Where the mother belongs to a Varna next lower to that of the father e.g. Brahman father and Kshatriya mother, Kshatriya father and Vaishya mother, Vaishya father and Shudra mother.

(3) Where the mother belongs to a Varna more than one degree lower to that of the father, e.g. Brahmin father and Vaishya or Shudra mother, Kshatriya father and Shudra mother. In the first case the Varna of the child is to be the Varna of the father. In the second case also the Varna of the child is to be the Varna of the father. But in the third case the child is not to have the father's Varna. Manu does not expressly say what is to be the Varna of the child if it is not to be that of the father. But all the commentators of Manu Medhatithi. Kalluka Bhatt. Narada and Nandapandit—agree

saying what of the course is obvious that in such cases the Varna of the child shall be the Varna of the mother. In short Manu altered the law of the child's Varna from that of Pitrasavarna—according to father's Varna to Matrasavarna—according to mother's Varna.

This is most revolutionary change. It is a pity few have realized that given the forms of marriage, kinds of sons, the permissibility of Anuloma marriages and the theory of Pitrasavarnya, the Varna system notwithstanding the desire of the Brahmins to make it a closed system remained an open system. There were so many holes so to say in the Varna system. Some of the forms of marriage had no relation to the theory of the Varna. Indeed they could not have. The Rakshas and the Paisachya marriages were in all probability marriages in which the males belonged to the lower varnas and the females to the higher varnas. The law of sonship probably left many loopholes for the sons of Shudra to pass as children of the Brahmin. Take for instances sons such as Gudhajas, Sahodhajas, Kanina. Who can say that they were not begotten by Shudra or Brahmin, Kshatriya or Vaishya. Whatever doubts there may be about these the Anuloma system of marriage which was sanctioned by law combined with the law of Pitrasavarnya had the positive effect of keeping the Varna system of allowing the lower Varnas to pass into the higher Varna. A Shudra could not become a Brahmin, a Kshatriya or a Vaishya. But the child of a Shudra woman could become a Vaishya if she was married to a Vaishya, a Kshatriya if she was married to a Kshatriya and even a Brahmin if she was married to a Brahmin. The elevation and the incorporation of the lower orders into the higher orders was positive and
certain though the way of doing it was indirect. This was one result of the old system. The other result was that a community of a Varna was always a mixed and a composite community. A Brahmin community might conceivably consist of children born of Brahmin women, Kshatriya women, Vaishya women, and Shudra women all entitled to the rights and privileges belonging to the Brahmin community. A Kshatriya community may conceivably consist of children born of Kshatriya women, Vaishya women and Shudra women all recognized as Kshatriya and entitled to the rights and privileges of the Kshatriya community. Similarly the Vaishya community may conceivably consist of children born of Vaishya women and Shudra women all recognized as Vaishyas and entitled to the rights and privileges of the Vaishya community.

The change made by Manu is opposed to some of the most fundamental notions of Hindu Law. In the first place, it is opposed to the Kshetra-Kshetraja rule of Hindu Law. According to this rule, which deals with the question of property in a child says that the owner of the child is the \textit{de jure} husband of the mother and not the \textit{de facto} father of the child. Manu is aware of this theory. He puts it in the following terms:

"Thus men who have no marital property in women, but sow in the fields owned by others, may raise up fruit to the husbands, but the procreator can have no advantage from it. Unless there be a special agreement between the owners of the land and of the seed, the fruit belongs clearly to the landowner, for the receptacle is more important than the seed."

It is on this that the right to the 12 kinds of sons is founded. This change was also opposed to the rule of Patna Potestas. Hindu family is a Patriarchal family same as the Roman family. In both the father possessed certain authority over members of the family. Manu is aware of this and recognized it in most ample terms. Defining the authority of the Hindu father, Manu says:

"Three persons, a wife, a son, and a slave, are declared by law to have in general no wealth exclusively their own; the wealth which they may earn is regularly acquired for the man to whom they belong."

They belong to the head of the family-namely the father. Under the Patna Potestas the sons earnings are the property of the father. The change in the law of paternity mean a definite loss to the father.

Why did Manu change the law from Pitra-savarnya to Matra-savarnya ?

RIDDLE NO. 20
KALI VARJYA OR THE BRAHMANIC ART OF SUSPENDING THE OPERATION OF SIN WITHOUT CALLING IT SIN

Few have heard of the Brahmanic dogma called Kali Varjya. It must not be
CHAPTER 11

The Triumph of Brahmanism: Regicide or the birth of Counter-Revolution

We have found only 3 typed pages under this title. Fortunately, a copy of the essay has been spared by Shri S. S. Rege for being included in this book. While examining the pages we have noticed that the copy given by Mr. Rege also lacks page nos 3 to 7 and 9 to 17. The total typed pages of this essay have been numbered 92 inclusive of the missing pages. The title on the copy of Mr. Rege is the ‘Triumph of Brahmanism’; whereas the first page of the script in our papers is also entitled as ‘Regicide or the Birth of Counter-Revolution’. The classification of the subject into IX Chapters is noted in our copy whereas it is missing from the copy of Mr. Rege. Both the titles and the classification are recorded in the handwriting of Dr. Ambedkar. Hence, they are retained in this print. Incidentally, the page nos 9 to 17 were found tagged in other file. All those papers have now been introduced at proper place. Thus except page Nos. 4 to 7, the script is complete.—Editors.

I

I The Brahmanic Revolt against Buddhism. II Manu the apostle of Brahmanism. III Brahmanism and the Brahmin’s Right to rule and regicide. IV Brahmanism and the privileges of Brahmins. V Brahmanism and the Creation of Caste. VI Brahmanism and the degradation of the Non-Brahmins. VII Brahmanism and the Suppression of the Shudra. VIII Brahmanism and the Subjection of Women. IX Brahmanism and the legalization of the social system.

Speaking about India, Prof. Bloomfield opens his lectures on the Religion of the Veda by reminding his audience that “India is the land
of religions in more than one sense. It has produced out of its own resources, a number of distinctive systems and sects....

In another sense India is a land of religions. Nowhere else is the texture of life so much impregnated with religious convictions and practices... "1

These observations contain profound truth. He would have given utterance to truth far more profound and arresting if he had said that India is a land of warring religions. For indeed there is no country in which Religion has played so great a part in its history as it has in the history of India. The history of India is nothing but a history of a mortal conflict between— Buddhism and Brahmanism. So neglected is this truth that no one will be found to give it his ready acceptance. Indeed there may not be wanting persons who would repudiate any such suggestion.

Let me therefore briefly recount the salient facts of Indian history. For it is important that everyone who was able to understand the history of India must know that it is nothing but the history of the struggle for supremacy between Brahmanism and Buddhism.

The history of India is said to begin with the Aryans who invaded India, made it their home and established their culture. Whatever may be the virtues of the Aryans, their culture, their religion and their social system, we know very little about their political history. Indeed notwithstanding the superiority that is claimed for the Aryans as against the Non-Aryans, the Aryans have left very little their political achievements for history to speak of. The political history of India begins with the rise of a non-Aryan people called Nagas, who were a powerful people, whom the Aryans were unable to conquer, with whom the Aryans had to make peace, and whom the Aryans were compelled to recognize as their equals. Whatever fame and glory India achieved in ancient times in the political field, the credit for it goes entirely to the Non-Aryan Nagas. It is they who made India great and glorious in the annals of the world.

The first landmark in India's political history is the emergence of the Kingdom of Magadha in Bihar in the year 642 B.C. The founder of this kingdom of Magadha is known by the name of Sisunag2 and belonged to the non-Aryan race of Nagas.

From the small beginning made by Sisunag, this Kingdom of Magadha grew in its extent under the capable rulers of this Sisunag dynasty. Under Bimbisara the fifth ruler of this dynasty the kingdom

1 The Religion of the Veda p. 1.
2 His name is also spelt as Sisunak.
grew into an Empire and came to be known as the Empire of Magadha. The Sisunag dynasty continued to rule the kingdom till 413 B.C. In that year the reigning Emperor of the Sisunag Dynasty Mahananda was killed by an adventurer called Nanda. Nanda usurped the throne of Magadha and founded the Nanda Dynasty. This Nanda Dynasty ruled over the Empire of Magadha upto 322 B.C. The last Nanda king was deposed by Chandragupta who founded the Maurya Dynasty. Chandragupta was related1 to the family of the last ruling emperor of the Sisunag Dynasty so that it may be said that the revolution effected by Chandragupta was really a restoration of the Naga Empire of Magadha.

The Mauryas by their conquests enormously extended the boundaries of this Empire of Magadha which they inherited. So vast became the growth of this Empire under Ashoka, the Empire began to be known by another name. It was called the Maurya Empire or the Empire of Ashoka. (From here onwards page Nos. 4 to 7 of the MS are missing.)

It did not remain as one of the many diverse religions then in vogue. Ashoka made it the religion of the state. This of course was the greatest blow to Brahmanism. The Brahmins lost all state patronage and were neglected to a secondary and subsidiary position in the Empire of Ashoka. Indeed it may be said to have been suppressed for the simple reason that Ashoka prohibited all animal sacrifices which constituted the very essence of Brahmanic Religion. The Brahmins had not only lost state patronage but they lost their occupation which mainly consisted in performing sacrifices for a fee which often times was very substantial and which constituted their chief source of living. The Brahmins therefore lived as the suppressed and Depressed Classes2 for nearly 140 years during which the Maurya Empire lasted. A rebellion against the Buddhist state was the only way of escape left to the suffering Brahmins and there is special reason why Pushyamitra should raise the banner of revolt against the rule of the Mauryas. Pushyamitra was a Sung by Gotra. The Sungas were Samvedi Brahmins,3 who believed in animal sacrifices and soma sacrifices. The Sungas were therefore quite naturally smarting under the prohibition on animal sacrifices throughout the Maurya Empire proclaimed in the very Rock Edict by Ashoka. No wonder if Pushyamitra who as a Samvedi Brahmin was the first to conceive the passion to end the degradation of the Brahmin by destroying the Buddhist state which

1 Mr. Hari Krishna Deb: quoted by Smith. Early History of India (1924) p.44. F.N. 1.
2 The inferiority complex of the Brahmins under the Maurya Rule becomes apparent from the privileges asked for them by Manu in the Manu Smriti. This inferiority complex must be due to their depressed condition.
was the cause of it and to free them to practise their Brahmanic religion.

That the object of the Regicide by Pushyamitra was to destroy Buddhism as a state religion and to make the Brahmins the sovereign rulers of India so that with the political power of the state behind it Brahmanism may triumph over Buddhism is borne out by two other circumstances.

The first circumstance relates to the conduct of Pushyamitra himself. There is evidence that Pushyamitra after he ascended the throne performed the Ashvamedha Yajna or the horse sacrifice, the vedic rite which could only be performed by a paramount sovereign. As Vincent Smith observes:

“The exaggerated regard for the sanctity of animal life, which was one of the most cherished features of Buddhism, and the motive of Ashoka’s most characteristic legislation, had necessarily involved the prohibition of bloody sacrifices, which are essential to certain forms of Brahmanical worship, and were believed by the orthodox to possess the highest saving efficacy. The memorable horse sacrifices of Pushyamitra marked an early stage in the Brahmanical reaction, which was fully developed five centuries later in the time of Samudragupta and his successors.”

Then there is evidence that Pushyamitra after his accession launched a violent and virulent campaign of persecution against Buddhists and Buddhism.

How pitiless was the persecution of Buddhism by Pushyamitra can be gauged from the Proclamation which he issued against the Buddhist monks. By this proclamation Pushyamitra set a price of 100 gold pieces on the head of every Buddhist monk.¹

Dr. Harprasad Shastri speaking about the persecution of Buddhists under Pushyamitra says²:

“The condition of the Buddhists under the imperial sway of the Sungas, orthodox and bigotted, can be more easily imagined than described. From Chinese authorities it is known that many Buddhists still do not pronounce the name of Pushyamitra without a curse.”

II

If the Revolution of Pushyamitra was a purely political revolution there was no need for him to have launched a campaign of persecution

² Buddhistic Studies (Ed. by Law) Chapter XXXIV p. 820.
against Buddhism which was not very different to the campaign of persecution launched by the Mahamad of Gazni against Hinduism. This is one piece of circumstantial evidence which proves that the aim of Pushyamitra was to overthrow Buddhism and establish Brahmanism in its place.

Another piece of evidence which shows that the origin and purpose of the revolution by Pushyamitra against the Mauryas was to destroy Buddhism and establish Brahmanism is evidenced by the promulgation of Manu Smriti as a code of laws.

The Manu Smriti is said to be divine in its origin. It is said to be revealed to man by Manu to whom it was revealed by the Swayamabhu (i.e., the Creator). This claim, as will be seen from the reference already made to it, is set out in the Code itself. It is surprising that nobody has cared to examine the grounds of such a claim. The result is that there is a complete failure to realize the significance, place and position of the Manu Smriti in the history of India. This is true even of the historians of India although the Manu Smriti is a record of the greatest social revolution that Hindu society has undergone. There can however be no doubt that the claim made in the Manu Smriti regarding its authorship is an utter fraud and the beliefs arising out of this false claim are quite untenable.

The name Manu had a great prestige in the ancient history of India and it is with the object to invest the code with this ancient prestige that its authorship was attributed to Manu. That this was a fraud to deceive people is beyond question. The code itself is signed in the family name of Bhrigu as was the ancient custom. “The Text Composed by Bhrigu (entitled) “The Dharma Code of Manu” is the real title of the work. The name Bhrigu is subscribed to the end of every chapter of the Code itself. We have therefore the family name of the author of the Code. His personal name is not disclosed in the Book. All the same it was known to many. The Author of Narada Smriti writing in about the 4th Century A.D. knew the name of the author of the Manu Smriti and gives out the secret. According to Narada it was one Sumati Bhargava who composed the Code of Manu. Sumati Bhargava is not a legendary name, and must have been a historical person for even Medhatithe the great commentator on the Code of Manu held the view that this Manu was ‘a certain individual’. Manu therefore is the assumed name of Sumati Bhargava who is the real author of Manu Smriti.

1 On this point see Jaiswal’s Volume on Manu & Yajnavalkya.
2 Commentary on Manu 1.1.
When did this Sumati Bhargava compose this Code? It is not possible to give any precise date for its composition. But quite a precise period during which it was composed can be given. According to scholars whose authority cannot be questioned Sumati Bhargava must have composed the Code which he deliberately called Munu Smriti between 170 B.C. and 150 B.C. Now if one bears in mind the fact that the Brahmanic Revolution by Pushyamitra took place in 185 B.C. there remains no doubt that the code known as Manu Smriti was promulgated by Pushyamitra as embodying the principles of Brahmanic Revolution against the Buddhist state of the Mauryas. That the Manu Smriti forms the Institutes of Brahmanism and are a proof that Pushyamitra Revolution was not a purely personal adventure will be clear to any one who cares to note the following peculiarities relating to the Manu Smriti.

First thing to be noted is that the Manu Smriti is a new Code of law promulgated for the first time during the reign of Pushyamitra. There was a view once prevalent that there existed a code known as the Manava-Dharma-Sutra and that what is known as Manu Smriti is an adaptation of the old Manava Dharma Sutra. This view has been abandoned as there has been no trace of any such work. Two other works existed prior to the present Manu Smriti. One was known as Manava Artha Sastra, or Manava-Raja-Sastra or Manava-Raja-Dharma-Sastra. The other work was known as Manava-Grihya-Sutra. Scholars have compared the Manu Smriti. On important points the provisions of one are not only dissimilar but are in every way contrary to the provisions contained in the other. This is enough to show that Manu Smriti contains the new law of the new regime.

That the new regime of Pushyamitra was anti-Buddhist is betrayed by the open provisions enacted in the Manu Smriti against the Buddhists and Buddhism. Note the following provisions in Manu Smriti:

IX. 225. "... Men who abide in heresy ... the king should banish from his realm."

IX. 226. “These robbers in disguise, living in the king’s realm constantly injure the worthy subject by the performance of their misdeeds.”

V. 89. “Libations of water shall not be offered to (the souls of) those who (neglect the prescribed rites and may be said to) have been born in vain, to those born in consequence of an illegal mixture of the castes, to those who are ascetics (of heretical sects) and to those who have committed suicide.”
V. 90. (Libations of water shall not be offered to the souls of) women who have joined a heretical sect.

IV. 30. Let him (the householder) not honour, even by a greeting heretics... logicians, (arguing against the Veda).

XII. 95. “All those traditions and all those despicable systems of Philosophy, which are not based on the Veda produce no reward after death, for they are declared to be founded on Darkness.

XII. 96. “All those (doctrines), differing from the (Veda), which spring up and (soon) perish, are worthless and false, because of modern date.”

Who are the heretics to whom Manu refers and whom he wants the new king to banish from his realm and the Householder not to honour in life as well as after death? What is this worthless philosophy of modern date, differing from the Vedas, based on darkness and bound to perish? There can be no doubt that the heretic of Manu is the Buddhist and the worthless philosophy of modern date differing from the Vedas is Buddhism. Kalluck Bhutt another commentator on Manu Smriti expressly states that the references to heretics in these Shlokas in Manu are to the Buddhists and Buddhism.

The third circumstance is the position assigned to the Brahmins in the Manu Smriti. Note the following provisions in Manu:—

I. 93. As the Brahmana sprang from (Bramha’s) mouth, as he was the first born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation.

I. 96. Of created beings the most excellent are said to be those which are animated; of the animated, those which subsist by intelligence; of the intelligent, mankind; and of men, the Brahmans.

I. 100. Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Bramhans; on account of the excellence of his origin the Brahmana is, indeed, entitled to it all.

I. 101. The Brahmana eats but his own food, wears but his own apparel, bestows but his own in alms; other mortals subsist through the benevolence of the Brahmana.

X. 3. On account of his pre-eminence, on account of the superiority of his origin, on account of his observance of (particular) restrictive rules, and on account of his particular sanctification, the Brahmana is the lord of (all) castes.

XI. 35. The Bramhana is declared to be the creator of the world, the punisher, the teacher, and hence a benefactor of all created beings; to him let no man say anything unpropitious, nor use any harsh words.
Manu warns the King against displeasing the Bramhans in the following terms:

IX. 313. Let him (the King) not, though fallen unto the deepest distress, provoke Bramhans to anger; for they, when angered, could instantly destroy him together with his army and his vehicles.

Manu further proclaims,

XI. 31. A Bramhana who knows the law need not bring any (offence) to the notice of the king; by his own power alone he can punish those men who injure him.

XI. 32. His own power is greater than the power of the king;

The Bramhana, therefore, may punish his foes by his own power alone.

This deification of the Brahmins, placing them even above the King would have been impossible unless the King himself was a Brahmin and in sympathy with the view expressed by Manu. Pushyamitra and his successors could not have tolerated these exaggerated claims of the Brahmins unless they themselves were Brahmins interested in the establishment of Bramhanism. Indeed it is quite possible that the Manu Smriti was composed at the command of Pushyamitra himself and forms the book of the philosophy of Bramhanism.

Taking all these facts into considerations there can remain no doubt; the one and only object of Pushyamitra’s revolution was to destroy Buddhism and re-establish Bramhanism.

The foregoing summary of the political history of India would have been quite unnecessary for the immediate purpose of this chapter if I was satisfied with the way in which the history of India is written. But frankly I am not satisfied. For too much emphasis is laid on the Muslim conquest of India. Reels and reels have been written to show how wave after wave of Muslim invasions came down like avalanche and enveloped the people and overthrew their rulers. The whole history of India is made to appear as though the only important thing in it is a catalogue of Muslim invasions. But even from this narrow point of view it is clear that the Muslim invasions are not the only invasions worth study. There have been other invasions equally if not of greater importance. If Hindu India was invaded by the Muslim invaders so was Buddhist India invaded by Bramhanic invaders. The Muslim invasions of Hindu India and the Bramhanic invasions of Buddhist India have many similarities. The Musalman invaders of Hindu India fought among themselves for their dynastic ambitions. The Arabs, Turks, Mongols and Afghans fought for supremacy among themselves. But they had one thing in common—namely the mission to destroy idolatory. Similarly the Bramhanic invadars of Buddhist India fought
among themselves for their dynastic ambitions. The Sungas, Kanvas and the Andhras fought for supremacy among themselves. But they, like the Muslim invaders of Hindu India, had one object in common that was to destroy Buddhism and the Buddhist Empire of the Mauryas. Surely if Muslim invasions of Hindu India are worthy of study at the hands of the historians, the invasions of Buddhist India by Bramhanic invaders are equally deserving of study. The ways and methods employed by the Bramhanic invaders of Buddhist India to suppress Buddhism were not less violent and less virulent than the ways and means adopted by Muslim invaders to suppress Hinduism. From the point of view of the permanent effect on the social and spiritual life of the people, the Bramhanic invasions of Buddhist India have been so profound in their effect that compared to them, the effect of Muslim invasions on Hindu India have been really superficial and ephemeral. The Muslim invaders destroyed only the outward symbols of Hindu religion such as temples and Maths etc. They did not extirpate Hinduism nor did they cause any subversion of the principles or doctrines which governed the spiritual life of the people. The effects of the Bramhanic invasions were a thorough-going change in the principles which Buddhism had preached for a century as true and eternal principles of spiritual life and which had been accepted and followed by the masses as the way of life. To alter the metaphor the Muslim invaders only stirred the waters in the bath and that too only for a while. Thereafter they got tired of stirring and left the waters with the sediments to settle. They never threw the baby—if one can speak of the principles of Hinduism as a baby—out of the bath. Bramhanism in its conflict with Buddhism made a clean sweep. It emptied the bath with the Buddhist Baby in it and filled the bath with its own waters and placed in it its own baby. Bramhanism did not care to stop how filthy and dirty was its water as compared with the clean and fragrant water which flowed from the noble source of Buddhism. Bramhanism did not care to stop how hideous and ugly was its own baby as compared with the Buddhist baby. Bramhanism acquired by its invasions political power to annihilate Buddhism and it did annihilate Buddhism. Islam did not supplant Hinduism. Islam never made a thorough job of its mission. Bramhanism did. It drove out Buddhism as a religion and occupied its place.

These facts show that Brahmanic invasions of Buddhist India have a far greater significance to the Historian of India than the Muslim invasions of Hindu India can be said to have produced. Yet very little space is devoted by historians to the vissicitudes which befell Buddhist India built up by the Mauryas and even where that is done they have
not cared to deal in a pointed manner with questions that quite naturally arise: questions such as, who were the Sungas, Kanavas and Andhras; why did they destroy the Buddhist India which was built up by the Mauryas, nor has any attempt been made to study the changes that Brahmanism after its triumph over Buddhism brought about in the political and social structure.

Failure to appreciate this aspect of India's history is due to the prevalence of some very wrong notions. It has been commonly supposed that the culture of India has been one and the same all throughout history; that Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism are simply different phases and that there has never been any fundamental antagonism between them. Secondly it has been assumed that whatever conflicts have taken place in Indian politics were purely political and dynastic and that they had no social and spiritual significance. It is because of these wrong notions that Indian history has become a purely mechanical thing, a record of one dynasty succeeding another and one ruler succeeding another ruler. A corrective to such an attitude and to such a method of writing history lies in recognition of two facts which are indisputable.

In the first place it must be recognized that there has never been such as a common Indian culture, that historically there have been three Indias, Brahmanic India, Buddhist India and Hindu India, each with its own culture. Secondly it must be recognized that the history of India before the Muslim invasions is the history of a mortal conflict between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Any one who does not recognize these two facts will never be able to write a true history of India, a history which will disclose the meaning and purpose running through it. It is a corrective to Indian history written as it is and to disclose the meaning and purposes running through it that I was obliged to recast the history of the Brahmanic invasions of Buddhist India and the political triumph of Brahmanism over Buddhism.

We must therefore begin with the recognition of the fact: Pushyamitra's revolution was a political revolution engineered by the Brahmmins to overthrow Buddhism.

The curious will naturally ask what did this triumphant Brahmanism do? It is to this question that I will now turn. The deeds or misdeeds of this triumphant Brahmanism may be catalogued under seven heads. (1) It established the right of the Brahmin to rule and commit regicide. (2) It made the Brahmmins a class of privileged persons. (3) It converted the Varna into caste. (4) It brought about a conflict and anti-social feeling between the different castes. (5) It degraded the Shudras and the women (6) It forged the system of graded inequality and (7) It made legal and rigid the social system which was conventional and flexible.
To begin with the first.

The revolution brought about by PushyaMITra created an initial difficulty in the way of the Brahmins. People could not be easily reconciled to this revolution. The resentment of the public was well expressed by the poet Bana1 when in referring to this revolution reviles PushyaMITra as being base born and calls his act of regicide as Anarya. The act of PushyaMITra was properly described by Bana as Anarya i.e. contrary to Aryan law. For on three points the Aryan law at the date of PushyaMITra's revolution was well settled. The then Aryan law declared (1) That Kingship is the right of the Kshatriya only. A Brahmin could never be a king. (2) That no Brahmin shall take to the profession of Arms2 and (3) That rebellion against the King's authority was a sin. PushyaMITra in fostering the rebellion had committed a crime against each of these three laws. He was Brahmin, and although a Brahmin he rebelled against the King, took to the profession of Arms and became a King. People were not reconciled to this usurpation which constituted so flagrant a breach of the law that the Brahmins had to regularize the position created by PushyaMITra. This the Brahmins did by taking the bold step of changing the law. This change of law is quite manifest from the Manu Smriti. I will quote the appropriate shlokas from the Code:

XII. 100. “The post of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kingdom, the very Headship of Government, the complete empire over every one are deserved by the Brahmin.”

Here we have one change in the law. This new law declares that the Brahmin has a right to become Senapati (Commander of forces), to conquer a kingdom, and to be the ruler and the Emperor of it.

XI. 31. A Brahmin, who well knows the laws, need not complain to the king of any grievous injury; since, even by his own power, he may chastise those, who injure him.

XI. 32. His (Brahmin's) own power, which depends on himself alone is mightier than the royal power, which depends on other men; by his own might, therefore may a Brahmin coerce his foes.

1 Harsha Charita, quoted by Smith (1924) p. 208.
2 The rule was so strict that according to the Apastamba Dharmasutra ‘A Brahman shall not take up a weapon in his hand though he be only desirous of examining it.’ It may be matter of some surprize how PushyaMITra who was a Brahmins could have done a deed which could under the circumstances be expected only from a member of the martial race. This difficulty is well explained by Harprasad Shastri. According to him the Sungas though Brahmins were a martial race. Among the fighting Brahmins, two were distinguished among the rest, the Vishwamitras and the Bharadvajas. The wife of Vishvamitra Brahmin proving barren, a Bharadvaj was requested by the ancient custom of ‘Niyoga’ to beget a son on Vishvamitra's. The issue was Sung. He was the progenitor of a Gotra and that Gotra took up the Samveda for their study. The Sungas were called a Drayamushyam gotra i.e. a gotra issuing from the two gotras, Vishvamitra and Bharadvaj both of which had taken to military occupation—See Buddhistic Studies (Ed. by Law) Ch. XXXIV, p. 820.
XI. 261-62. A Brahmin who has killed even the peoples of the three worlds, is completely freed from all sins on reciting three times the Rig, Yajur or Sama.-Veda with the Upanishadas.”

Here is the second change in the law. It authorized the Brahmin to kill not only the king but to engage in a general massacre of men if they seek to do injury to his power and position.

VIII. 348. “The twice born man may take arms, when the rightful occupation assigned to each by Dharma is obstructed by force; and when, in some evil time, a disaster has befallen the twice-born classes.”

IX. 320. Of a Kshatriya (Military man or king), who raise his arm violently on all occasions against the Brahmans, Brahmin himself shall be the chastiser; since the soldier originally proceeded from the Brahmin.”

This is the third legal change. It recognized the right to rebellion and the right to regicide. The new law is very delicately framed. It gives the right of rebellion to three higher classes. But it is also given to the Brahmans singly by way of providing for a situation when the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas may not be prepared to join the Brahmin in bringing about a rebellion. The right of rebellion is well circumscribed. It can be exercised only when the king is guilty of upsetting the occupations assigned by Manu to the different Varnas.

These legal changes were as necessary as they were revolutionary. Their object was to legalize and regularize the position created by Pushyamitra by killing the last Maurya King. By virtue of these legal changes, a Brahmin could lawfully become a king, could lawfully take arms, could lawfully depose or murder a king who was opposed to Chaturvarna and could lawfully kill any subject that opposed the authority of the Brahmin. Manu gave the Brahmans a right to commit Bartholomeu if it became necessary to safeguard their interests.

In this way Brahmanism established the right of Brahmana to rule and set at rest whatever doubt and dispute there was regarding the same. But that could hardly be enough for the Brahmans as a whole. It may be a matter of pride but not of any advantage. There can be no special virtue in Brahmin rule if the Brahmin was treated as common man along with the Non-Brahmins having the same rights and same duties. Brahmin rule if it is to justify itself, it must do so by conferring special privileges and immunities on the Brahmans as a class. Indeed Pushyamitra’s Revolution would have been an ill wind blowing no good if it had not recognized the superior position of the Brahmans and conferred upon them special advantages. Manu was alive to this and accordingly proceeds to create monopolies for Brahmans and grant them certain immunities and privileges as may be seen from the Code.
First as to monopolies:

I. 88. To Brahmanas he assigned teaching and studying (the Veda) sacrificing for their own benefit and for others, giving and accepting (of alms).

X. 1. Let the three twice-born castes (Varna), discharging their (prescribed) duties, study (the Veda); but among them the Brahmana (alone) shall teach it, not the other two; that is an established rule.

X. 2. The Brahmana must know the means of subsistence (prescribed) by law for all, instruct others, and himself live according to (the law).

X. 3. On account of his pre-eminence, on account of the superiority of his origin, on account of his observance of (particular) restrictive rules, and on account of his particular sanctification, the Brahmana is the lord of (all) castes (varna).

X. 74. Brahmanas who are intent on the means (of gaining union with Brahman and firm in (discharging) their duties, shall live by duly performing the following six acts, (which are enumerated) in their (proper) order.

X. 75. Teaching, studying, sacrificing for himself, sacrificing for others, making gifts and receiving them are the six acts (prescribed) for a Brahmaana.

X. 76. But among the six acts (ordained) for him three are his means of subsistence, (viz.) sacrificing for others, teaching, and accepting gifts from pure mdn.

X. 77. (Passing) from the Brahmana to the Kshatriya, three acts (incumbent) (on the former) are forbidden, (viz.) teaching, sacrificing for others, and, thirdly, the acceptance of gifts.

X. 78. The same are likewise forbidden to a Vaisya, that is a settled rule; for Manu, the lord of creatures (Prajapati), has not prescribed them for men of those two (castes).

X. 79. To carry arms for striking and for throwing (is prescribed) for Kshatriyas as a means of subsistence; to trade, (to rear) cattle, and agriculture for Vaisyas; but their duties are liberality, the study of the Veda, and the performance of sacrifices.

Here are three things which Manu made the monopoly of the Brahmin: teaching Vedas, performing Sacrifices and receiving gifts.

The following are the immunities that were granted to the Brahmins. They fall into two classes; freedom from taxation and exemption from certain forms of punishment for crimes.

VII. 133. Though dying (with want), a king must not levy a tax on Srotriyas, and no Srotriya residing in his kingdom, must perish from hunger.
VIII. 122. They declare that the wise have prescribed these fines for
perjury, in order to prevent a failure of justice, and in order to restrain
injustice.

VIII. 123. But a just king shall fine and banish (men of) the three
(lower) castes (varna) who have given false evidence, but a Brahmana
he shall (only) banish.

VIII. 124. Manu, the son of the Self-existent (Svayambhu), has named
ten places on which punishment may be (made to fall) in the cases of
the three (lower) castes (varna); but a Brahmana shall depart unhurt
(from the country).

VIII. 379. Tonsure (of the head) is ordained for a Brahmana (instead
of) capital punishment; but (men of) other castes shall suffer capital
punishment.

VIII. 380. Let him never slay a Brahmana, though he have committed
all (possible) crimes; let him banish such an (offender), leaving all his
property (to him) and (his body) unhurt.

Thus Manu places the Brahmin above the ordinary penal law for
felony. He is to be allowed to leave the country withdraw a wound on
him and with all property in proved offences of capital punishment. He
is not to suffer forfeiture of fine nor capital punishment. He suffered
only banishment which in the words of Hobbes was only a “Change of
air” after having committed the most heinous crimes.

Manu gave him also certain privileges.

A Judge must be a Brahmin.

VIII. 9. But if the king does not personally investigate the suits, then
let him appoint a learned Brahmana to try them.

VIII. 10. That (man) shall enter that most excellent court, accompanied
by three assessors, and fully consider (all) causes (brought) before the
(king), either sitting down or standing. The other privileges were financial.

VIII. 37. When a learned Brahmana has found treasure deposited
in former (times), he may take even the whole (of it); for he is master
of everything.

VIII. 38. When the king finds treasure of old concealed in the ground,
let him give one half to Brahmanas and place the (other)half in his
treasury.

IX. 323. But (a king who feels his end drawing nigh) shall bestow
all his wealth, accumulated from fines, on Brahmanas, make over his
kingdom to his son, and then seek death in battle.

IX. 187. Always to that (relative within three degrees) who is nearest
to the (deceased) Sapinda the estate shall belong; afterwards a Sakulya
shall be (the heir, then) the spiritual teacher or the pupil.
IX. 188. But on failure of all (heirs) Brahmans (shall) share the estate, (who are) versed in the three Vedas, pure and self-controlled; thus the law is not violated.

IX. 189. The property of a Brahmana must never be taken by the King, that is a settled rule; but (the property of men) of other castes the king may take on failure of all (heirs).

These are some of the advantages, immunities and privileges which Manu conferred upon the Brahmins. This was a token of a Brahmin having become a king.

Supporters of Brahmanism—so strong is the belief in the excellence of Brahmanism that there are no apologists for it as yet—never fail to point to the disabilities which Manu has imposed upon the Brahmins. Their object in doing so is to show that the ideal placed by Manu before the Brahmin is poverty and service. That Manu has placed certain disabilities upon the Brahmins is a fact. But to conclude from it that Manu’s ideal for a Brahmin is poverty and service is a gross and deliberate concoction for which there is no foundation in Manu.

To understand the real purpose which Manu had in imposing these disabilities, two things must be borne in mind. Firstly the place Manu has assigned to the Brahmins in the general scheme of society and secondly the nature of the disabilities. The place assigned by Manu to the Brahmins is enunciated by him in unequivocal terms. The matter being important I must quote again the Verses already quoted.

I. 93. As the Brahmana sprang from (Brahman’s) mouth, as he was the first born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation.

Consider the nature of the disabilities.

IV. 2. A Brahmana must seek a means of subsistence which either causes no, or at least little pain (to others), and live (by that) except in times of distress.

IV. 3. For the purpose of gaining bare subsistence, let him accumulate property by (following those) irreproachable occupations (which are prescribed for) his (caste), without (unduly) fatiguing his body.

VIII. 337. In (a case of) theft the guilt of a Sudra shall be eightfold, that of a Vaishya sixteenfold, that of a Kshatriya two-and-thirty fold.

VIII. 338. That of a Brahmana sixty-four-fold, or quite a hundred-fold or (even) twice four-and-sixty-fold; (each of them) knowing the nature of the offence.

VIII. 383. A Brahmana shall be compelled to pay a fine of one thousand (panas) if he has intercourse with guarded (females of)
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those two (castes); for (offending with) a (guarded) Sudra female a fine of one thousand (panas) (shall be inflicted) on a Kshatriya or a Vaishya.

VIII. 384. For (intercourse with) an unguarded Kshatriya a fine of five hundred (panas shall fall) on a Vaisya; but (for the same offence) a Kshatriya shall be shaved with the urine (of a donkey) or (pay) the same fine.

VIII. 385. A Brahamana who approaches unguarded females (of the) Kshatriya or Vaisya (castes), or a Sudra female, shall be fined five hundred (panas); but (for intercourse with) a female (of the) lowest (castes), one thousand.

Examining these disabilities against the background furnished by the place assigned to him by Manu, it is obvious that the object of these disabilities was not to make the Brahmin suffer. On the other hand it becomes clear that the object of Manu was to save the Brahmin from falling from the high pennacle on which he had placed him and incurring the disgrace of the non-Brahmins.

That the object of Manu was not to subject the Brahmins to poverty and destitute is clear from other provisions from Manu-Smriti. In this connection reference should be made to the rule contained in the Manu Smriti regarding the course of conduct a Brahmin should pursue when he is in distres.

X. 80. Among the several occupations the most commendable are, teaching the Veda for a Brahmana, protecting (the people) for a Kshatriya, and trade for a Vaisya.

X. 81. But a Brahmana, unable to subsist by his peculiar occupations just mentioned, may live according to the law applicable to Kshatriyas; for the latter is next to him in rank.

X. 82. If it be asked, ‘How shall it be, if he cannot maintain himself by either (of these occupations?’ the answer is), he may adopt a Vaisya’s mode of life, employing himself in agriculture and rearing cattle.

X. 83. But a Brahamana, or a Kshatriya, living by a Vaisya’s mode of subsistence, shall carefully avoid (the pursuit of) agriculture, (which causes) injury to many beings and depends on others.

X. 84. (Some) declare that agriculture is something excellent, (but) that means of subsistence is blamed by the virtuous; (for) the wooden (implement) with iron point injures the earth and (the beings) living in the earth.

X. 85. But he who, through a want of means of subsistence, gives up the strictness with respect to his duties, may sell, in order to
increase his wealth, the commodities sold by Vaisyas, making (however) the (following) exceptions.

It will be seen that the disabilities imposed upon a Brahmin last as long as he is prospering by the occupations which belong to him as of right. As soon as he is in distress and his disabilities vanish and he is free to do anything that he likes to do in addition to the occupations reserved to him and without ceasing to be a Brahmin. Further whether he is in distress or not is a matter which is left to the Brahmin to be decided in his own discretion. There is therefore no bar to prevent even a prosperous Brahmin to supplement his earnings by following any of the professions open to him in distress by satisfying his conscience.

There are other provisions in Manu Smriti intended to materially benefit the Brahmanas. They are Dakshina and Dana, Dakshina is the fee which the Brahmin is entitled to charge when he is called to perform a religious ceremony. Brahmanism is full of rites and ceremonies. It is not very difficult to imagine how great must this source of income be to every Brahmin. There was no chance of a priest being cheated of his fees. The religious sense attached to Dakshina was a sufficient sanction for regular payment. But Manu wanted to give the Brahmins the right to recover his fees.

XI. 38. A Brahmin who, though wealthy, does not give, as fee for the performance of an Agnyadheya, a horse sacred to Prajapati, becomes (equal to one) who has not kindled the sacred fires.

XI. 39. Let him who has faith and controls his senses, perform other meritorious acts, but let him on no account offer sacrifices at which he gives smaller fees (than those prescribed).

XI. 40. The organs (of sense and action), honour, (bliss in) heaven, longevity, fame, offspring, and cattle are destroyed by a sacrifice at which (too) small sacrificial fees are given; hence a man of small means should not offer a (Srauta) sacrifice.

He even goes to the length of excusing a Brahmin by declaring that anything done by him to recover his fees shall not be an offence under the law.

VIII. 349. In their own defence, in a strife for the fees of officiating priests and in order to protect women and Brahmanas; he who (under such circumstances) kills in the cause of right, commits no sin.

But it is the provision of Dana which makes a fruitful source of income to the Brahmins. Manu exhorts the King to make Dana to Brahmins.
VII. 79. A King shall offer various (Srauta) sacrifices at which liberal fees (are distributed), and in order to acquire merit, he shall give to Brahmanas enjoyments and wealth.

VII. 82. Let him honour those Brahmanas who have returned from their teacher’s house (after studying the Veda); for that (money which is given) to Brahmanas is declared to be an imperishable treasure for kings.

VII. 83. Neither thieves nor foes can take it, nor can it be lost; hence an imperishable store must be deposited by kings with Brahmanas.

XI. 4. But a king shall bestow, as is proper, jewels of all sorts, and presents for the sake of sacrifices on Brahmanas learned in the Vedas.

This admonition by Manu to the King did not remain a mere hope for the Brahmin. For as history shows that this exhortation was fully exploited by the Brahmins as the number of dana patras discovered by Archialogists indicate. It is astounding how the kings were befooled by the Brahmins to transfer village after village to crafty, lazy and indolent Brahmins. Indeed a large part of the wealth of the present day Brahmins lies in this swindle practised by wily Brahmins upon pious but foolish kings. Manu was not content to let the Brahmin prey upon the King for dana. He also allowed the Brahmin to prey upon the public in the matter of dana. This Manu does in three different ways. In the first place he exhorts people to make gifts as a part of the duty owed by the pious to himself at the same time pointing out that the highest dana to a Brahmin:

VII. 85. A gift to one who is not a Brahmana (yields) the ordinary (reward); a gift to one who calls himself a Brahmana, a double (reward); a gift to a well-read Brahmana, a hundred thousandfold (reward); (a gift) to one who knows the Veda and the Angas (Vedaparanga), (a reward) without end.

VII. 86. For according to the particular qualities of the recipient and according to the faith (of the giver) a small or a great reward will be obtained for a gift in the next world.

In the next place Manu declares that in certain circumstances dana to a Brahmin is compulsory.

XI. 1. Him who wishes (to marry for the sake of having) offspring, him who wishes to perform a sacrifice, a traveller, him who has given away all his property, him who begs for the sake of his teacher, his father, or his mother, a student of the Veda, and a sick man.
XI. 2 These nine Brahmanas one should consider as Snatakas, begging in order to fulfill the sacred law; to such poor men gifts must be given in proportion to their learning.

XI. 3. To these most excellent among the twice-born, food and presents (of money) must be given; it is declared that food must be given to others outside the sacrificial enclosure.

XI. 6. One should give, according to one’s ability, wealth to Brahmanas learned in the Veda and living alone; (thus) one obtains after death heavenly bliss.

The third method adopted by Manu to make the rule of Dana become a source of secure and steady income is beyond question the most ingenuous one. Manu linked up dana with penance. In the Scheme of Manu, an improper act may be a sin although not an offence or it may be both a sin as well as an offence. As a sin its punishment is a matter for canonical law. As an offence its punishment is a matter of secular law. As sin, the improper act is called Pataka and the punishment for it is called Penance. In the Scheme of Manu every Pataka must be expunged by the performance of a penance.

XI. 44. A man who omits a prescribed act, or performs a blameable act, or cleaves to sensual enjoyments, must perform a penance.

XI. 45. (All) sages prescribe a penance for a sin unintentionally committed; some declare, on the evidence of the revealed texts, (that it may be performed) even for an intentional (offences).

XI. 46. A sin unintentionally committed is expiated by the recitation of Vedic texts, but that which (men) in their folly commit intentionally, by various (special) penances.

XI. 53. Thus in consequence of a remnant of (the guilt of former) crimes, are born idiots, dumb, blind, deaf and deformed men, who are (all) despised by the virtuous.

XL. 54. Penances, therefore, must always be performed for the sake of purification, because those whose sins have not been expiated, are born (again) with disgraceful marks.

The penances prescribed by Manu are many and the curious may refer to the Manu Smriti itself for a knowledge of what they are. What is worthy of note is these penances are calculated to materially benefit the Brahmin. Some penances take the form of a simple dana to the Brahmin. Others prescribe the performance of some religious rites. But as religious rites cannot be performed by anybody except by a Brahmin and that the performance of religious rite requires the payment of fees the Brahmin alone can be the beneficiary of the dana system.
It is therefore absurd to suggest that Manu wanted to place before the Brahmins the ideal of humility, poverty and service. The Brahmins certainly did not understand Manu that way. Indeed they believed that they were made a privileged class. Not only they believed in it but they sought to extend their privileges in other directions a matter which will be discussed later on. They were perfectly justified, in their view. Manu called the Brahmins the ‘lords of the earth’ and he framed (the law) with such care that they shall remain so.

Having made full provision for Brahmin Rule and Brahmin dominance Manu next launches out to transform society to suit his purposes.

The transformation of Varna into Caste is the most stupendous and selfish task in which Brahmanism after its triumph became primarily engaged. We have no explicit record of the steps that Brahmanism took to bring about this change. On the contrary we have a lot of confused thinking on the relation between Varna and Caste. Some think that Varna and Caste are the same. Those who think that they are different seem to believe that Varna became caste when prohibition on intermarriage became part of the social order. All this, of course, is erroneous and the error is due to the fact that Manu in transforming the Varna into Caste has nowhere explained his ends and how his means are related to those ends. Oscar Wilde has said that to be intelligible is to be found out. Manu did not wish to be found out. He is therefore silent about his ends and means, leaving people to imagine them. For Hindus the subject is important beyond measure. An attempt at clarification is absolutely essential so that the confusion due to different people imagining differently the design of Manu may be removed and light thrown on the way how Brahmanism proceeded to give a wrong and pernicious turn to the original idea of Varna as the basis of society.

As I said Manu’s ways are silent and subterranean and we cannot give the detailed and chronological history of this conversion of Varna into Caste. But fortunately there are landmarks which are clear enough to indicate how the change was brought about.

Before proceeding to describe how this change was brought about let me clear the confusion between Varna and Caste. This can best be done by noting the similarities and differences between the two. Varna and Caste are identical in their *de jure* connotation. Both connote status and occupation. Status and occupation are the two concepts which are implied both in the notion Varna as well as in the notion of Caste. Varna and Caste however differ in one
important particular. Varna is not hereditary either in status or occupation. On the other hand Caste implies a system in which status and occupation are hereditary and descend from father to son.

When I say that Brahmanism converted Varna into Caste what I mean is that it made status and occupation hereditary.

How was this transformation effected? As I said there are no footprints left of the steps taken by Brahmanism to accomplish this change but there are landmarks which serve to give us a clear view of how the deed came to be done.

The change was accomplished by stages. In the transformation of Varna into Caste three stages are quite well marked. The first stage was the stage in which the duration of Varna i.e. of status and occupation of a person was for a prescribed period of time only. The second stage was a stage in which the status and occupation involved the Varna of a person ensured during lifetime only. The third stage was a stage in which the status and occupation of the Varna became hereditary. To use legal language the Estate conferred by Varna was at the beginning an Estate for a term only. Thereafter it became a life Estate and finally it became an Estate of inheritance which is tantamount to saying that Varna became Caste. That these are the stages by which Varna was converted into Caste seems to have ample support from tradition as recorded in the religious literature.\footnote{I am here following the clues supplied by the investigations of Mr. Daphtary and Pradnayneshwar Yati. The former's Dharma Rahasya and the latter's Chaturvarnya are very valuable as they are quite original in their point of view. The subject of course needs to be further investigated along the lines suggested by them.} There is no reason why this tradition should not be accepted as embodying some thing that is quite genuine. According to this tradition, the task of determining Varna of a person was effected by a body of officers called Manu and Sapta Rishis. From the mass of people Manu selected those who were fit to be Kshatriyas and Vaishas and the Sapta Rishis selected those who were fit to be Brahmanas. After this selection was made by Manu and Sapta Rishis for being Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishas, the rest that were not selected were called Shudras. The Varna arrangement so determined lasts for one \textit{Yug} i.e. a period of four years. Every fourth year a new body of officers known by the same designation Manu and Sapta Rishi were appointed for making a new selection. It happened that last time some of those who were left to be fit only for being Shudras were selected for being Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas while some of those who were, elected last time for being Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas were left as being fit only of being Shudras. Thus the personnel of the Varna changed. It was
a sort of a periodical shuffling and selection of men to take up according to their mental and physical aptitudes and occupations which were essential to the life of the community. The time when the reshuffling of the Varnas took place was called *Manwantar* which etymologically means change of Vama made by Manu. The word Manwantar also means the period for which the Varna of an individual was fixed. The word Manwantar is very rich in its contents and expresses the essential elements of the Varna system which were two. First it shows that Varna was determined by an independent body of people called Manu and Saptarshi. Secondly it shows that the Varna was for a period after which a change was made by Manu.\(^1\) According to ancient tradition as embodied in the Puranas the period for which the Varna of a person was fixed by Manu and Saptarshi was a period of four years and was called *Yug*. At the end of the period of four years there occurred the Manwantar whereby every fourth year the list was revised. Under the revision some changed their old Varna, some retained it, some lost it and some gained it.\(^2\)

The original system seems to have in contemplation the determination of the Varna of adults. It was not based on prior training or close scrutiny of bias and aptitude. Manu and Saptarshi was a sort of a Board of Interview which determined the Varna of a person from how he struck them at the interview. The determination of the Varna was done in a rough and tumble manner. This system seems to have gone into abeyance. A new system grew up in its place. It was known as the Gurukul system. The Gurukul was a school maintained by a Guru (teacher) also called Acharya (learned man). All children went to this Gurukul for their education. The period of education extended for twelve years. The child while at Gurukul was known as Bramhachari. After the period of education was over there was the Upanayan ceremony performed at the Gurukul by the Acharya. The Upanayan ceremony was the most important ceremony. It was a ceremony at which the Acharya determined the Varna of the student and sent him out in the world to perform the duties of that Varna. Upanayan by the Acharyas was the new method of determining Varna which came into vogue in place of method of determination by Manu and Saptarshi. The new method was undoubtedly superior to the old method. It retained the

\(^1\) One can now see why Sumati Bhargava called his code as the Code of Manu. He wanted to invest it with the dignity and authority of the ancient law-giver Manu.

\(^2\) This is the only theory which can explain how some of the Mantras of the Vedas are admitted to have been made by Shudras, a question which in view of the statement of Manu that the Shudras must not recite the Vedas, nor hear them recited becomes a very puzzling question.
true feature of the old method namely that the Varna should be determined by a disinterested and independent body. But it added a new feature namely training as a pre-requisite for assignment of Varna. On the ground that training alone develops individual in the make up of a person and the only safe way to determine the Varna of a person is to know his individuality, the addition of this new feature was undoubtedly a great improvement.

With the introduction of the Acharya Gurukul system, the duration of the Varna came to be altered. Varna instead of being Varna for a period became Varna for life. But it was not hereditary.

Evidently Brahmanism was dissatisfied with this system. The reason for dissatisfaction was quite obvious. Under the system as prevalent there was every chance of the Acharya declaring the child of a Brahmin as fit only to be a Shudra. Brahmanism was naturally most anxious to avoid this result. It wanted the Varna to be hereditary. Only by making the Varna hereditary could it save the children of the Brahmins from being declared Shudra. To achieve this Brahmanism proceeded in the most audacious manner one can think of.

III

Brahmanism made three most radical changes in the system of determining the Varna of the child. In the first place the system of Gurukul as the place where training to the child was given and its Varna was determined by the Guru at the end of the period of training was abolished. Manu is quite aware of the Gurukul and refers to Guruvas\(^1\) i.e. training and residence in the Gurukul under the Guru. But does not refer to it at all in connection with the Upanayan. He abolishes the Guru as an authority competent to perform Upanayan by omitting to make even the remotest reference to him in connection with Upanayan. In place of the Guru Manu allows the Upanayan of the child to be performed by its father athome.\(^2\) Secondly Upanayan was made into a Sanskara i.e. a sacrament. In olden times Upanayan was like a convocation ceremony\(^3\) held by the Guru to confer degrees obtained by students in his Gurukul in which certificates of proficiency in the duties of a particular Varna were granted. In Manu’s law that Upanayan was a complete change in the meaning and purpose of this most important institution. Thirdly the relation of training to Upanayan was totally reversed. In the olden system training came before Upanayan.

\(^1\) Manu II. 67 Where Manu.
\(^2\) Manu II, 36-37.
\(^3\) On this point see Pradnaneshwar Yati’s booklet on Upnayan.
Under the Brahmanism Upanayan came before training. Manu directs that a child be sent to the Guru for training but that is after Upanayan i.e. after his Varna is determined by his father.

The principal change made by Brahmanism was the transfer of authority from the Guru to the father in the matter of performing Upanayan. The result was that the father having the right to perform the Upanayan of his child gave his own Varna to the child and thus made it hereditary. It is by divesting the Guru of his authority to determine the Varna and vesting it in the father that Brahmanism ultimately converted Varna into Caste.

Such is the story of the transformation of Varna into Caste. The story of the transition from one to the other is of course reconstructed. For the reasons already given it may not be quite as accurate as one would wish it to be in all its details. But I have no doubt that the stages and the ways by which Varna ceased to exist and caste came into being must be some such as have been suggested in the foregoing discussion of the subject.

What object Brahmanism could have had in converting Varna into caste it is not difficult to imagine. The object was to make the high status enjoyed by the Brahmins from ancient times the privilege of every Brahmin and his progeny without reference to merits or to qualifications. To put it differently the object was to elevate and en noble every Brahmin, however mean and worthless he may be, to the high status occupied by some of them on account of the virtue. It was an attempt to en noble the whole of the Brahmin Community without exception.

That this was the object of Brahmanism is clear from Manu’s ordinances. Manu knew that making Varna hereditary, the most ignorant Brahmin will be elevated to the status occupied by the most learned Brahmin. He feared that the former may not be respected as much as the most learned, which was the object of this attempt at the ennoblement of the whole class of Brahmins. Manu is very much concerned about the ignorant Brahmin—a new thing—and warns people against being disrespectful to an ignorant and mean Brahmin.

IX. 317. A Brahmin, whether learned or ignorant, is a powerful divinity; even as fire is powerful divinity, whether consecrated or popular.

IX. 319. Thus although Brahmins employ themselves in all sorts of mean occupations, they must invariably be honoured; for they are something transcendently divine.

1 Manu II. 69.

2 Under the Varna there could be no ignorant Brahmin. The possibility of an ignorant Brahmin can arise only when Varna becomes Caste i.e. when one becomes a Brahmin only by reason of birth.
Such a warning was unnecessary if the object was to ennoble the whole Brahmin class. Here is a case where vice refuses to pay to virtue even the homage of hypocracy. Can there be greater moral degeneracy than what is shown by Manu in insisting upon the worship of the Brahmin even if he is mean and ignorant?

So much for the object of change from Varna to caste. What have been the consequences of this change?

From the spiritual point of view the consequences have been too harmful to be contemplated with equanimity. The harm done may perhaps be better realized by comparing the position of the Brahmin as a priest resulting from the law of Manu with that of the law of the clergy under the Church of England. There the clergy is subject to the criminal law as every citizen is. But in addition to that he is always subject to Church Discipline Act. Under the Criminal Law he would be punished if he officiated as a clergy without being qualified for it. Under the Church Discipline Act he would be liable to be disqualified as a clergy for conduct which would be deemed to be morally wrong although it did not amount to a crime. This double check on the clergy is held justifiable because learning and morality are deemed to be quite essential for the profession of the clergy who are supposed to administer to the spiritual needs of the people. Under Brahmanism the Brahmin who alone can be the clergy need not possess learning or morality. Yet he is in sole charge of the spiritual affairs of the people!! On the value of a creed which permits this, comment is unnecessary.

From the secular point of view, the consequences of this transformation of Varna into Caste has to introduce a most pernicious mentality among the Hindus. It is to disregard merit and have regard only to birth. If one is descended from the high he has respect although he may be utterly devoid of merit or worth. One who is of high birth will be superior to the one who is of low birth although the latter may be superior to the former in point of worth. Under Brahmanism it is birth that always wins, whether it is against birth or against worth. Merit by itself can win no meads. This is entirely due to the dissociation of merits from status which is the work of Brahmanism. Nothing could be better calculated to produce an unprogressive society which sacrifices the rights of intelligence on the altar of aristocratic privilege.

Now the third deed in the catalogue of deeds done by Brahmanism after its triumph over Buddhism. It was to separate the Brahmins from the result of the Non-Brahmin population and to sever the different social strata of the Non-Brahmin population.
Pushyamitra’s Brahmanic Revolution was undertaken for the purposes of restoring the ancient social system of Chaturvarna which under the Buddhist regime was put into the melting pot. But when Brahmanism triumphed over Buddhism it did not content itself with merely restoring Chaturvarna as it was in its original form. The system of Chaturvarna of the Pre-Buddhist days was a flexible system and was an open to system. This was because the Varna system had no connection with the marriage system. While Chaturvarna recognized the existence of four different classes, it did not prohibit inter-marriage between them. A male of one Varna could lawfully marry a female of another Varna. There are numerous illustrations in support of this view. I give below some instances which refer to well known and respectable individuals which have acquired a name and fame in the sacred lore of the Hindus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>His Varna</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Her Varna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shantanu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Ganga</td>
<td>Shudra Anamik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shantanu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Matsyagandha</td>
<td>Shudra Fisher woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parashara</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Matsyagandha</td>
<td>Shudra Fisher woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vishwamitra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Menaka</td>
<td>Apsara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yayati</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Devayani</td>
<td>Brahmmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Yayati</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Sharmishta</td>
<td>Asuri—Non-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jaratkara</td>
<td>Brahmmin</td>
<td>Jaratkari</td>
<td>Nag—Non-Aryan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should anybody retain doubt on the question that the division of the society into classes did not prohibit intermarriages between the four Varnas let him consider the geneology of the family of the great Brahmin sage Vyas.

**GENEEOLOGY OF VYAS**

Varuna Mitra = Urvashi

Vashishtha = Akshamala

Shakti =

Parashara = Matsyagandha

= Vyas

Brahmintsrm with the ferocity of an outraged brute proceeded to put a stop to these intermarriage between the different Varnas. A new law is proclaimed by Manu. It is in the following terms:—

III. 12. For the first marriage of twice born men (wives) of equal caste are recommended.
III. 13. It is declared that a Sudra woman alone can be the wife of a Shudra.

III. 14. A Shudra woman is not mentioned even in any (ancient) story as the (first) wife of a Brahmana or of a Kshatriya, though they lived in the (greatest) distress.

III. 15. Twice-born men who, in their folly, wed wives of the low (Sudra) caste, soon degrade their families and their children to the state of Sudras.

III. 16. According to Atri and to (Gautama) the son of Utathya, he who weds a Sudra woman becomes an outcast, according to Saunakaon the birth of a son, and according to Bhrigu he who has (male)offspring from a (Sudra female, alone).

III. 17. A Brahmana who takes a Sudra wife to his bed, will (after death) sink into hell; if he begets a child by her, he will lose the rank of a Brahmana.

III. 18. The manes and the gods will not eat the (offerings) of that man who performs the rites in honour of the gods, of the manes, and of guests chiefly with a (Sudra wife's) assistance, and such (a man) will not go to heaven.

III. 19. For him who drinks the moisture of a Sudra's lips, who is tainted by her breath, and who begets a son on her, no expiation is prescribed.

Brahmanism was not satisfied with the prohibition of intermarriage. Brahmanism went further and prohibited interdining.

Manu lays down certain interdicts on food. Some are hygenic. Some are social. Of the social the following are worthy of attention:

IV. 218. Food given by a king, impairs his manly vigour; by one of the servile class, his divine light; by goldsmiths, his life; by leathercutters, his good name.

IV. 219. Given by cooks and the like mean artizans, it destroys his offsprings: by a washerman, his muscular strength;

IV. 221. That of all others, mentioned in order, whose food must never be tasted, is held equal by the wise to the skin, bones, and hair of the head.

IV. 222. Having unknowingly swallowed the food of any such persons, he must fast during three days; but having eaten it knowingly, he must perform the same harsh penance, as if he had tasted any seminal impurity, ordure, or urine.

I said that Brahmanism acted with the ferocity of an outranged brute in undertaking the task of prohibiting intermarriage and interdining. Those who have doubts in this matter ponder over the language of Manu.
Mark the disgust Manu shows with regard to the Shudra woman.

Mark what Manu says about the food of the Shudra. He says it is as impure as semen or urine.

These two laws have produced the caste system. Prohibition of intermarriage and prohibition against interdining are two pillars on which it rests. The caste system and the rules relating to intermarriage and interdining are related to each other as ends to means. Indeed by no other means could the end be realized.

The forging of these means shows that the creation of the caste system was end and aim of Brahmanism. Brahmanism enacted the prohibitions against intermarriage and interdining. But Brahmanism introduced other changes in the social system and if the purposes underlying these changes are those which I suggest them to be, then it must be admitted that Brahmanism was so keen in sustaining the caste system that it did not mind whether ways and means employed were fair or unfair, moral or immoral. I refer to the laws contained in the Code of Manu regarding marriage of girls and the life of widows.

See the law that Manu promulgates regarding the marriage of females.

IX. 4. Reprehensible is the father who gives not (his daughter) in marriage at the proper time.

IX. 88. To a distinguished, handsome suitor of equal caste should a father give his daughter in accordance with the prescribed rule, though she have not attained (the proper age), i.e. although she may not have reached puberty.

By this rule Manu enjoins that a girl should be married even though she may not have reached the age of puberty i.e. even when she is a child.

Now with regard to widows Manu promulgates the following rule.

V. 157. At her pleasure let her (i.e. widow) emaciate her body, by living voluntarily on pure flowers, roots and fruits; but let her not, when her lord is deceased, even pronounce the name of another man.

V. 161. But a widow, who from a wish to bear children, slights her deceased husband by marrying again, brings disgrace on herself here below, and shall be excluded from the seat of her lord (in heaven).

V. 162. Offspring begotten on a woman by any other than her husband, is here declared to be no progeny of hers; no more than a child, begotten on the wife of another man belongs to the begetter; nor is a second husband any where prescribed for a virtuous woman.
This is the rule of enforced widowhood for a woman. A reference may also be made to Sati or a widow who burns herself on the funeral pyre of her husband and thus puts an end to her life. Manu is silent about it.

Yajnavalkya\(^1\) an authority nearly as great as Manu says, she must not live separately or alone.

86. When deprived of her husband, she must not remain away from her father, mother, son, brother, mother-in-law or from her maternal uncle; otherwise she might become liable to censure.

Here again Yajnavalkya does not suggest that a widow become a Sati. But Vijnaneshwar, the author of Mitakshara a commentary on Yajnavalkya Smriti makes the following observation in commenting on the above Sloka.

“This is in the case of the alternative of leading a celibate life vide the text of Vishnu:\(^2\) “After the death of the husband, either celibacy or ascending the (cremation) pile after him.”

Vijnaneshwar\(^3\) adds as his opinion that ‘There is great merit in ascending the funeral pyre after him.’

From this one can very easily and clearly see how the rule of Sati came to be forged. Manu’s rule was that a widow was not to remarry. But it appears from the statement by Vijnaneshwar that from the time of the Vishnu Smriti a different interpretation began to put on the ordinance of Manu. According to this new interpretation Manu’s rule was explained to be offering to the widow a choice between two alternatives: (1) Either burn yourself on your husband’s funeral pyre or (2) If you don’t, remain unmarried. This of course is totally false interpretation quite unwarranted by the clear words of Manu. Somehow it came to be accepted. The date of the Vishnu Smriti is somewhere about the 3rd or 4th Century. It can therefore be said that rule of Sati dates from this period.

One thing is certain, these were new rules. The rule of Manu that girl should be married before she has reached puberty is a new rule. In Pre-Buddhistic Brahmanism\(^4\) marriages were performed not only after puberty but they were performed when girls had reached an age when they could be called grown up. Of this there is ample evidence. Similarly the rule that a woman once she had lost her husband must not remarry is a new rule. In the Pre-Buddhist Brahmanism there was no prohibition on widow remarriage. The fact that the Sanskrit language contains words such as Punarbhuh (woman who has

---

\(^1\) The date of the Yajnavalkya Smriti is between 150-200 A.D.
\(^2\) Vishnu Smriti Ch. XXV 14.
\(^3\) He wrote his Mitakshara between 1070 and 1100 A.D.
\(^4\) See kane—History of Dharmashastra I. Part I. page.
undergone a second marriage ceremony) and *punarbhav* (second husband) show that such marriages were quite common under the Pre-Buddhist Brahmanism.\(^1\) With regard to Sati the position as to when it arose,\(^2\) there is evidence to suggest that it existed in ancient times. But there is evidence that it had died out and it was revived after Brahmanism under Pushyamitra obtained its victory over Buddhism although it was some time later than Manu.

Question is this, why these changes were made by the triumphant Brahmanism? What did Brahmanism want to achieve by having girls married before they had become pubert, by denying the widow to the right to marry again and by telling her to put herself to death by immolating herself in the funeral pyre of her deceased husband? No explanations are forthcoming for these changes. Mr. C. V. Vaidya who offers an explanation for girl marriage says\(^3\) that girl marriage was introduced to prevent girls from joining the Buddhist order of nuns. This explanation does not satisfy me. Mr. Vaidya omits to take into consideration another rule laid down by Manu—namely the rule relating to suitable age for marriage. According to that rule.

IX. 94. A man, aged thirty, shall marry a maiden of twelve who pleases him, or a man of twenty-four a girl eight years of age.

The question is not why girl marriage was introduced. The question is why Manu allowed so much discrepancy in the ages of the bride and the bridegroom.

Mr. Kane\(^4\) has attempted an explanation of Sati. His explanation is that there is nothing new in it. It existed in India in ancient times as it did in other parts of the world. This again does not satisfy the world. If it existed outside India, it has not been practised on so enormous a scale as in India. Secondly if traces of it are found in Ancient India in the Kshatriyas, why was it revived, why was it not universalized? There is no satisfactory explanation. Mr. Kane’s explanation that the prevalence of Sati by reference to laws of inheritance does not appear to me very convincing. It may be that because under the Hindu Law of inheritance as it prevailed in Bengal, women got a share in property. The relations of the husband of the widow pressed her to be a Sati in order to get rid of a share may explain why Sati was practised on so large a scale in Bengal. But it does not explain how it arose nor how it came to be practised in other parts of India.

Again with regard to the prohibition of widow remarriage, there is no explanation whatsoever. Why was the widow, contrary to

\(^1\) See Kane—History of Dharmaashastra, Vol. II, Part II Chapt.
\(^2\) The available evidence on Sati has been collected by Kane in his History of Dharmaashastra Vol. II Part I pp. 617-636.
\(^3\) History of India Vol. II.
\(^4\) History or Dharmaashastra.
established practice, prohibited from marrying? Why was she required to lead a life of misery? Why was she disfigured?

My explanation for girl marriage, enforced widowhood and Sati is quite different and I offer it for what it is worth.¹

“Thus the superposition of endogamy over exogamy means the creation of Caste. But this is not an easy affair. Let us take an imaginary group that desire to make itself into a caste and analyse what means it will have to adopt to make itself endogamous. If a group desires to make itself endogamous, a formal injunction against intermarriage with outside groups will be of no avail, especially if prior to the introduction of endogamy, exogamy were to be the rule in all matrimonial relations. Again there is a tendency in all groups living in close contact with one another to assimilate and amalgamate, and thus consolidate into a homogeneous society. If this tendency be strongly counteracted in the interest of Caste formation, it is absolutely necessary to circumscribe a circle without which people should not contract marriages.”

“Nevertheless this encircling to prevent marriages from without creates problems from within which are not very easy of solution. Roughly speaking in a normal group the two sexes are more or less evenly distributed, and generally speaking there is an equality between those of the same age. But this equality is never quite realised in actual societies. While to the group that is desirous of making itself into a caste the maintenance of this equality between the sexes becomes the ultimate goal, for without this endogamy can no longer subsist. In other words, if endogamy is to be preserved, conjugal rights from within have to be provided for, else members of the group will be driven out of the circle to take care of themselves in any way they please. But in order that the conjugal rights be provided for from within, it is absolutely necessary to maintain a numerical equality between the marriageable units of the two sexes within the group desirous of making itself into a Caste. It is only through the maintenance of this equality that the necessary endogamy of the group could be kept intact, and a very large disparity is sure to break it.”

“The problem of Caste then ultimately resolves itself into one of repairing the disparity between the marriageable units of the two sexes within it. The much needed parity between the units could be realized only when a couple dies simultaneously. But this is a rare contingency. The husband may die before the wife and create a surplus woman who must be disposed of, else through intermarriage she will violate the endogamy of the group. In like manner the husband may survive his

¹ They will be found in my paper on “Castes in India” which appeared in The Indian Antiquarry for May, 1917.
wife and be a surplus man whom the group, while it may sympathise with him for the sad bereavement, has to dispose of, else he will marry outside the Caste and will break the endogamy. Thus both the surplus man and the surplus woman constitute a menace to the Caste if not taken care of, for, not finding suitable partners inside their prescribed circle (and they cannot find any, for there are just enough pairs to go round) very likely they will transgress the boundary, marry outside and import population that is foreign to the Caste. Let us see what our imaginary group is likely to do with this surplus man and surplus woman. We will first take up the case of the surplus woman.

She can be disposed of in two different ways so as to preserve the endogamy of the Caste.

"First : burn her on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband and get rid of her. This, however, is rather an impracticable way of solving the problem of sex disparity. In some cases it may work, in others it may not. Consequently every surplus woman cannot thus be disposed of, because it is an easy solution but a hard realization. However, the surplus woman (widow) if not disposed of, remains in the group: but in her very existence lies a double danger. She may marry outside the Caste and violate to endogamy or she may marry within the Caste and through competition encroach upon the chances of marriage that must be reserved for the potential brides in the Caste. She therefore is a menace in any case and something must be done to her if she cannot be burned along with her deceased husband."

"The second remedy is to enforce widowhood on her for the rest of her life. So far as the objective results are concerned burning is a better solution than enforcing widowhood. Burning the widow eliminates all the three evils that a surplus woman is fraught with. Being dead and gone she creates no problem of remarriage either inside or outside the Caste. But compulsory widowhood is superior to burning because it is more practicable. Besides being comparatively humane it also guards against the evils of remarriage as does burning; but it fails to guard the morals of the group. No doubt under compulsory widowhood the woman remains and, just because she is deprived of her natural right of being a legitimate wife in future, the incentive to bad moral conduct is increased. But this is by no means an insuperable difficulty. She can be degraded to a condition where she could no longer be a source of allurement."

"The problem of surplus man (widower) is much more important and much more difficult than that of the surplus woman in a group that desires to make itself into a Caste. From time immemorial man as compared with woman has had the upper hand. He is a dominant
figure in every group and of the two sexes has greater prestige. With this traditional superiority of man over woman his wishes have always been consulted. Woman on the other hand has been an easy prey to all kinds of iniquitous injunctions, religious, social or economic. But man as a maker of injunctions is most often above them all. Such being the case you cannot accord the same kind of treatment to a surplus man as you can to a surplus woman in a Caste.”

“The project of burning him with his deceased wife is hazardous in two ways: first of all it cannot be done, simply because he is a man. Secondly, if done, a sturdy soul is lost to the Caste. There remain then only two solutions which can conveniently dispose of him. I say conveniently because he is an asset to the group.”

“Important as he is to the group, endogamy is still more important, and the solution must assure both these ends. Under these circumstances he may be forced, or I should say induced, after the manner of the widow to remain a widower for the rest of his life. This solution is not altogether difficult, for without there being any compulsion some are so disposed as to enjoy self-imposed celibacy or may even take a further step of their own accord to renounce the world and its joys. But, given human nature as it is, this solution can hardly be expected to be realized. On the other hand, as is very likely to be the case, if he remains in the group as an active participator in group activities, he is a danger to the morals of the group. Looked at from a different viewpoint, celibacy though easy in cases where it succeeds, is not so advantageous even then to the material prospects of the Caste. If he observes genuine celibacy and renounces the world, he would not be a menace to the preservation of Caste endogamy or Caste morals as undoubtedly would be, if he remained a secular person. But as an ascetic celibate he is as good as burned, so far as the material well-being of his Caste is concerned. A Caste, in order that it may be large enough to afford a vigorous communal life, must be maintained at a certain numerical strength. But to hope for this and to proclaim celibacy is the same as trying to cure atrophy by bleeding.

“Imposing celibacy on the surplus man in the group therefore fails, both theoretically and practically. It is in the interest of the Caste to keep him as a Grahastha (one who raises a family) to use a Sanskrit technicality. But the problem is to provide him with a wife from within the Caste. At the outset this is not possible, for the ruling ratio in a caste has to be one man to one woman and none can have two chances of marriage, for in a Caste thoroughly self enclosed there are always just enough marriageable women to go round for the marriageable men. Under these circumstances the surplus man can
only be provided with a wife by recruiting a bride from the ranks of those not yet marriageable in order to tie him down to the group. This is certainly the best of the possible solutions in the case of the surplus man. By this, he is kept within the Caste. By this, this numerical depletion through constant outflow is guarded against, and by this endogamy and morals are preserved.

“It will now be seen that the four means by which numerical disparity between the two sexes is conveniently maintained are: (1) Burning the widow with her deceased husband; (2) Compulsory widowhood—a milder form of burning; (3) Imposing celibacy on the widower; (4) Wedding him to a girl not yet marriageable. Though as I said above, burning the widow and imposing celibacy on the widower are of doubtful service to the group in its endeavour to preserve its endogamy, all of them operate as means. But means as forces, when liberated or set in motion create an end. What then is the end that these means create? They create and perpetuate endogamy, while caste and endogamy, according to our analysis of the various definitions of caste, are one and the same thing. Thus the existence of these means means caste and caste involves these means.”

“This, in my opinion, is the general mechanism of a caste in a system of castes. Let us now turn to the castes in the Hindu Society and inquire into their mechanism. I need hardly promise that there are a great many pitfalls in the path of those who try to unfold the past, and caste in India to be sure is a very ancient institution. This is especially true where there exist no authentic or written history or records or where the people, like the Hindus are so constituted that to them writing history is a folly, for the world is an illusion. But institutions do live, though for a long time they may remain unrecorded and as often as not customs and morals are like fossils that tell their own history. If this is true, our task will be amply rewarded if we scrutinize the solution the Hindus arrived at to meet the problems of the surplus man and surplus woman.”

“Complex though it be in its general working the Hindu Society, even to a superficial observer, presents three singular uxorial customs, namely:—

(i) Sati or the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband.

(ii) Enforced widowhood by which a widow is not allowed to remarry.

(iii) Girl marriage.

In addition to these, one also notes a great hankering after Sannyasa (renunciation) on the part of the widower, but it may in some cases be due purely to psychic disposition.
“So far as I know, no scientific explanation of the origin of these customs is forthcoming even today. We have plenty of philosophy to tell us why these customs were honoured. (Cf. A. K. Coomaraswamy— “Sati: a Defence of the Eastern Woman “in the British Sociological Review Vol. VI 1913) Because it is a “proof of the perfect unity of body and soul” between husband and wife and of “devotion beyond the grave”, because it embodied the ideal of wifehood which is well expressed by Lima when she said “Devotion to her Lord is woman’s honour, it is her eternal heaven: and O Maheshwara”, she adds with a most touching human cry, “I desire not paradise itself if thou art not satisfied with me!” Why compulsory widowhood is honoured I know not nor have I yet met with anyone who sang in praise of it, though there are a great many who adhere to it. The eulogy in honour of girl marriage is reported by Dr. Ketkar to be as follows: “A really faithful man or woman ought not to feel affection for a woman or a man other than the one with whom he or she is united. Such purity is compulsory not only after marriage, but even before marriage, for that is the only correct ideal of chastity. No maiden could be considered pure if she feels love for a man other than to whom she might get married. As she does not know whom she is going to get married to, she must not feel affection for any man at all before marriage. If she does so, it is a sin. So it is better for a girl to know whom she has to love, before any sexual consciousness has been awakened in her”. Hence girl marriage.

“This high-flown and ingenious sophistry indicates why these institutions were honoured, but does not tell us why they were practised. My own interpretation is that they were honoured because they were practised. Any one slightly acquainted with rise of individualism in the 18th century will appreciate my remark. At all times, it is the movement that is most important; and the philosophies grow around it long afterwards to justify it and give it a moral support. In like manner I urge that the very fact that these customs were so highly eulogized proves that they needed eulogy for their prevalence. Regarding the question as to why they arose, I submit that they were needed to create the structure of caste and the philosophies in honour of them were intended to popularize them or to gild the pill, as we might say, for they must have been so abominable and shocking to the sense of the unsophisticated that they needed a great deal of sweetening. These customs are essentially of the nature of means, though they are represented as ideals. But this should not blind us from understanding the results that flow from them. One might safely say that idealization of means is
necessary and in this particular case was perhaps motivated to endow them with greater efficacy. Calling means an end does not harm except that it disguises its real character, but it does not deprive it of its real nature, that of a means. You may pass a law that all cats are dogs, just as you can call a means an end. But you can no more change the nature of means thereby than you can turn cats into dogs; consequently I am justified in holding that, regard them as ends or as means, Sati, enforced widowhood and girl marriage are customs that were primarily intended to solve the problem of the surplus man and surplus woman in a caste and to maintain its endogamy. Strict endogamy could not be preserved without these customs, while caste without endogamy is fake."

According to my view girl marriage, enforced widowhood and Sati had no other purpose than that of supporting the Caste System which Brahmanism was seeking to establish by prohibiting intermarriage. It is difficult to stop intermarriage. Members of different castes are likely to go out of their Caste either for love or for necessity. It is to provide against necessity that Brahmanism made these rules. This is my explanation of these new rules, made by Brahmanism. That explanation may not be acceptable to all. But there can be no doubt that Brahmanism was taking all means possible to prevent intermarriages between the different classes taking place.

Another illustration of this desire on the part of Brahmanism is to be found in the rule regarding excommunication promulgated by Manu.

Manu says that a person who is excommunicated by his Caste is an outcast.\(^1\) According to Manu an outcast is to be treated as though he was actually dead. Manu ordains that his obsequies should be performed and lays down the mode and manner of performing these obsequies of the outcast.

XI. 183. The Sapindas and Samanodakas of an outcast must offer (a libation of) water (to him, as if he were dead), outside (the village), on an inauspicious day, in the evening and in the presence of the relatives, officiating priests, and teachers.

XI. 184. A female slave shall upset with her foot a pot filled with water, as if it were for a dead person; (his Sapindas) as well as the Samanodakas shall be impure for a day and a night. Manu however allows the outcast to return to Caste on performing penance as will be seen from the following rules:

XI. 187. But when he has performed his penance, they shall bathe with him in a holy pool and throw down a new pot, filled with water.

\(^1\) The outcast is quite different from un Untouchable as will be shown later.
XI. 188. But he shall throw that pot into water, enter his house and perform, as before, all the duties incumbent on a relative.

XI. 189. Let him follow the same rule in the case of female outcasts; but clothes, food, and drink shall be given to them, and they shall live close to the (family) house.

But if the outcast was recalcitrant and impenitent Manu provides for his punishment.

Manu will not allow the outcast to live in the family house. Manu enjoins that

XI. 189………Clothes, food, and drink shall be given to them (i.e. the outcast members of the family), and they shall live close to the (family) house.

III. 92. Let him (i.e. the householder) gently place on the ground (some food) for dogs, outcasts, chandals, those afflicted with diseases that are punishments of former sins, crows and insects.

Manu declares that having social intercourse with an outcast is a sin. He warns the Snataka

IV. 79…………not (to) stay together with outcasts.

IV. 213…………Not (to eat food given) by outcasts.

To the householder Manu says:—

III. 151. Let him (i.e. the householder) not entertain at a Shradha.

III. 157. (A person) who forsakes his mother, his father, or a teacher without (sufficient) reason, he who has contracted an alliance with outcasts either through the Veda or through a marriage.

Manu ordains a social boycott of the outcast by penalizing those who associate with him.

XI. 181. He who associates himself for one year with an outcast himself becomes an outcast; not by sacrificing, reading the Veda, or contracting affinity with him, since by those acts he loses his class immediately, but even by using the same carriage or seat, or by taking his food at the same board.

XI. 182. He who associates with any one of those outcasts, must perform, in order to atone for (such) intercourse, the penance prescribed for that (sinner).

Then there are penalties against an outcast who defies his caste and choses to remain an outcast. Manu tells him what will be his penalty in the next world.

XII. 60. He who has associated with outcasts (will) become Brahmarakshas (i.e. an evil spirit).
Manu however was not prepared to leave the outcast with this. He proceeds to enact penalty the severity of which cannot be doubted. The following are the penal sections of Manu Smriti against an outcast.

III. 150. Those Brahmins who are outcasts. Athesists are unworthy (to partake) of oblations to the gods and manes.

IX. 201. Outcast receive(s) no share (in inheritance).

XI. 185. But thenceforward (i.e. after the obsequies of the outcast have been performed) it shall be forbidden to converse with him, to sit with him, to give him a share of the inheritance, and to hold with him such intercourse as is usual among men;

XI. 186. And (if the outcast be the eldest) his right of primogeniture shall be withheld and the additional share, due to the eldest son; and in his stead a younger brother, excelling in virtue (i.e. who observes the rule of caste) shall obtain the share of the eldest.

Such is the law of Manu against an outcast. The severity of the penalties prescribed against him is quite obvious. Its effect is to exclude him from all social intercourse, to suspend him from every civil function, to disqualify him for all offices and to disable him from inheriting any property. Under these pains and penalties the outcaste might as well be dead which indeed Manu considers him to be, directing libations to be offered to the manes as though he was naturally so. This system of privations and mortifications was enforced by prescribing a similar fate to anyone who endeavoured to associate with an outcast. The penalty was not confined to the outcast. Nor was it restricted to males. Males and females were both subject to the law of the outcast. Even their progeny was subject to penalty. The law was extended to the son of the outcast. Born before son was entitled to inherit immediately, as though his father was dead. Born after excommunication he lost his right to inherit, i.e. he became an outcast along with his father.

The laws of Manu regarding the outcast are of course devoid of justice and humanity. Some might think that there is nothing very strange about them. That is because these laws are very similar to the laws against apostacy and heresy to be found in all religious codes. It is unfortunately a fact. All religions — Except Buddhism — have used or misused the laws of inheritance for enforcing adhesion and conformity to their codes. The conversion of a Christian to Judaism or paganism or any other religion was punished by the Emperors Constantines and Jul Emperors Theodosius and Valentiniaus added capital punishment, in
case the apostle endeavoured to pervert others to the same inequity. This was borrowed by all the European countries who maintained a similar system of penalties to enforce the Christian faith.

Such a view of the law of the outcast would be quite superficial. First of all the outcast is a creation of Brahmanism. It is a necessary coefficient of caste. Indeed once Brahmanism was determined to create the caste system the law against the outcast was absolutely essential. For only by punishing the outcast can the caste system be maintained. Secondly there is a difference between the Christian or Mahomedan Law of Apostacy and the Brahmanic law of caste. The disqualification under the Christian or Mahomedan law of apostacy was restricted to want of religious belief or the profession of wrong religious belief. Under the Brahmanic law the disqualification had no connection with belief or want of belief. It was connected with the sanctity of a certain form of social organization—namely Caste. It is the act of going out of one’s caste that was made punishable. This is a very important difference.

The Brahmanic law of the outcast as compared with the law of apostacy in other religions shows that a belief in God is not essential to Brahmanism; that a belief in life after death is not essential to Brahmanism; that a belief in salvation either by good deeds or by a belief in a prophet is not essential to Brahmanism; that a belief in the sacredness of the Vedas is essential to Brahmanism. This is only one thing that is essential to Brahmanism. For it is only breach of caste which is penalized. All else is left to violation.

Those who are not blind to these forces of integration will admit that this act of Brahmanism in prohibiting intermarriage and interdining is nothing short of a complete dismemberment of society. It is a deathknell to unity, an effective bar to united action. As will be shown hereafter Brahmanism was keen on preventing united action by Non-Brahmins to overthrow Brahmanism and that is why Brahmanism brought about this segmentation of Indian Society. But the fatal effects of a poison can never be confined to the limits of the original intention of the perpetrator. The same thing has happened in the case of Caste. Brahmanism intended to paralyse the Non-Brahmans for action against Brahmins, it did not design that they as a nation should be paralysed for action against a foreign nation. But the result of the poison of Caste has been they have become stricken for action against Brahmanism as well as against foreigners. In other words Brahmanism in instituting Caste system has put the greatest impediment against the growth of nationalism.

In spite of what others say the Hindu will not admit that there is any thing evil in the Caste system, and from one point of view he is right. There is love, unity and mutual aid among members of a family. There is honour among thieves. A band of robbers have common interests as respects to its members. Gangs are marked by fraternal feelings and intense loyalty to their own ends however opposed they may be to the other gangs. Following this up one can say that a Caste has got all the praiseworthy characteristics which a society is supposed to have.

It has got the virtues of a family inasmuch as there is love unity and mutual aid. It has got the honour known to prevail among thieves. It has got the loyalty and fraternal feeling we meet with in gangs and it also possesses that sense of common interests which is found among robbers.

A Hindu may take satisfaction in these praiseworthy characteristics of the Caste and deny that there is anything evil in it. But he forgets that his thesis that Caste is an ideal form of social organization is supportable on the supposition that each caste is entitled to regard himself as an independent society, as an end in itself as nations do. But the theory breaks down when the consideration pertains to Hindu Society and to the Caste-System which goes with it.

Even in such a consideration of the subject the Hindu will not admit that the Caste system is an evil. Charge Hinduism with the responsibility for the evils of the Caste-system and the Hindu will at once retort, “What about the Class System in Europe?” Upto a point the retort is good if it means that there exists nowhere that ideal society of the philosophers marked by organic unity, accompanied by praiseworthy community of purpose, mutuality of sympathy, loyalty to public ends and concern for general welfare. Nobody can have much quarrel if the Hindu by way of analogy were to say that in every Society there are families and classes marked by exclusiveness, suspicion, and jealousy as to those without; bands of robbers, gangs. narrow cliques, trade unions. Employees’ Associations, Kartels, Chambers of Commerce and political parties. Some of these are held together by the interest and plunder and others while aspiring to serve the public do not hesitate to prey upon it.

It may be conceded that everywhere de facto society whether in the past or in the present is not a single whole but a collection of small groups devoted to diverse purposes as their immediate and particular objectives. But the Hindu cannot take shelter under this analogy between the Hindu caste system and the Non-Hindu Class system and rest there as though there is nothing more to be said about the subject. The fact is there is a far bigger question which the Hindu has still to
face. He must take note of the fact that although every society consists of groups there are societies in which the groups are only non-social while there are societies in which the groups are anti-social. The difference between a society with the class system and a society with the caste system lies just in this namely the class system is merely non-social but the caste system is positively anti-social.

It may be important to realize why in some societies the group system produces only non-social feeling and in some societies the group system produces anti-social feeling. No better explanation of this difference can be given than the one given by professor John Dewey. According to him every thing depends upon whether the groups are isolated or associated, whether there is reciprocity of interest between them or whether there is lack of reciprocity of interest. If the groups are associated, if there is a reciprocity of interest between them the feeling between them will be only non-social. If the groups are isolated, if there is no reciprocity between them the feeling between them will be anti-social. To quote Professor Dewey¹:

“The isolation and exclusiveness of a gang or clique brings its anti-social spirit into relief. But this same spirit is found wherever one group has interests ‘of its own’ which shut it out from full interaction with other groups, so that its prevailing purpose is the protection of what it has got, instead of reorganization and progress through wider relationships. It marks nations in their isolation from one another; families which seclude their domestic concerns as if they had no connection with a larger life; schools when separated from the interest of home and community; the divisions of rich and poor; learned and unlearned. The essential point is that isolation makes for rigidity and formal institutionalizing of life, for static and selfish ideals within the group.”

The question to be asked is not whether there are groups in a Society or whether the Society is one single whole. The question to be asked is what degree of association, cooperative intercourse and interaction exists among the different groups; how numerous and varied are the interests which are consciously shared by them: how full and free is the interplay with other forms of Association? A society is not to be condemned as body because there are groups in it. It is to be condemned if the groups are isolated, each leading an exclusive life of its own. Because it is this isolation which produces the anti-social spirit which makes co-operative effort so impossible of achievement.

This isolation among the classes is the work of Brahmanism. The principal steps taken by it was to abrogate the system of intermarriage
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and interdining that was prevalent among the four Varnas in olden times. This has already been discussed in an earlier section of this chapter. There is however one part of the story that remains to be told. I have said the Varna system had nothing to do with marriage. That males and females belonging to the different Varnas could marry and did marry. Law did not come in the way of inter-varna marriage. Social morality was not opposed to such marriages. Savarna marriage was neither required by law nor demanded by Society. All marriages between different Varnas—irrespective of the question whether the bride was of a higher Varna than the bride-groom or whether the bride-groom was of the higher Varna and the bride of the lower Varna—were valid. Indeed as Prof. Kane says the distinction between Anuloma and Pratiloma marriage was quite unknown and even the terms Anuloma and Pratiloma were not in existence. They are the creation of Brahmanism. Brahmanism put a stop to Pratiloma marriages i.e. marriages between women of a higher Varna and men of lower Varna. That was a step in the direction of closing the connection between the Varnas and creating in them an exclusive and anti-social spirit regarding one another. But while the inter-connecting gate of the Pratiloma marriage was closed the inter-connecting gate of Anuloma marriage had remained open. That was not closed. As pointed out in the section on graded inequality Anuloma marriage i.e. marriage between a male of the higher Varna and the female of the lower Varna was allowed by Brahmanism to continue. The gate of Anuloma marriage was not very respectable and was a one way gate only, still it was an interconnecting gate by which it was possible to prevent a complete isolation of the Varnas. But even here Brahmanism played what cannot but be called a dirty trick. To show how dirty the trick was is necessary first to state the rules which prevailed for determining the status of the child. Under the rule existing from very ancient times the status of the child was determined by the Varna of the father. The Varna of the mother was quite unimportant. The following illustrations will place the point beyond doubt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's name</th>
<th>Varna of father</th>
<th>Mother's name</th>
<th>Varna of mother</th>
<th>Child's name</th>
<th>Varna of child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shantanu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Ganga</td>
<td>Shudra (Anamik)</td>
<td>Bhishma</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shantanu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Matsyagandha</td>
<td>Shudra (Fisher)</td>
<td>Viehitra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parashar</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Matsyagandha</td>
<td>Shudra (Fisher)</td>
<td>Krishna-Dwaipayana</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vishwamitra</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Menaka</td>
<td>(Apsara)</td>
<td>Shakuntala</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yayati</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Devayani</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Yadu</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Yayati</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>Sharmishta</td>
<td>Asuri (Nonaryan)</td>
<td>Druhya</td>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rule was known as the rule of Pitra Savarnya. It would be interesting to consider the effect of this rule of Pitra Savarnya on the Anuloma and Pratiloma systems of marriage.

The effect on Pratiloma marriage would be that the children, of mothers of the higher Varnas would be dragged down to the level of the lower Varnas represented by their fathers. Its effect on Anuloma marriage would be just the contrary. The children of mothers of the lower Varnas would be raised up and absorbed in the higher Varnas of their fathers.

Manu stopped Pratiloma marriages and thereby prevented the higher from being dragged to the status of the lower. However regrettable, not much damage was done by it so long as the Anuloma marriage and the rule of Pitra Savarnya continued in operation. The two together formed a very useful system. The Anuloma marriage maintained the interconnection and the Pitra Savarnya rule made the higher classes quite composite in their make up. For they could not but help to be drawn from mothers of different Varnas. Brahmanism did not want to keep this gate of intercommunication between the Varnas open. It was bent on closing it. But it did it in a manner which is disreputable. The straight and honourable way was to stop Anuloma marriage. But Brahmanism did not do that. It allowed the system of Anuloma marriage to continue. What it did was to alter the rule of determining the status of the child. It replaced the rule of Pitra Savarnya by the rule of Matra Savarnya by which the status of the child came to be determined by the status of the mother. By this change marriage ceased to be that means of intersocial communication which it principally is. It relieved men of the higher Varna from the responsibility to their children simply because they were born of a mother of lower Varna. It made Anuloma marriage mere matter of sex. a humiliation and insult to the lower Varnas and a privilege to the higher classes to lawfully commit prostitution with women of the lower classes. And from a larger social point of view it brought the complete isolation among the Varnas which has been the bane of Hindu Society. Notwithstanding all this the Orthodox Hindu still believes that the caste system is an ideal system. But why talk about the orthodox Hindus. There are among enlightened politicians and historians. There are of course Indians both politicians and historians who vehemently deny that the Caste system comes in the way of nationalism. They presume that India is a nation and feel very much offended if anybody instead of speaking of the Indian Nation speaks of the people of India. This attitude is quite understandable. Most of the politicians and historians are Brahmins and cannot be expected to have the courage to
expose the misdeeds of their ancestors or admit the evils perpetrated by
them. Ask any one the question, is India a nation, and all in a chorus say,
‘yes.’ Ask for reasons, they will say that India is a nation firstly because
India has a geographical unity of the country and secondly because of
the fundamental unity of the culture. All this may be admitted for the
sake of argument and yet it is true to say that to draw an inference
from these facts that India is a nation is really to cherish a delusion. For
what is a nation? A nation is not a country in the physical sense of the
country whatever degree of geographical unity it may posses. A nation
is not people synthesized by a common culture derived from common
language, common religion or common race. To recall what I have said
in another place “ Nationality is a subjective psychological feeling. It is
a feeling of a corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those who are
charged with it feel that they are kith and kin. This national feeling is
double edged feeling. It is at once a feeling of fellowship for one’s own
kith and an anti-fellowship feeling for those who are not one’s own kith.
It is a feeling of “ consciousness of kind” which binds together those who
are within the limits of the kindred and severs them from those who
are outside the limits of the kindred. It is a longing to belong to one’s
own group and a longing not to belong to any other group. This is the
essence of what is called a nationality and national feeling. This longing
to belong to one’s own kindred as I said is a subjective psychological
feeling and what is important to bear in mind is that the longing to
belong to one’s own kindred is quite independent of geography, culture
or economic or social conflict. There may be geographical unity and yet
there may be no “longing to belong”. There may be no geographical unity
and yet the feeling of longing to belong may be very intense. There may
be cultural unity and yet there may be no longing to belong. There may
be economical conflicts and class divisions and yet there may be an
intense feeling of longing to belong. The point is that nationality is not
primarily a matter of geography culture or”............

In the declining\footnote{By declining days I mean the period since when the Brahmins started disturbing the
balance of Chaturvarya system by asserting their supremacy.} days of the Vedic Regime, the Shudras as well
as women had come to occupy a very low position. The rising tide of
Buddhism had brought about a great change in the status of both.
To put it briefly a Shudra under the Buddhist regime could acquire
property, learning and could even become a king. Nay he could even
rise to the highest rung of the social ladder occupied by the Brahmin
in the Vedic Regime. The Buddhist order of Bhikshus was counterpart
of the Vedic order of Brahmins. The two orders, each within its own
religious system were on a par in the matter of status and dignity. The Shudra could never aspire to be a Brahmin in the Vedic regime but he could become a Bhikshu and occupy the same status and dignity as did the Brahmin. For, while the Vedic order of Bramhins was closed to the Shudra, the Buddhist order of Bhikshus was open to him and many Shudras who could not become Bramhins under the Vedic Regime had become their peers by becoming Bhikshus under Buddhism. Similar change is noticeable in the case of women. Under the Buddhist regime she became a free person. Marriage did not make her a slave. For marriage under the Buddhist rule was a contract. Under the Buddhist Regime she could acquire property, she could acquire learning and what was unique, she could become a member of the Buddhist order of Nuns and reach the same status and dignity as a Brahmin. The elevation of the status of the Shudras and women was so much the result of the gospel of Buddhism that Buddhism was called by its enemies as the Shudra religion (i.e. the religion of the low classes).

All this of course must have been very galling to the Brahmins. How very galling it must have been to them is shown by the vandallic fury with which Bramhanism after its triumph over Buddhism proceeded to bring about a complete demolition of the high status to which the Shudras and women had been elevated by the revolutionary changes effected by the vivifying gospel of Buddhism.

Starting with this background one shudders at the inhumanity and cruelty of the laws made by Manu against the Shudras. I quote a few of them assembling them under certain general heads.

Manu asks the householders of the Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya Class:

IV. 61. Let him not dwell in a country where the rulers are Shudra...........

This cannot mean that Bramhana, Kashtriya and Vaishya should leave the country where Shudra is a ruler. It can only mean that if a Shudra becomes a king he should be killed. Not only a Shudra is not to be recognized as fit to be a king, he is not to be deemed as a respectable person. For Manu enacts that —

XI. 24. A Bramhin shall never beg from a Shudra property for (performing) a sacrifice i.e. for religious purposes.

All marriage ties with the Shudra were proscribed. A marriage with a woman belonging to any of the three higher classes was forbidden. A Shudra was not to have any connection with a woman of the higher classes and an act of adultery committed by a Shudra with her was declared by Manu to be an offence involving capital punishment.
VIII. 374. A Shudra who has an intercourse with a woman of the higher caste guarded¹ or unguarded, shall be punished in the following manner; if she was unguarded, he loses the offending part. If she was guarded then he should be put to death and his property confiscated.

Manu insists that a Shudra shall be servile, unfit for office, without education, without property and as a contemptible person, his person and property shall always be liable to be conscripted.

As to office Manu prescribes.

VIII. 20. A Bramhana who is only a Brahmana by descent i.e. one has neither studied nor performed any other act required by the Vedas may, at the king’s pleasure, interpret the law to him i.e. act as the Judge, but never a Shudra (however learned he may be).

VIII. 21. The Kingdom of that monarch who looks on while a Shudra settles the law will sink low like a cow in a morass.

VIII. 272. If a Shudra arrogantly presumes to preach religion to Bramhins the King shall have poured burning oil in his mouth and ears.

In olden times the study of the Vedas stood for education. Manu declare that the study of the Vedas was not a matter of right but that it was a matter of privilege. Manu deprived the Shudra of the right to study Veda. He made it a privilege of the three higher classes. Not only did he debar the Shudra from the study of the Vedas but he enacted penalties against those who might help the Shudra to acquire knowledge of the Veda. To a person who is previleged to study the Vedas, Manu ordains that :

IV. 99. He must never read the Vedas... in the presence of the Shudras.

and prescribes that :

III. 156. He who instructs Shudra pupils and he whose teacher is a Shudra shall become disqualified for being invited to Shradha.

Manu’s successor went much beyond him in the cruelty of their punishment of the Shudra for studying the Veda. For instance Katyayana lays down that if a Shudra overheard the Veda or ventured to utter a word of the Veda, the King shall cut his tongue in twain and put hot molten lead in his ears.

As to property Manu is both ruthless and shameless. According to the Code of Manu :

X. 129. No superfluous collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra, even though he has power to make it since a servile man, who has amassed riches, becomes proud, and. by his insolence or neglect, gives pain to Bramhans.

¹Guarded means under the protection of relation, Unguarded means living alone.
The reason for the rule is more revolting than the rule itself. Manu was of course not sure that the prohibitory injunction will be enough to prevent the Shudra from acquiring wealth. To leave no room for the Shudra to give offence to the Bramhins by his accumulation of wealth Manu added another section to his code whereby he declared that:

VIII. 417. A Bramhana may seize without hesitation if he be in distress for his subsistence, the goods of his Shudra.

Not only is the property of a Shudra liable to conscription but the labour of the Shudra, Manu declares, is liable to conscription. Compare the following provision in Manu:

VIII. 413. A Bramhana may compel a Shudra, whether bought or unbought to do servile work; for he is created by the creator to be the slave of a Bramhana.

A Shudra was required by Manu to be servile in his speech. How very servile he must be can be seen from the following provisions in Manu:

VIII. 270. A Shudra who insults a twiceborn man with gross invective, shall have his tongue cut out; for he is of low origin.

VIII. 271. If he mentions the names and castes of the (twiceborn) with contumely, an iron nail, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red hot into his mouth.

Manu's object was to make the Shudra not merely a servile person but an altogether contemptible person. Manu will not allow a Shudra the comfort of having a high sounding name. Had Manu not been there to furnish incontrovertible proof it would be difficult to believe that Bramanism could have been so relentless and pitiless in its persecution of the Shudra. Observe Manu's law as to the names that the different classes can give to their children.

II. 31. Let the first part of a Brahman's name denote something auspicious, a Kshatriya's be connected with power, and a Vaishya's with wealth, but a Shudra's express something contemptible.

II. 32. The second part of a Bramhan's name shall be a word implying happiness, of a Kshatriya's a word implying protection, of a Vaisya's a term expressive of thriving and of a Shudra's an expression denoting service.

The basis of all these inhuman laws is the theory enunciated by Manu regarding the Shudra. At the outset of his Code, Manu takes care to assert it emphatically and without blushing. He says:

I. 91. One occupation only, the Lord prescribed to the Shudra, to serve meekly these other three castes (namely Bramhin, Kshatriya and Vaishya).
Holding that the Shudra was born to be servile, Manu made his laws accordingly so as to compel him to remain servile. In the Buddhist regime a Shudra could aspire to be a judge, a priest and even a King, the highest status that he could ever aspire to. Compare with this the ideal that Manu places before the Shudra and one can get an idea of what fate was to be under Brahmanism:

X. 121. If a Shudra, (unable to subsist by serving Brahmanas), seeks a livelihood, he may serve Kshartiyas, or he may also seek to maintain himself by attending on a wealthy Vaishya.

X. 122. But let a (Shudra) serve Brahmanas, either for the sake of heaven, or with a view to both (this life and the next); for he who is called the servant of a Brahmana thereby gains all his ends.

X. 123. The service of Brahmanas alone is declared (to be) an excellent occupation for a Shudra; for whatever else besides this he may perform will bear him no fruit.

X. 124. They must allot to him out of their own family (property) a suitable maintenance, after considering his ability, his industry, and the number of those whom he is bound to support.

X. 125. The remnants of their food must be given to him, as well as their old household furniture.

Manu can hardly be said to be more tender to women than he was to the Shudra. He starts with a low opinion of women. Manu proclaims:

II. 213. It is the nature of women to seduce men in this (world); for that reason the wise are never unguarded in (the company of) females.

II. 214. For women are able to lead astray in (this) world not only a fool, but even a learned man, and (to make) him a slave of desire and anger.

II. 215. One should not sit in a lonely place with one’s mother sister or daughter; for the senses are powerful, and master even a learned man.

IX. 14. Women do not care for beauty, nor is their attention fixed on age; (thinking), ‘(It is enough that) he is a man ’, they give themselves to the handsome and to the ugly.

IX. 15. Through their passion for men, through their mutable temper, through their natural heartlessness, they become disloyal towards their husbands, however carefully they may be guarded in this (world).

IX. 16. Knowing their disposition, which the Lord of creatures laid in them at the creation, to be such, (every) man should most strenuously exert himself to guard them.
IX. 17. (When creating them) Manu allotted to women (a love of their) bed, (of their) seat and (of) ornament, impure desires, wrath, dishonesty, malice, and bad conduct.

The laws of Manu against women are of a piece with this view. Women are not to be free under any circumstances. In the opinion of Manu:

IX. 2. Day and night women must be kept in dependence by the males (of) their (families), and, if they attach themselves to sensual enjoyments, they must be kept under one's control.

IX. 3. Her father protects (her) in childhood, her husband protects (her) in youth, and her sons protect (her) in old age; a woman is never fit for independence.

IX. 5. Women must particularly be guarded against evil inclinations, however trifling (they may appear); for, if they are not guarded, they will bring sorrow on two families.

IX. 6. Considering that the highest duty of all castes, even weak husbands (must) strive to guard their wives.

V. 147. By a girl, by a young woman, or even by an aged one, nothing must be done independently, even in her own house.

V. 148. In childhood a female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, when her lord is dead to her sons; a woman must never be independent.

V. 149. She must not seek to separate herself from her father, husband, or sons; by leaving them she would make both (her own and her husband's) families contemptible. Woman is not to have a right to divorce.

IX. 45. The husband is declared to be one with the wife, which means that there could be no separation once a woman is married. Many Hindus stop here as though this is the whole story regarding Manu's law of divorce and keep on idolizing it by comforting their conscience by holding out the view that Manu regarded marriage as sacrament and therefore did not allow divorce. This of course is far from the truth. His law against divorce had a very different motive. It was not to tie up a man to a woman but it was to tie up the woman to a man and to leave the man free. For Manu does not prevent a man for giving up his wife. Indeed he not only allows him to abandon his wife but he also permits him to sell her. But what he does is to prevent the wife from becoming free. See what Manu Says:

IX. 46. Neither by sale nor by repudiation is a wife released from her husband.
The meaning is that a wife, sold or repudiated by her husband, can never become the legitimate wife of another who may have bought or received her after she was repudiated. If this is not monstrous nothing can be. But Manu was not worried by considerations of justice or injustice of his laws. He wanted to deprive women of the freedom she had under the Buddhistic regime. He knew, by her misuse of her liberty, by her willingness to marry the Shudra that the system of the gradation of the Varna had been destroyed. Manu was outraged by her license and in putting a stop to it he deprived her of her liberty.

A wife was reduced by Manu to the level of a slave in the matter of property.

IX. 146. A wife, a son, and a slave, these three are declared to have no property; the wealth which they earn is (acquired) for him to whom they belong.

When she becomes a widow Manu allows her maintenance if her husband was joint and a widow’s estate in the property of her husband if he was separate from his family. But Manu never allows her to have any dominion over property.

A woman under the laws of Manu is subject to corporal punishment and Manu allows the husband the right to beat his wife.

VIII. 299. A wife, a son, a slave, a pupil, and a younger brother of the full blood, who have committed faults, may be beaten with a rope or a split bamboo.

In other matters woman was reduced by Manu to the same position as the Shudra.

The study of the Veda was forbidden to her by Manu as it was to the Shudra.

II. 66. Even for a woman the performance of the Sanskaras are necessary and they should be performed. But they should. be performed without uttering the Veda Mantras.

IX. 18. Women have no right to study the Vedas. That is why their Sanskars are performed without Veda Mantras. Women have no knowledge of religion because they have no right to know the Vedas. The uttering of the Veda Mantras is useful for removing sin. As women cannot utter the Veda Mantras they are as unclean as untruth is.

Offering sacrifices according to Bramhanism formed the very soul of religion. Yet Manu will not allow women to perform them. Manu ordains that :

XI. 36. A woman shall not perform the daily sacrifices prescribed by the Vedas. XI. 37. If she does it she will go to hell.
To disable her from performing such sacrifices Manu prevents her from getting the aid and services of a Brāhmaṇ priest.

IV. 205. A Brāhmaṇ must never eat food given at a sacrifice performed by a woman.

IV. 206. Sacrifices performed by women are inauspicious and not acceptable to God. They should therefore be avoided.

Woman was not to have any intellectual pursuits and nor free will nor freedom of thought. She was not to join any heretical sect such as Buddhism. If she continues to adhere to it, till death she is not to be given the libation of water as is done in the case of all dead.

Finally a word regarding the ideal of life, Manu has sought to place before a woman. It had better be stated in his own words:

V. 151. Him to whom her father may give her, or her brother with the father's permission, she shall obey as long as he lives and when he is dead, she must not insult his memory.

V. 154. Though destitute of virtue, or seeking pleasure elsewhere, or devoid of good qualities, yet a husband must be constantly worshipped as a god by a faithful wife.

V. 155. No sacrifice, no vow, no fast must be performed by women, apart from their husbands; if a wife obeys her husband, she will for that reason alone be exalted in heaven.

Then comes the choicest texts which forms the pith and the marrow of this ideal which Manu prescribes for the women:

V. 153. The husband who wedded her with sacred Mantras, is always a source of happiness to his wife, both in season and out of season, in this world and in the next.

V. 150. She must always be cheerful, clever in the management of her household affairs, careful in cleaning her utensils, and economical in expenditure.

This the Hindus regard as a very lofty ideal for a woman!!!

The severity of these laws against Shudras and women show that the phenomenal rise of these classes during the Buddhist regime had not only offended the Brahmins but had become intolerable to them. It was a complete reversal of their sacred social order from top to bottom. The first had become last and the last had become first. The laws of Manu also explain, the determined way in which the Brahmins proceeded to use their political power to degrade the Shudras and the women to their old status. The triumphant Brāhmaṇism began its onslaught on both the Shudras and the women in pursuit of the old ideal namely servility and Brāhmaṇism did succeed in making the Shudras and women the servile classes, Shudras the serfs to the three higher classes and women the serfs to their husbands. Of the black
The deeds committed by Brahmanism after its triumph over Buddhism this one is the blackest. There is no parallel in history for so foul deeds of degradation committed by a class of usurpers in the interest of class domination. The colossal character of this deed of degradation perpetrated by Barahmanism is unfortunately not fully realized. It is concealed by those small monosyllabic words, Stri and Shudra. Let those who wish to get an idea of the enormity of their deed think, of the numbers that lie behind these two terms. What part of the population do they apply to? The woman represents one half of the population. Of the balance the Shudra represents not less than two third. The two together make up about 75% of the total population. It is this huge mass of people that has been doomed by Brahmanism to eternal servility and eternal degradation. It is because of the colossal scale of degradation whereby 75% of her people were deprived of their right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness that India became a decaying if not a dead nation.

The principle of graded inequality runs through the whole of the Manu Smriti. There is no department of life in which he has not introduced his principle of graded inequality. For a complete and thorough exposition of it, it would be necessary to reproduce the whole of Manu Smriti. I will take only a few departments to illustrate how in the hands of Manu the principle of graded inequality became imbedded in the social life.

Take the field of marriage. Observe the rule of Manu:

III. 13. It is declared that a Shudra woman alone (can be) the wife of a Shudra, she and one of his own caste (the wives) of a Vaishya, those two and one of his own caste the wives of a Kshatriya, those three and one of his own caste (the wives of a Bramhan).

Take the rules of Manu regarding the treatment of guests:

III. 110. But a Kshatriya (who comes) to the house of a Brahmana is not called a guest (atitthi), nor a Vaisya, nor a Shudra, nor a personal friend, nor a relative, nor the teacher.

III. 111. But if Kshatriya comes to the house of a Brahmana in the manner of a guest, (the house-holder) may feed him according to his desire, after, the above mentioned Brahmanas have eaten.

III. 112. Even a Vaisya and a Shudra who have approached his house in the manner of guests, he may allow to eat with his servants, showing (thereby) his compassionate disposition.

In the house of a Brahmana, nobody except a Brahmin is to have the honour of being a guest.¹ If the Kshatriya comes in the manner

¹ The word guest is used by Manu in a technical sense and means a Bramhana who stays one night only see III. 102.
of a guest to the house of a Brahmin he is to be fed after all the Brahmins are fed and if the Vaishyas and Shudras come in the manner of guests they are to be fed after everybody is fed and only in the company of servants.

Take the rules of Manu regarding Sanskaras:

X. 126. A Shudra has no right to receive the sacraments.

X. 68. The law prescribes that neither of the two (that is those who belong to mixed castes) shall receive the sacraments the first being excluded on account of lowness of his origin of his parents was against the order of the castes.

II. 66. The whole series\(^1\) of sacraments must be performed for females also in order to sanctify the body at the proper time and in the proper order, but without the recitation of sacred Vedic Mantras.

Manu further lays down that:

VI. 1. A twice born Snataka, who has thus lived according to the law in the order of householders, may, taking a firm resolution and keeping his organs in subjection; dwell in the forest, duly (observing the rules given below).

VI. 33. But having thus passed the third part of (a man’s natural term of) life in the forest, he may live as an ascetic during the fourth part of his existence, after abandoning all attachment to worldly objects.

Even in law Manu introduces the principle of graded inequality. To take only two illustrations, the law of defamation, abuse and the law of assault:

VIII. 267. A Kshatriya having defamed a Brahmana, shall be fined one hundred (panas); A Vaisya one hundred and fifty or two hundred; a Shudra shall suffer corporal punishment.

VIII. 268. A Brahmana shall be fined fifty (panas) for defaming a Kshatriya; in (the case of) a Vaisya the fine shall be twenty five (panas); in (the case of) a Shudra twelve.

VIII. 269. For offences of twice born men against those of equal caste (varna, the fine shall be) also twelve (panas) for speeches which ought not to be uttered, that (and every fine shall be) double.

VIII. 276. (For mutual abuse) by a Brahmana and a Kshatriya a fine must be imposed by a discerning (king), on the Brahmana the lowest agreement, but on the Kshatriya the middlemost.

VIII. 277. A Vaisya and a Shudra must be punished exactly in the same manner according to their respective castes, but the tongue (of the Shudra) shall not be cut out; that is the decision.

\(^1\) Except Upanayan which is forbidden for women.
VIII. 279. With whatever limb a man of a low caste does hurt to (a man of the three) highest (castes), even that limb shall be cut off; that is the teaching of Manu.

VIII. 280. He who raises his hand or a stick, shall have his hand cut off; he who in anger kicks with his foot, shall have his foot cut off.

Everywhere is the principle of graded inequality. So ingrained it had become in the social system that the successors of Manu were careful to introduce it where he had failed to give effect to it. For instance Manu had had recognized the system of slavery. But had failed to prescribe whether the system of slavery was or was not subject to the principle of graded order of insubordination.

Lest it should be understood that the law of graded inequality did not apply to slavery and that a Brahmin may be a slave of the Shudra, Yajnavalkya at once proceeds to clear the doubt. He expressly laid down that:—

“Slavery is in the descending order of the Varnas and not in the ascending order” (XIV. 183).

Vijnaneshwar in his commentary on Yajnavalkya makes it concrete by his illustrations when he says:

“Of the Varnas such as the Brahmana and the rest, a state of slavery shall exist Anulomyena, in the descending order. Thus, of a Brahmana, a Kshatriya and the rest may become a slave; of a Kshatriya, the Vaishya and the Shudra; and of a Vaishya, Shudra, thus the state of slavery shall operate in the descending order.”

Stated in the language of equality and inequality, this means that the Brahmin is the highest because he can be the slave of nobody but is entitled to keep a person of any class as his slave. The Shudra is the lowest because everybody can keep him as his slave but he can keep no one as his slave except a Shudra. The place assigned to the Kshatriya and the Vaishya introduces the system of graded inequality. A Kshatriya while he is inferior to the Brahmin he can be the slave of the Brahmin. While he is yet superior to the Vaishyas and the Shudras because he can keep them as his slaves; the Vaishyas and the Shudras have no right to keep a Kshatriya as his slave. Similarly a Vaishya while he is inferior to the Bramhins and the Kshatriyas, because they can keep him as their slave and he cannot keep any one of them as his slave, he is proud that he is at least superior to the Shudra because he can keep the Shudra as his slave while Shudra cannot keep the Vaishya as his slave.

Such is the principle of graded inequality which Bramhanism injected into the bone and the marrow of the people. Nothing worse to paralyze society to overthrow inequity could have been done.
Although its effects have not been clearly noticed there can be no doubt that because of it the Hindus have been stricken with palsy. Students of social organization have been content with noting the difference between equality and inequality. None have realized that in addition to equality and inequality there is such a thing as graded inequality. Yet inequality is not half so dangerous as graded inequality. Inequality carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Inequality does not last long. Under pure and simple inequality two things happen. It creates general discontent which forms the seed of revolution. Secondly it makes the sufferers combine against a common foe and on a common grievance. But the nature and circumstances of the system of graded inequality leave no room for either of these two things to happen. The system of graded inequality prevents the rise of general discontent against inequity, it cannot therefore become the storm centre of revolution. Secondly the sufferers under inequality becoming unequal both in terms of the benefit and the burden there is no possibility of a general combination of all classes to overthrow the inequity. To make the thing concrete the Brahmanic law of marriage is full of inequity. The right of Brahmana to take a woman from the classes below him but not to give a woman to them is in inequity. But the Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra will not combine to destroy it. The Kshatriya resents this right of the Brahmana. But he will not combine with Vaishya or the Shudra and that for two reasons. Firstly because he is satisfied that if the Brahman has the right to take the right of three communities, the Kshatriya has the right to appropriate the women of two communities. He does not suffer so much as the other two. Secondly if he joins in a general revolution against this marriage—inequity in one way he will rise to the level of the Bramhins but in another way all will be equal which to him means that the Vaishyas and the Shudras will rise to his level i.e. they will claim Kshatriya women—which means he will fall to their level. Take any other inequity and think of a revolt against it. The same social psychology will show that a general rebellion against it is impossible.

One of the reasons why there has been no revolution against Brahmanism and its inequities is due entirely to the principle of graded inequality. If is a system of permitting a share in the spoils with a view to enlist them to support the spoils system. It is a system full of low cunning which man could have invented to perpetuate inequity and to profit by it. For it is nothing else but inviting people to share in inequity in order that they may all be supporters of inequity.

There now remains to lift the curtain from the last act of this drama of Bramhanism.
Bramhanism inherited from the Vedic past that system of Chaturvarna. The system of Chaturvarna which the Hindus regard as the unique creation of their Aryan ancestors is in no sense unique. There is nothing original about it. The whole ancient world had stumbled into it. The Egyptians had it and the ancient Persians had it. Plato was so convinced about its excellence that he presented it as ideal form of social organization. The ideal of the Chaturvarna is faulty. The lumping together of individuals into a few sharply marked off classes is a very superficial view of man and his powers. The Ancient Aryans as well as Plato had no conception of the uniqueness of every individual, of his incommensurability with others and of each individual forming a class of his own. They had no recognition of the infinite diversity of active tendencies and combination of tendencies of which an individual is capable. To them there were types of faculties or powers in the individual constitution and all that is necessary for social organization is to classify them. All this is demonstrably wrong. Modern science has shown that lumping together of individuals into a few sharply marked off classes each confined to one particular sphere does injustice both to the individual and to Society. The stratification of Society by classes and occupations is incompatible with the fullest, utilization of the qualities which is so necessary for social advancement and is also incompatible with the safety and security of the individual as well as of Society in general.¹

There is another mistake which the Ancient Hindus including Plato, made. There is probably some truth in saying that there is among human beings a dimorphism or polyformism in human beings as there is among insects, though in the former it is only psychological while in the latter it is both physical as well as psychololgical. But assuming that there is a thing psychological dimorphism or polyformism among human beings, it is wrong to separate them into those who are born to do one thing and others to do another, some born to command i.e. to be masters and some born to obey i.e. to be slaves. It is wrong to suppose that in a given person some qualities are present and others are absent. On the contrary the truth is that all qualities are present in every person and this truth is not diminished in any way by that, some tendency predominates to the extent of being the only one that is apparent. So well established is this truth that a tendency which may be dominant in a man at one time may be quite different from and even the direct opposite of the tendency that may be dominant at another time. As Prof. Bergson² in speaking of the Nietsche’s false antithesis of ‘men’ and ‘slaves’ observes:

¹ For further consideration of this subject see my tract on “Annihilation of Caste.”
"We have a clear vision of this (falsity) in times of revolution, Unassuming citizens, upto that moment humble and obedient, wake up one fine day with pretentions to be leaders of men".

The cases of Mussolini and Hitler are a complete disproof of the theory of the Aryans and of Plato.

This Vedic system of Chaturvarna, far from being an ideal system was made positively worse by the changes which Bramhanism made and which have already been described. Every one of them was mischievous in character is beyond question. The Buddhist order of Bhikshus and the Vedic order of Brahmans were designed to serve the same purpose. They formed the elite of their society whose function was to lead and guide society along the right road. Although designed to discharge the same function the Buddhist Bhikshu was better placed to discharge it than was the Bramhin. That is because Buddha recognized one thing which nobody either before him or after him has done. Buddha realized that for a person to give a true lead to Society and be its trustworthy guide he must be intellectually free and further, which is more important, to be intellectually free he must not have private property. An elite charged with the care of his private property must fail to discharge his duty of leading and guiding Society along the right road. Buddha therefore took care to include in the Code of discipline for the Bhikshus a rule prohibiting a Bhikshu from holding private property. In the Vedic order of Brahmans there was no such prohibition. A Bramhin was free to hold property. This difference produced a profound difference on the character and outlook of the Buddhist Bhikshu and the Vedic Bramhin. The Bhikshus formed an intellectual class. The Bramhins formed on the other hand merely an educated class. There is a great difference between an intellectual class and an educated class. An intellectual class has no limitations arising out of any affiliations to any class or to any interest. An educated Class on the other hand is not an intellectual class although it has cultivated its intellect. The reason is that its range of vision and its sympathy to a new ideology is circumscribed by its being identified with the interest of the class with which it is affiliated.

The Bramhins from the very beginning therefore were inclined to be a purely educated class, enlightened but selfish. This evil in the Vedic order of Bramhins was extreme by the changes made in the old Vedic System. The right of the Brahmans to rule and the grant of special privileges and immunities made them more selfish, and induced in them the desire to use their education not for the advancement of learning but for the use of their community and against the advancement of society.
All their energy and their education has been spent in maintaining their own privileges against the good of the public. It has been the boast of many Hindu authors that the civilization of India is the most ancient civilization in the world. They will insist that there was no branch of knowledge in which their ancestors were not the pioneers. Open a book like “The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology” by Prof. Benoy Kumar Sarkar, or a book like “The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus” by Dr. Brajendranath Seal one is overwhelmed with data touching upon the knowledge their ancestors had about various scientific subjects. From these books it would appear that the ancient Indians knew astronomy, astrology, biology, chemistry, mathematics, Medicine, mineralogy. Physics and in the view of the mass of people even aviation. All this may be very true. The important question is now how the ancient Indians discovered these positive sciences. The important question is why did the ancient Indians cease to make any progress in the sciences in which they were the pioneers? This sudden arrest in the progress of science in ancient India is as astounding as it is deplorable. In the scientific world India occupies a position which even if it be first among the primitive is certainly last among the civilized nation. How did it happen that a people who began the work of scientific progress stopped, halted on the way, left in its incoherent and incomplete condition? This is a question that needs to be considered and answered, not what the ancient Indians knew.

There is only one answer to the question and it is a very simple answer. In ancient India the Bramhins were the only educated class. They were also the Class which was claiming to be above all others. Buddha disputed their claim for supremacy and declared a war on the Brahmins. The Brahmins acted as an Educated Class—as distinguished from an intellectual class—would act under the circumstances. It abandoned all pursuits and engaged itself in defending the claim of supremacy and the social, economic and political interests of its class. Instead of writing books on Science, the Brahmins undertook to write Smritis. Here is an explanation why the progress of science in India became arrested. Brahmins found it more important and more imperative to write Smritis to repel the Buddhist doctrine of social equality.

How many Smritis did the Brahmins write?

Mr. Kane a great authority on the Smriti literature has computed their number to be 128. And what for? The Smritis are called lawbooks which of course hide their nature. They are really treatises expounding the supremacy of the Brahmins and their rights to special privileges. The defence of Bramhanism was more important than the
Bramhanism not only defended its privileges but set about extending them in a manner that would cover every descent man with shame. The Brahmans started particularly to expand the meaning of certain privileges granted to them by Manu.

Manu had given the Brahmans the right to dana, gift. The dana was always intended to be money or chattel. But in course of time the concept of dana was expanded so as to include the gift of a woman which a Brahmin could keep as his mistress or who could be released by the Bramhin on commutation of money payment.

Manu designated the Brahmans as Bhu-devas, lords of the Earth. The Brahmans enlarged the scope of this statement and began to claim the right to sexual intercourse with women of other classes. Even queens were not exempt from this claim. Ludovico Di Varthema who came to India as a traveller in about 1502 A.D. records the following about the Brahmans of Calicut:

"It is a proper, and at the same time pleasant thing to know who these Brahmans are. You must know that they are the chief persons of the faith, as priests are among us. And when the King takes a wife, he selects the most worthy and the most honoured of these Brahmans and makes him sleep the first night with his wife, in order that he may deflower her."

Similarly Hamilton another writer says:

"When the Samorin marries, he must not cohabit with his bride till the Nambourie (Nambudari Brahmin), or chief priest, has enjoyed her, and if he pleases, he may have three nights of her company, because the first fruits of her nuptials must be an holy oblation to the god she worships."

In the Bombay Presidency the priests of the Vaishnava sect claimed the right to deflower the women of their sect. This gave rise to the famous Maharaja Libel case brought by the chief priest of the Sect against one Karosondas Mulji in the High Court of Bombay in the year 1869 which shows that the right to claim the benefit of the first night was certainly effective till then.

When such a right to sexual cohabitation for the first night could be extended against the generality of the lower classes the Brahmans did not hesitate to extend it. This they did particularly in Malabar. There, Manu designated the Brahmans as Bhu-devas, lords of the earth. The Brahmans enlarged the scope of this statement and began to claim the

1 I remember reading the report of case in which a Brahmin who had taken a married wife as Dana refused to release her even though communication was offered by her husband.

2 "The Travels of Ludovico Di Varthema" (Pub. Hakyt Society) Page 141. Varthema adds Do not imagine that the Brahmin goes willingly to perform this operation. The King is even obliged to pay him four hundred or five hundred ducats.

right of promiscuous sexual intercourse with the women folk of the other Classes. This happened particularly in Malabar. There¹

“The Brahman castes follow the Makatyam System that is the system by which the child belongs to its father’s family. They contract, within their own caste regular marriages, with all the ordinary legal and religious sanctions and incidents. But the Brahmin men are also in the habit of entering into Sambandhan-Unions with women of the lower castes.”

This is not all. Observe further what the writer has to say:

“Neither party to a Sambadhan Unions becomes thereby a member of the other family; and the offspring of the Union belong to their mothers tharwad (family) and have no sort of claim, so far as the law goes, to a share of their father’s property or to maintenance therefrom.”

Speaking of the origin of this practice the author of the Gazetteer observes that the origin of this institution:

“Is found in the claim of the Bhu-devas” or “Earth Gods” (that the Brahmanas) and on a lower plain of the Kshatriyas or the ruling classes, to the first fruits of lower Caste Womanhood, a right akin to the medieval droit de Seigneurie.”

It is an understatement to say that it is only a right to first fruits as the ‘right to the first night’ was called in the middle ages in Europe. It is more than that. It is a general right of the Brahmin against the lower caste to claim any woman of that class for mere prostitution, for the mere satisfaction of sexual appetite, without burdening the Brahmin to any of the obligations of marriage.

Such were the rights which the Brahmins the spiritual precepts claimed against the laity!! The Borgese Popes have been run down in history as the most debauched race of spiritual preceptors who ascended the throne of Peter. One wonders whether they were really worse than the Brahmins of India.

A purely intellectual Class, free to consider general good and having no interest of a class to consider, such as the one contemplated by Buddha is not to be had anywhere. For the limitations resulting from property on the freedom of intellect of the elite have not been generally recognized until very recently. But this want of an intellectual class has been made good in other countries by the fact that in those countries each Strata of Society has its educated class. There is safety, if no definite guidance, in the multiplicity of views expressed by different educated classes drawn from different strata of society. In such a multiplicity of views there is no danger of Society being misguided or

¹ Gazetteer of Malabar and Anjengo District by Mr. C. A. Innes Vol. I. p. 95
misdirected by the views of one single educated class drawn from one single class of society and which is naturally bound to place the interest of its class before the interests of the country. By the change made by Brahmanism India ceased to have safe and sure guidance of an intellectual class. But what is worse is that the Hindus lost the safety and security which other peoples have and which arises from the multiplicity of views expressed by various educated classes drawn from different strata of Society.

By the denial of education to the Shudras, by diverting the Kshatryyas to military pursuits, and the Vaishyas to trade and by reserving education to themselves the Brahmins alone could become the educated class—free to misdirect and misguide the whole society. By converting Varna into Caste they declared that mere birth was a real and final measure of the worth of a man. Caste and Graded inequality made disunity and discord a matter of course.

All this disfigurement of the original Varna system would have been tolerable if it had remained a mere matter of social practice. But Brahmanism was not content to leave the matter there. It wanted to give the Chaturvarna in its changed and perverted form the force of law. This new Chaturvarna the making of Brahmanism occupies in the Manu Smriti as the Law of Persons and the Law of Family. Nobody can make a mistake about it. Manu made it an offence for a person of a lower Caste to arrogate to himself the status of a higher Caste or to pass off as a member of the higher Caste.

X. 96. A man of low caste who through covetousness lives by the occupations of a higher one, the king shall deprive of his property and banish.

XI. 56. Falsely attributing to oneself high birth, giving information to the king (regarding a crime), and falsely accusing one's teacher, (are offences) equal to slaying a Brahmana.

Here there are two offences, General Impersonation (X. 96) and impersonation by the Shudra (XI 56). Note also the punishments how severe they are. For the first the punishment is confiscation of property and banishment. For the second the punishment is the same as the punishment for causing the death of a Brahmin.

The offence of personation is not unknown in modern jurisprudence and the Indian Penal Code recognizes it in section 419. But what is the punishment the Indian Penal Code prescribes for cheating by personation? Fine, and if imprisonment, then 3 years or both. Manu must be turning in his grave to find the British Government make so light of his law of Caste.
Manu next proceeds to direct the king that he should execute this law. In the first place he appeals to the King in the name of his pious duty:

VIII. 172. By preventing the confusion of Castes.............the power of the King grows, and he prospers in this world and after death.

Manu perhaps knows that the law relating to the confusion of Varna may not be quite agreeable to the conscience of the king and he avoids enforcement. Consequently Manu tells the King how in the matter of the execution of the laws the King should act:

VIII. 177. Therefore let the King not heeding his own likes and dislikes behave exactly like Yama.

i.e. he should be as impartial as Yama the Judge of the Dead.

Manu however does not wish to leave the matter to the King as a mere matter of pious duty. Manu makes it a matter of obligation upon the King. Accordingly Manu lays down as a matter of obligation that:

VIII. 410. The King should order a Vaishya to trade to lend money, to cultivate the land, or to lend cattle, and the Shudra to serve the twice born Caste. Again Manu reverts to the subject and say:

VIII 418. The King should carefully compel Vaishyas and Sudras to perform the work (prescribed) for them; for if these two castes swerved from their duties they would throw this whole world into confusion.

What if the Kings do not act up to this obligation. This law of Chaturvarna is so supreme in the eyes of Manu that Manu will not allow himself to be thwarted by a King who will not keep his obligation to maintain this law. Boldly Manu forges a new law that such a king shall be disposed. One can imagine how dear Chaturvarna was to Manu and to Brahmanism.

As I have said the Chaturvarna of the Vedic system was better than caste system was not very favourable to the creation of a Society which could be regarded as one single whole possessing the Unity of the ideal society. By its very theory the Chaturvarna has given birth to four classes. These four classes were far from friendly. Often they were quarreling and their quarrels were so bitter that they cannot but be designated as Class wars. All the same this old Chaturvarna had two saving features which Brahminism most selfishly removed. Firstly there was no isolation among the Varnas. Intermarriage and interdining the two strongest bonds for unity had full play. There was no room for the different Varnas to develop that anti-social feeling which destroys the very basis of Society. While the Kshatriyas fought against the Brahmins and the Brahmins fought against the Kshatriyas there were
not wanting Kshatriyas who fought against the Kshatriyas\(^1\) for the sake of Brahmans and there were not wanting Brahmans\(^2\) who joined hands with Kshatriyas to put down the Brahmans.

Secondly this old Chaturvarna was conventional. It was the ideal of the Society but it was not the law of the State. Brahmanism isolated the Varnas and sowed the seed of antagonism. Brahmanism made legal what was only conventional. By giving it a legal basis it perpetrated the mischief. The Vedic Chaturvarna if it was an evil would have died out by force of time and circumstances. By giving it the force of Law Brahmanism has made it eternal. This is probably the greatest mischief that Brahmanism has done to Hindu Society.

In considering this question one cannot fail to notice that the obligation imposed upon the King for the maintenance of the law of Chaturvarna which is another name for the system of graded inequality does not require the King to enforce it against the Brahmans and the Kshatriyas. The obligation is limited to the enforcement of the law against the Vaishyas and the Shudras. Having regard to the fact that Brahmanism was so intent on giving the system the force of law the result has been very awkward to say the least about it. Notwithstanding this attempt at legalization the system remained half legal and half conventional, legal as to the Vaishyas and the Shudras and merely conventional as to Brahmans and Kshatriyas.

This difference needs to be accounted for. Was Brahmanism honest in its attempt to give the system the force of law? Did it wish that each of the four Varnas be bound by it? The fact that Brahmanism would not bind the Brahmans and the Kshatriyas by the law it made, shows that in this business Brahmanism was far from honest. If it believed in the system as ideal it could not have failed to make it an universal binding force.

But there is more than dishonesty in this foul game. One can quite understand why the Brahmans were left free and untramelled by the shackles of the law. Manu called them Gods on earth and Gods must be above the law. But why were the Kshatriyas left free in the same way as the Brahmans. He knows that the Kshatriyas will not humble themselves before the Brahmans. He then proceeds to warn them, how the Brahmans can punish them if the Kshatriyas show arrogance and plan rebellion.

IX. 320 When the Kshatriyas become in any way overbearing towards the Brahmans, the Brahmans themselves shall duly restrain them; for the Kshatriyas sprang from the Brahmans.

\(^1\) This is how Interpret the story of Parashuram’s war against the Kshatriyas.
\(^2\) Buddhism was a revolt against Brahmans and Brhminism. Yet many or the early followers of Buddha & Buddhism were Brahmans.
IX. 321. Fire sprang from water, Kshatriya from Brahmanas, iron from stone; the all-penetrating force of those (three) has no effect on that whence they were produced.

One might think that the reason why Manu does not impose an obligation upon the King to enforce the law against the Kshatriya was because the Brahmins felt themselves quite capable of dealing with Kshatriyas by their own prowess and without the aid of the King and that they meant to put their sanctions against the Kshatriyas when the time came and without fear of consequences. All this could not have been meant by Manu. For after uttering this vows of vengeance, and threats and imprecations Manu suddenly come down and begins to plead with the Kshatriyas for cooperation and common front with the Brahmins. In a verse next after the verse in which he utters the threats and imprecations against the Kshatriyas Manu pleads:

IX. 323. But (a king who feels his end drawing nigh) shall bestow all his wealth, accumulated from fines on Brahmanas, make over his kingdom to his son and then seek death in battle.

From imprecations to supplication is a very queer cry. What is the explanation of this anti-climax in the attitude of this strange behaviour of Manu towards the Kshatriyas? What is the object of this cooperation between Brahmins and Kshatriyas? Against whom is this common front to be? Manu does not explain. A whole history of a thousand years must be told before this puzzle is solved and the questions satisfactorily answered.

The history which furnishes the clue to the solution of this puzzle is the history of the class wars between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas.

Most of the orthodox Hindus are repelled by the doctrine of Class war which was propounded by Karl Marx and would be certainly shocked if they were told that the history of their own ancestors probably furnishes the most cogent evidence that Marx was searching for support of his theory. Indeed there have been numerous class wars between Brahmins and the Kshatriyas and only the most important of them have been recorded in the ancient Hindu literature. We have record of the conflict between the Brahmins and the Kings who were all Kshatriyas. The first of these conflicts was a conflict with King Vena, the second with Pururavas, the third with Nahusha, fourth with Nimi and fifth with Sumukha. There is a record of a conflict between Vashishtha a Brahmin and Vishvamitra an ordinary Kshatriya and not a king. Then we have the record of the wholesale massacre of the Brahmins of Bhrigu clan by the Kshatriya descendants of Krataviya.

---

1 All this record has been collected by Prof. Muir in his Original Sanskrit Texts. Vo. I.
and then we have the record of the whole class of Kshatriyas exterminated by Parashuram acting on behalf of the Brahmanas. The issues that brought them in conflict extended over a wide range and show how bitter and strained must have been the feelings between Brahmins and Kshatriyas. There were conflicts over the question whether the Kshatriya had a right to become a Brahmana. There were conflicts over the question, whether the Brahmins were subject to the authority or not. There were conflicts on the question who should salute first and who should give way to whom. The wars were wars of authority, status and dignity.

The results of these wars could not but be obvious to the Brahmins. Notwithstanding their boastful utterances they must have realized that it was not possible for them to crush the Kshatriyas and that notwithstanding the wars of extermination the Kshatriyas survived in sufficient numbers to plague the Brahmins. One need not pay any attention to the filthy story told by the Brahmins and alluded to by Manu that the Kshatriyas of the Manu’s day were not the original Kshatriyas but a race of new Kshatriyas begotten by the Brahmins upon the widows of the old Kshatriyas who were massacred by Parashuram. Blackmailing is one of the means which Brahmanism is never ashamed of using to advance its own purposes. The fight of Brahmanism against the Kshatriyas was from the very beginning a fight between a fool and a bully. Brahmanas were fighting against the Kshatriyas for the maintenance of the Chaturvarna. Now it is this very Chaturvarna which allowed bayonets to the Kshatriyas and denied them to the Brahmins. How under this theory could the Brahmin fight with the Kshatriya with any hope of success? It could not have taken long for the Brahmins to realise the truth—which Tallyrand told Napoleon—that it is easy to give bayonets but it is very difficult to sit on them and that as Kshatriyas had bayonets and Brahmins none, war with the Kshatriya was the way to ruin. These were the direct consequences of these wars between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. But there were others which could not have escaped the attention of the Brahmins. While the Brahmins and Kshatriyas were fighting among themselves nobody was left to check and keep the Vaishyas and the Shudras under control. They were on the road of social equality almost nearing to the status of the Brahmins and Kshatriyas. To Brahmanism the possibility of suppressing the Kshatriya was very remote and the danger of being overtaken by Vaishyas and Shudras were real and very real. Should the Brahmana continue to fight the Kshatriya and ignore the danger of the Vaishyas and the Shudras? Or Should the Brahmana give up the hopeless struggle against the

1 See Hopkins History of the Ruling Races.
Kshatriya and befriend him and make with him a common cause and suppress the growing menace of the Vaishyas and Shudras? Brahmanism after it was exhausted in the wars with the Kshathyas chose the second alternative. It sought to befriend their worthwhile enemies the Kshatriyas to work for a new ideal namely to enslave and exploit the two classes below them namely the Vaishyas and the Shudras. This new ideal must have taken shape some time when the Satpatha Brahmana came to be composed. It is in the Satpatha Brahmana we find the new ideal expressed it was well established. The language in which it is expressed, and the subject to which it is applied are so telling that I feel it should be quoted in its original terms. Says the author of the Satpatha:

“They then make the beast return (to the Ahavaniya) the he-goat goes first of them, then the ass, then the horse. Now in going away from this (Ahavaniya) the horse goes first, then the ass, then the he-goat—for the horse corresponds to the Kshatra (nobility), the ass to the Vaishya and Shudra, the he-goat to the Brahman and in-as-much as, in going from here, the horse goes first, therefore the Kshatriya, going first, is followed by the three others castes; and in-as-much as, in returning from here, the he-goat goes first, therefore the Brahman, going first, is followed by the three other castes. And in-as-much as the ass does not go first, either in going back from here, or in coming back from there, therefore the Brahmana and Kshatriya never go behind the Vaishya and Sudra; hence they walk thus in order to avoid a confusion between good and bad. And, moreover, he thus encloses those two castes (the Vaishyas and Sudra) on both sides by the priesthood and the nobility and makes them submissive.”

Here is the explanation of the puzzling attitude of Manu towards the Kshatriyas, attitude of willing to wound but afraid to strike, of wishing to dictate but preferring to befriend.

It is these wars and the compromise that had taught Manu that it was no use trying to coerce the Kshatriyas to submit to the domination of the Brahmin. It may be an ideal to be kept up. But as practical politics it was an impossible ideal. Like Bismark, Manu knew that politics was the game of the possible. What was possible was to make a common cause and to build up a common front between the Brhamins and the Kshatriyas against the Vaishyas and the Shudras and this is what Manu did. The pity of it is that it was done in the name of religion. This need not shock anybody who has studied the soul and spirit of Brahmanism. With Brahmanism religion is a cloak to cover and hide its acquisitive politics.


2. Avavaniya.