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Abstract

This article attempts to contextualize the original part of the Bhagavad Gītā. The study observes the total 85 verses up to 2.38 of the Gītā as the original one, which deals with the question of war. The study has relevance as it informs the reader of the dominant ideology of the time when the text was produced. The article addresses on the research problems concerning the basic ideology or dharma of the original Gītā and its indication of the time when the text was set. In order to contextualize the original Gītā, the historical background and textual properties of this part will be analyzed by applying the methodological tool of the Marxist concept of historical materialism. Historical materialism analyzes any text as a literary production that reflects the social and economic base of a particular society. The study reveals that the original Gītā carries the dominant ideology or dharma as the human greed for wealth, power, and prosperity of the new territorial slave states based on private property and classes. The original Gītā, thus, is found to be set at a time when Indian slavery was on the rise overthrowing the primitive commune of Aryan Ga-a-Sa ghas.
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Introduction

The Bhagavad Gītā is the part of the epic Mahābhārata. It is thought that the text primarily deals with Arjuna’s issue on the battlefield as the great Mahābhārata war was about to start. The primary objective of the Gītā is to prepare Arjuna for the war because he refuses to fight and causes problems. The majority of the verses of the Gītā, however, are devoted to addressing various philosophical schools, with only a small number of verses focused on Arjuna’s core issues, the war, and its resolution. As a result, the text can be separated into two sections based on its content: "the original war Gītā,"

which deals with war-related themes, and "philosophic Gītā," which is primarily focused on philosophical ideas. The original war Gītā ends in \(BG\) 2.38 because the rest of the verses after 2.38 are not on the subject of war. The philosophic Gītā, which is not related to the context of the war, comprises all the remaining verses after \(BG\) 2.38. It is regarded only the original war Gītā as a genuine part of the epic and the philosophic Gītā as a later interpolation. The two Gītās were not produced at the same historical context; instead, they were the productions of two different stages of Indian history. This article analyzes the verses of the original Gītā and links them with the basic features of the particular era of Indian history. The historical materialistic critique of the verses of the text indicates that the birth of the original Gītā goes back to the early stage of Indian slavery when the Indian territorial slave states were being strengthened, overthrowing the ancient Aryan Gaṇa-Saṁghas.

**Results and Discussion**

The birth of the original Gītā, which is regarded as the authentic portion of the \(Mahābhārata\) epic, can be examined with the birth of the epic as a whole. The \(Mahābhārata\) is an epic poem that tells the account of "... a fratricidal war, arising out of heirship controversy" (Mishra, 1987, Social, p. 333). It is based on the historical Bharata War, which took place between princes of the same ruling family of the kingdom of Hastināpura. The war began as a civil war among kinsmen (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, p.159). The Bharat war, which occurred in prehistoric India between "2000 B.C. and 1500 B.C." (Dange, 1972, Gana-Saṁghas, p.136), is regarded as a significant historical event in which "... the whole old world of the Gaṇa-Saṁghās, military democracies, aristocratic Kula-Saṁghās, slave states and all were thrown in one boiling cauldron of the war" (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, p.159). The Bharat war is seen as a turning point in Indian history since it puts an end to the Gaṇa-Saṁghās' old world's morals, ethics, economy, and social ties (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, p.159). The original Gītā, which was written alongside the epic, theorizes the morals and ideals of the new slave territorial kingdoms based on class relations and private property. Dange (1972) asserts:

Leaving aside for the moment the various schools of philosophy which that book \(Bhagavad Gītā\) discusses, its origin suggests that it gave the final death-blow to the collective Gaṇa relations and their ideology and enthroned, almost in a cynical fashion, the supremacy of the morality of private property and class relations. The new relations had become a fact, the word of \(Geeta\) gave them a theory and tried to silence critics, who may speak from the standpoint of the old Gaṇa democracy. (Mahābhārata, p.160)

In the aforementioned passage, Dange makes reference not to the whole portion of the Gītā, but to "its origin," or the original Gītā, the part of the \(Mahābhārata\). He views the
original Gītā as a result of the historical context in which the new territorial slave states were strengthening and the old Gaṇa-Saṁghās were disintegrating. The original Gītā serves as a spokesperson for the new slave territorial states based on private property and class relations.

The Gaṇa-Saṁghā is the primitive Aryan commune’s political body. The Gaṇa-Saṁghā is described as a Gaṇa or gentile organization, in which all members were related by blood. In such a society, there was collective labor and property in the very early stages, no division of classes or castes, no state, no king, no exploiters and exploited. It was a self-acting armed organization of the people (Dange, 1972, Gaṇa-Gotra, p. 62). F. Engels (1983) explains the Gaṇa-Saṁghās as "... the old gentile associations, built upon and held together by ties of blood" (p. 327). The Gaṇa-Saṁghās, or these gentile organizations, had their own gentile constitution, which "... had grown out of a society that knew no internal antagonisms, and was adapted only for such a society. It had no coercive power except public opinion" (Engels, 1983, p. 325). The Gaṇa-Saṁghā is also known as a tribal community or organization in which people from the same tribe who are related by blood or kinship live together in a shared area, speak the same language, and have a similar culture. It is also known as a political organization of primitive people (Mishra, 1987, Development, p. 35). In other words, the Gaṇa-Saṁghā stands for the state mechanisms of pre-historic Aryan society.

The word Gaṇa-Saṁghā or tribal or gentile society explains that such Saṁghā or society was "democratic and also communistic" because "There was no such thing in it as private or individual ownership of property" (Chattopadhyaya, 1992, Saṁgha, p. 492). Such a society is commonly referred to as the primitive commune because it "... produced its wealth on land and cattle in common and shared the product in common consumption" (Dange, 1972, Preface, p. XIV). The existence of the primitive commune in ancient India is a topic of discussion. D. D. Kosambi (1994) rejects the idea of having such a society in India. He asserts that some people still discuss early communism as if it were a perfect social order in which everyone shared equally and met their basic needs through cooperation. This is the 'Golden Age' tale, taken to its logical conclusion, dressed in pinkish current attire (Primitive, p. 30). He only regards such a society as the myth of the "Golden age," Dange (1972), however, recognizes such a society in ancient India. He argues that Ancient Gaṇa communues and the later emergence of classes and class tensions among them, which caused changes in their organizational structure and ideological make-up, are historical realities in India, not made-up stories (Gana-Samghas, p.145). He believes that while studying ancient Indian history through historical materialism, India also arrived at the present through the many stages of human progress. Literary evidence from the Mahābhārata supports Dange's claim. In the Sāntiparva, Bhismā suggests: "At that time, i.e. in the kṛita yuga, there was no state, no king, no
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punishment, no punisher. All men used to protect one another by Dharma” (as cited in Damodaran, 1967, p. 57). The mythical krita-yuga and the primitive commune both represent the same kind of ancient Indian societies, hence there is a similarity between both. They characterize prehistoric societies as democratic and communistic. This provides us additional evidence for the existence of the primitive commune or Gaṇa-Saṁghās in ancient India because Hindu mythology, if interpreted through historical materialism, paints a consistent and logical picture of India's ancient history (Dange, 1972, Contemporary, p. 19). The only method to understand the social structure of the ancient Aryan commune life is to examine the myths and gods that are depicted in Vedic and Epic literature. The myths created to meet basic social needs help us understand the structure and organization of early Aryan communist civilizations (Dange, 1972, Yajña, Brahman, p. 57). The historical evidences prove as having the existence of the primitive communism.

There was no division of labor in ancient communist societies in India because "the backwardness of the instruments of production ruled out any division of labour in the commune at this stage" (Dange, 1972, Gana-Gotra, p. 60). Survival has been the primary concern of humans since the beginning of human history. In order to exist, a man struggles to find food, clothing, and shelter. The tools or instruments of production that a man creates determine his state, and as a result, the growth of productive forces determines his social relationships (Dange, 1972, Contemporary, p. 14). The productive forces, in ancient days, were not developed so much because primitive men gathered the food necessary for them with the help of ancient tools like stone tools etc. and living in "the primitive commune which was a very small unit" (Dange, 1972, Yajña: The Collective, p. 47), they consumed the food collectively. In those days, the division of labor was not necessary. However, once the productive forces reached a certain point in their development, the division of labor became a prerequisite for society's advancement. K. Marx (1984) asserts: "The social division of labor arises from the exchange between spheres of production that are originally distinct and independent of one another" (Division, p. 332). The reciprocal exchange of goods is prompted by the interaction of various communities with various means of production and subsistence, and it also produces a situation where individuals who were formerly associated with various communities are compelled to participate in various specialized fields of production. The primitive commune grew in size as more people joined who came from many areas and had expertise in the specialized area of production. The diversity of goods and labor increased as a result, giving rise to the division of labor, or varṇās, in the old Aryan commune of collective labor and consumption (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, p. 161). The division of work, or varṇās, according to Dange (1972), first appeared in ancient India "before the Mahābhārata war" (Dange, 1972, Gana-Samghas, p. 135) when "The
domestication of cattle in Asia, including the horse, had created the pre-conditions of the 
varṇā division of social labour of the Aryan commune” (Dange, 1972, Rise, p. 98). The 
increased population, the diversity of goods and labor and the domestication of cattle 
created the ground for the division of labor in ancient communistic societies. This gave 
birth to the varṇās or classes in Aryan society.

In the early stages of the ancient Aryan community, the varṇās were not the 
hostile classes. The many tasks split the ancient people into various varṇās, but 
because private property did not exist, they did not have a hostile relationship with one 
another. Dange (1972) contends:

The members of a whole commune get differentiated and tied to different tasks 
and become crystallized into varṇās. But this crystallization into varṇās at the 
early stages, due to the absence of private property and collective ownership of 
the principal means of production, does not allow the varṇās to become hostile 
classes, as they do later on. (Rise, p.100)

In the ancient Aryan community, each varṇā worked in their particular production area 
but lacked property rights; all the goods were social and consumed collectively. The 
varṇā division merely enhanced social production and specialized labor. The Kṣatriyas 
had a duty to wage war and destroy the adversary, but in the Gaṇa communal era, the 
enemy was always an outsider. There was no chance of the Kṣatriyas fighting with their 
own Gaṇa members since they were all kinsmen and blood relatives of one another and 
there were no class enmities inside the early Aryan commune (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, pp. 
161-62). The ancient commune had no knowledge of warfare among 
relatives or between brothers (Dange, 1972, Falling, p. 114). There were conflicts and 
acts of violence, but these were fought between members of various tribes. As stated by 
S. G. Sardesai (2012):

War and violence were there in tribal societies. But that took place between 
different tribes, not connected with one another by blood. Violence against a 
member of one's own tribe, i.e., within the periphery of blood relations, was 
unknown to tribal societies. It was just not done. Such violence violated the 
sacred principle of Kula dharma and was impermissible. (p. 24)

The Kuladharma principle of the ancient Aryan cultures forbade warfare between 
members of the same tribe and led people to feel that it was the warrior's sacred duty to 
defend his kin and kula (Neupane, 2015, p. 157). This suggests that the Kṣatriyas at that 
time, in order to defend the rights of their kins and kula, did not wage war against their 
own kin members but rather against the alien tribes.

The primary issue for Arjuna is to fight in the war and slaughter his own family 
members. Arjuna has no problem killing outsiders other than his relatives. The first thing 
to keep in mind, according to M. K. Gandhi, is that Arjuna makes the mistake of
distinguishing between family members and strangers. Outsiders may be killed even if they are not oppressors, while kinsmen may not be slain even if they are oppressors (as cited in Desai, 2014, p.57). As a fervent admirer of the historic Gaṇa-Saṁghas (Upadhyaya, 2070 B.S., p. 198), Arjuna worries about the possibility of transgressing the revered Kuladharma, the precept of murdering his own kins. The Gītā discloses Arjuna’s dilemma in I.33–4:

yeṣām arthe kāṅkṣitāṁ no rājyaṁ bhogāḥ sukhāṇī ca
ta ime 'vasthitā yuddhe prāṇāṁsthyaktvā dhanāṇī ca
cācāryāḥ pitarāḥ putrāḥ tathaiva ca pitāmahāḥ
mātulāḥśvāsurāḥ paurāḥśyālāḥ sambandhinastathā

[Those for whose sake we desire kingdom, enjoyments and pleasures, they stand here in battle, renouncing their lives and riches. Teachers, fathers, sons and also grandfathers; uncles and fathers-in-law, grandsons and brothers-in-law and (other) kinsmen]. (Radhakrishnan’s translation, 2010, p. 101)

The verses from the original Gītā above shed light on Arjuna's objections to taking part in the Mahābhārata war. Arjuna is well aware of the Kuladharma principle, which led him to believe that he should fight for the kingdom, the enjoyment, and the joys of his kinsmen rather than for their deaths. This sentiment held by Arjuna does not oppose the Kuladharma concept upheld by the early Aryan communist Gaṇa-Saṁghas. Even though Arjuna is aware that the sons of Dhrtarastra are criminals (ātatāyinah) (I.36, p. 25), he refuses to kill them because they are his relatives (I.37, p. 25), views family dissolution as sinful (I.39, p. 26), and expresses concern for the destruction of customary rites and obligations (kulādharmaḥ) brought on by family dissolution (I.40, Gambhirananda’s translation, 2014, p. 26). Arjuna, as Gandhi claims, would not hesitate to murder the Kauravas if they were outsiders. Arjuna hesitates to join the fight only because he cannot shake off the principles of Kuladharma of the ancient Gaṇa-Saṁghas. This demonstrates that Arjuna carries the ideology of the dying Gaṇa-Saṁghas.

In tribal societies, the division of labor increased output, and "Tribal or Gaṇa democracy had allowed the varṇas to develop their spheres of activity..." (Dange, 1972, Falling, p. 109). Gaṇa rights, however, started to battle with varṇa rights as the varied divided varṇa economy matured within the womb of the old undivided Gaṇa economy (Dange, 1972, Struggle, p. 128). The new productive forces and the production relations that went along with them emerged within the old, undivided Gaṇa economy, and they came into existence not as the result of the conscious activities of the Gaṇa members. Marx (1984) points out: “In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces” (Preface, p. 137). The ancient Gaṇa-Saṁghas would not have permitted the development
of the \textit{varṇas} if they had realized that the \textit{varṇas} would finally bring an end to their own pure communistic collectivism.

The course of history is not decided by man's will. History progresses without pause and without interruption. The means and relations of production serve as the impetus for the advancement of human history. The history of humanity is actually the history of the successive changes in the means and relations of production (Kosambi, 1994, Historical, p. 10). The qualitative shift in the means of production, which led to the emergence of new production relations matching them, marked a turning point in the history of the prehistoric Aryan \textit{Gaṇa-Ṣaṁghās}. D. Chattopadhyaya (1992) explains:

The final qualitative change – the full transformation of the pre-class into the class-divided society – could only be the result of the accumulated quantitative changes, the gradual increase in the productivity of human labor which ultimately enabled it to produce more than was necessary for its maintenance, i.e., created the possibility for a few to live on the labour of many, the essential precondition for the division of society into classes. (Varuna, pp. 555-56)

The surplus production, which was the outcome of the qualitative shift in the primitive mode of production, was a crucial prerequisite for the division of society into two hostile classes because some people lived in their own production while some lived appropriating the surplus production produced by others. Dange (1972) observes that society had become divided into exploited and exploiters, into those who produced and those who appropriated the surplus of the producers. The exploited poor were forced to give up their old ṣātra rights and collectivism in order to live under the exploiters' control or to struggle (Falling, p. 113). The revolution that had taken place in the field of productive forces, ultimately, destroyed the primordial Aryan \textit{Gaṇa-Ṣaṁghās} founded on collectivism.

The productive forces developed and human society transitioned from a state of barbarism to one of civilization, but exploitation of one class by another became the basis of civilization. Engels (1983) examines that every improvement in production also represents deterioration in the situation of the oppressed class or the vast majority. What is advantageous to one must be detrimental to the other; each new class emancipation inevitably results in new subjugation of a different class (p. 333). Since civilized society gives certain people the chance to seize the surplus products produced by others and stockpile them to enhance their private property, the main characteristic of civilized society is now blatant greed. Engels (1983) asserts that civilization, since its inception to the present, has been driven by bare greed; its single and overriding goal has been to accumulate wealth—more wealth, more wealth, and more wealth—not for society but for this shabby person (p. 333). Prior to the societies' division into class rivalries, individuals...
worked for the commune, but now their only overriding goal is to accumulate money for themselves.

The primitive Aryan Gaṇa-Saṁghas fell apart, and the varṇas—who had not previously been antagonistic classes and had worked for collectivism's welfare—became hostile classes and started to promote the individual by enhancing private property. Each private family started to establish its own private property and privileges in accordance with the varṇa in which it was placed with the advent of exchange, trade, private property, and money. The varṇas associated with war, commerce, and the flow of production became the economically dominant varṇas. Even in the Brāhma- Kṣatriya varṇas that were in power, the impoverished were expelled into the laboring varṇas, into Viśalatva. The varṇas were changed into classes in this process. Class affinity, loyalty, responsibility, and rewards have taken the place of varṇa affinity. The upper two varṇas, the Brāhma- Kṣatriya, became the exploiting class, and the other two, Vaiśya-Śūdra, the exploited ones. The varṇas, however, were not hereditary. Except for the 'Śūdra slave', one could change his varṇa or his class from one into another according to his property and status. Varṇa or class rights became superior as varṇas were transformed into classes, and Gaṇa commune rights were ruthlessly suppressed (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, p.162). The right to keep the private property by individual along with the development of productive forces destroys the communistic culture of the Aryan's Gaṇa-Saṁghas and the society enters into the endless chasm of class antagonisms.

There were no state institutions when the Aryan Gaṇa commune first emerged. In the small Gaṇa commune, the whole Viśha used to administer its affairs, electing the leader by the whole commune members. The elected Gaṇa commune leadership took on a more or less permanent character and evolved into a form of aristocracy once the war turned into a vocation. The authority of leadership, however, came from election since the chosen leader had to take the consecration from the Gaṇa. The Gaṇa commune gave rise to private property, antagonistic varṇas, and slavery, and then the commune changed into the state (Rājyam), and the leadership chosen "to rule" became the monarch (Rājāns) (Dange, 1972, "Gana-Saṁghas", p. 140). The state emerged on the ruins of the democracy of Aryan Gaṇa commune and therefore, the state by nature is coercive. The ruling class by the means of state mechanism coerces the ruled one.

The elected leadership of the Rājyam or the state, however, had not yet turned into a hereditary monarchy. Engels (1983) explains that the groundwork for hereditary kingship and hereditary nobility was created with the gradual transformation of the traditional election of successors from a single family into hereditary succession, first tolerated, then claimed, and finally usurped; especially following the introduction of father right (p. 322). The Rājyam, or state, though it has a coercive nature, initially functions as the administrative organ of the tribes. However, after the advent of
hereditary monarchy, the state completely changed itself into a coercive organ, starting to dominate and oppress both the people of their own tribe and those of other ones. Engels (1983) further explains:

. . . from an organization of tribes for the free administration of their own affairs it became an organization for plundering and oppressing their neighbors; and correspondingly its organs were transformed from instruments of the will of the people into independent organs for ruling and oppressing their own people. (p. 322)

The hereditary monarchy consequently evolved into a procedure for transferring Gaṇā sovereignty into territorial authority. Territorial issues, with the emergence of class antagonisms and economic inequalities, became more important in eroding the bond of kinship because new units of people began to emerge living within well-defined areas. The territorial organization started to take shape, undermining the gentle order, and tribe chieftains evolved into monarchs of territories (Damodaran, 1967, pp.60-1). The permanent residence of people within the particular territory creates new material ground for developing the large territorial kingdoms and this annihilates the tribal kingdoms along with its Gaṇā sovereignty.

It was at this crucial point in Indian history that the old communist Gaṇā-Saṁghas began to fall apart and the new territorial slave states began to build their empires overthrowing the nearby tribal kingdoms. Dange (1972) writes:

The Rajan families went to war with each other, a thing unheard of and considered most sinful in the old Gaṇā democracy. Kamsa of Mathura, Jarasandha of Magadha and the Kauravas of Hastināpura were attempting to become big empire builders, overthrowing all vestiges of the old tribal military democracy and establishing absolute hereditary kingships, amassing wealth, land and slaves, by a furious war with neighboring tribes and civil war with one’s own rival kins. (Mahābhārata, p. 157)

The old communistic Gaṇā-Saṁghas developed first to hereditary nobility and later converted into the monarchical slave-states. The conflict between these expanding slave states to each other and with the Gaṇā-Saṁghas of the original inhabitants over the plunder of the enormous wealth created by laboring masses, the Vaiśyas and Śūdras, ultimately resulted in the Mahābhārata war (Dange, 1972, Gana-Samghas, p. 144; Mahābhārata, p. 157). According to native traditions, it is believed that the mythological Kaliyuga - Kali era began with the Mahābhārata war because it was an age of great social transformations from tribal to class society (Dange, 1972, Mahābhārata, p. 155; Mishra, 1987, Conclusion, p. 383). The characteristics of the Kaliyuga described in myths are very similar to those of class societies of the present day built on injustice and exploitation.
The Mahābhārata has preserved the war's events as well as the ethics, morals, and values of the new territorial slave states. The epic was a Shāstra of the slave-owning classes, and the slave owners and the kings of the new territorial slave kingdoms utilized it as an ideological weapon. The Shāstra is a byproduct of class society and is seen as the laws of coercion or the form of the dictatorship of one class over another. The Shāstra was unnecessary in the old society because there were no class conflicts, but they quickly developed into the ideological tools of the kings of the slave states (Dange, 1972, Sanguinary, p. 152). The epic particularly conveys the ethics and morality of the new age through the original Gītā. The original Gītā—the authentic portion of the Mahābhārata—is exhibited as a powerful ideological weapon for slave owners and the monarchs of the expanding territorial slave states. Kṛṣṇa is seen as an advocate of the ethics and morality of the new territorial slave states in the original Gītā. He enlightens Arjuna on the ethics and morality of the new age in order to persuade him to take part in the violent war. The Gītā encapsulates the general new-age ethics in II.31 and 37:

svadhammāpi cāvekṣya na vikampitumarhasi dharmyāddhi yuddhācchreyo 'nyat kṣatriyasya na vidyate

Further, having regard for thine own duty, thou shouldst not falter, there exists no greater good for a ksatriya than a battle enjoined by duty. Either slain thou shalt go to heaven; or victorious thou shalt enjoy the earth. Therefore arise, O son of kunti (Arjuna), resolved on battle.

In the lines above, Kṛṣṇa makes it clear that it is a Kṣatriya's responsibility to take part in the deadly war and kill his relatives or outsiders in order to gain personal power, wealth, and pleasure. It is not for the benefit of the kin members or of the kin groups that Kṛṣṇa advises Arjuna to fight in the war. According to Kṛṣṇa, the main objective of the war would be to provide Arjuna, the particular fighter, access to paradise or earthly pleasure. It is the premise and foundation of a class society in which individuals pursue their own interests in wealth, pleasure, power, and personal gain since whatever they rob or acquire will become their private property.

The Kṣatriya and Brāhmaṇ became the exploiters and the instruments of force in the exploitation of toiling Viśhas and slaves once the varṇas turned into hostile classes. Moreover, they were not content with merely taking advantage of those from the victimized classes. The greed for wealth led them to fight each other and the war became the profession of the exploiting varṇas. Kṛṣṇa sees the war (yuddham) as the Kṣatriyas' open gateway to heaven (svarga-dvāram-apārvatām) (II.32, p. 79-80). If they choose not
to participate in the war, the Kṣatriyas will incur sin (pāpam-avāpsyasi) and people will speak of their eternal infamy (avyayām akiṛtim) (II.33-4, Gambhirananda's translation, 2014, pp. 80-1). This demonstrates that if the Kṣatriyas wished to maintain their standing and reputation in society, they had no choice except to engage in combat. This justifies the professionalism of the war for the exploiting class, the Kṣatriyas. The new territorial slave nations competed with one another for control of slaves, riches, and territory. As a result, the ethics and morals of the new age were based on the desire for wealth, power, and prosperity. In the original Gītā, Kṛṣṇa seeks to persuade the doubting Arjuna, who was still clinging to the outdated Gaṇa dharmas and morals, by explaining this fact of the new age. According to the dharma of the old communistic Gaṇa-Saṁghas, Arjuna could not kill his kith and kins but Kṛṣṇa makes him aware that according to the dharmas of the class state based on exploitation, he could kill anybody else whether he may be a kin, blood relation, teacher or grandfather, Gaṇa member or alien (Dange, 1972, “Mahābhārata”, p.162). It is the primary lesson of the original Gītā. The original Gītā’s morals are in stark opposition to the morals of the old communistic Aryan Gaṇa-Saṁghas. This indicates that the original Gītā was set during a period of intense conflict between the newly formed territorial slave states to each other and with the antiquated communistic Aryan Gaṇa-Saṁghas, which culminated in the historical Mahābhārata War. It marked a turning point in Indian history that saw the growth of Indian slavery and the demise of Aryan primitivism.

**Conclusion**

The article reveals that the original Gītā was set at the early stage of Indian slavery and it exposes the ethics and morality of the expanding territorial slave states. This part of the BhagavadGītā is observed as a genuine part of the epic and can be concluded that it was composed at a time with the epic. It was a time when the varṇas, which emerged along with the division of labor, began to be transferred into hostile classes and the bond of kinship of the primitive Gaṇa societies was falling apart giving rise to class-based territorial societies. It was a time when the people began to amass their own private property, a system unknown to the old communistic societies where people enjoyed common ownership in the means of production. The rise of private property and classes gave birth to human greed which introduced the varieties of inequalities and injustices in society. The small tribal kingdoms of ancient societies began to be transformed into territorial kingdoms and this resulted in big wars like the war of the Mahābhārata in which the warriors fought not for the protection of collective rights but for enhancing individual gains and luxuries. In the primitive Gaṇa-Saṁghas, the warriors fought for the protection of the rights of Gaṇa members, but in the territorial slave kingdoms, the warriors fought for the expansion of territory and for amassing slaves, wealth, and prosperity. The article exposes the fact that Kṛṣṇa in the original Gītā
instructs Arjuna, the follower of *kuladharma* of the ancient *Gaṇa-Saṁghas*, to pursue his own interests in wealth, pleasure, power, and personal gain which is regarded as fundamental ethics and morality of the expanding territorial slave states. Kṛṣṇa, in the original *Gītā*, reminds Arjuna of the *Kṣatriyādharma* as involving in wars where the warriors are allowed to kill anybody else whether they belong to fathers, sons, uncles, grandfathers, or teachers if they stand in enemy lines and become their obstacles in amassing personal wealth and prosperity. Arjuna hesitates at first to follow Kṛṣṇa’s advice but he is compelled to follow it at last because Arjuna cannot adhere to old ethics of the old age and challenge the ethics of the new age, the age of slavery. This suggests that the original part of the *Bhagavad-Gītās* found to be the mouthpiece of the early age of Indian slavery when the big wars were going on in expanding the slave empires, overthrowing the primitive *Gaṇa-Saṁghas*.
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