

Original *Gītā* : The Mouthpiece of Indian Territorial Slave States¹

Tilak Bahadur Khatri

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 *Gaṇa-Saṅghas*.

Key Terms: *Gaṇa-Saṅghas*, Kuladharmas, Primitive commune, Slavery, *Vara*

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*,"

¹ Cite this article as: Khatri, T. B. (2023). *Contemporary Research: An Interdisciplinary Academic Journal*, vol. 6 (2); DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/craiaj.v6i2.60278>

Tilak Bahadur Khatri, PhD, Asst. Professor, Patan Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Email: tilakckhatri@gmail.com

Article history: Received on September 4, 2023; Accepted on Nov. 17; Published on Nov. 29, 2023

Peer reviewed under the authority of CRAIAJ, academic journal of Ghodaghodi Multiple Campus, Kailali, Nepal, with ISSN 2717-4611 (Print) and ISSN 2717-462X (Online).

© 2023 CRAIAJ, A Star Rated Journal Indexed in Nepjol



Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Full text can be downloaded: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/craiaj> & <http://www.craiaj.info/>

which deals with war-related themes, and "philosophic *G t*," which is primarily focused on philosophical ideas. The original war *G t* ends in *BG* 2.38 because the rest of the verses after 2.38 are not on the subject of war. The philosophic *G t*, 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 *G t* as a genuine part of the epic and the philosophic *G t* as a later interpolation. The two *G t*s 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 *G t* 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 *G t* goes back to the early stage of Indian slavery when the Indian territorial slave states were being strengthened, overthrowing the ancient Aryan *Ga a-Sa ghas*.

Results and Discussion

The birth of the original *G t*, which is regarded as the authentic portion of the *Mah bh rata* epic, can be examined with the birth of the epic as a whole. The *Mah bh rata* 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 Hastin pura. The war began as a civil war among kinsmen (Dange, 1972, Mah bh rata, p.159). The Bharat war, which occurred in prehistoric India between "2000 B.C. and 1500 B.C." (Dange, 1972, Gana-Samghas, p.136), is regarded as a significant historical event in which ". . . the whole old world of the *Ga a-Sa ghas*, military democracies, aristocratic *Kula-Sa ghas*, slave states and all were thrown in one boiling cauldron of the war" (Dange, 1972, Mah bh rata, p.159). The Bharat war is seen as a turning point in Indian history since it puts an end to the *Ga a-Sa ghas*' old world's morals, ethics, economy, and social ties (Dange, 1972, Mah bh rata, p.159). The original *G t*, 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 G t*] discusses, its origin suggests that it gave the final death-blow to the collective *Ga a* 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 *Ga a* democracy. (Mah bh rata, p.160)

In the aforementioned passage, Dange makes reference not to the whole portion of the *G t*, but to "its origin," or the original *G t*, the part of the *Mah bh rata*. He views the

original *G t* as a result of the historical context in which the new territorial slave states were strengthening and the old *Ga a-Sa ghas* were disintegrating. The original *G t* serves as a spokesperson for the new slave territorial states based on private property and class relations.

The *Ga a-Sa gha* is the primitive Aryan commune's political body. The *Ga a-Sa gha* is described as a *Ga a* 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, Gana-Gotra, p. 62). F. Engels (1983) explains the *Ga a-Sa ghas* as ". . . the old gentile associations, built upon and held together by ties of blood" (p. 327). The *Ga a-Sa ghas*, 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 *Ga a-Sa gha* 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 *Ga a-Sa gha* stands for the state mechanisms of pre-historic Aryan society.

The word *Ga a-Sa gha* or tribal or gentile society explains that such *Sa gha* or society was "democratic and also communistic" because "There was no such thing in it as private or individual ownership of property" (Chattopadhyaya, 1992, *Sa gha*, 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 *Ga a* communes 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 *Mah bh rata* supports Dange's claim. In the *S ntiparva*, Bhishma suggests: "At that time, i.e. in the *krita yuga*, there was no state, no king, no

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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* 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 communistic 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 *var as*, in the old Aryan commune of collective labor and consumption (Dange, 1972, Mah bh rata, p. 161). The division of work, or *var as*, according to Dange (1972), first appeared in ancient India "before the Mah bh rata war" (Dange, 1972, Gana-Samghas, p. 135) when "The

domestication of cattle in Asia, including the horse, had created the pre-conditions of the *var a* division of social labour for 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 *var as* or classes in Aryan society.

In the early stages of the ancient Aryan community, the *var as* were not the hostile classes. The many tasks split the ancient people into various *var as*, 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 *var as*. But this crystallization into *var as* at the early stages, due to the absence of private property and collective ownership of the principal means of production, does not allow the *var as* to become hostile classes, as they do later on. (Rise, p. 100)

In the ancient Aryan community, each *var a* worked in their particular production area but lacked property rights; all the goods were social and consumed collectively. The *var a* division merely enhanced social production and specialized labor. The *K atriya*s had a duty to wage war and destroy the adversary, but in the *Ga a* communal era, the enemy was always an outsider. There was no chance of the *K atriya*s fighting with their own *Ga a* 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, Mah bh rata, 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 *Kuladharm*a 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 *K atriya*s 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* (Upadhyaya, 2070 B.S., p. 198), Arjuna worries about the possibility of transgressing the revered *Kuladharmā*, the precept of murdering his own kins. The *Gītā* discloses Arjuna's dilemma in I.33–4:

ye m arthe k k ita no r jya bhog sukh ni ca
 ta ime 'vasthit yuddhe pr styaktv dhan ni ca
 c ry pitara putr s tathaiva ca pit mah h
 m tul va ur pautr y l sambandhinastath

[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 *Kuladharmā* 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 *Kuladharmā* concept upheld by the early Aryan communist *Ga a-Sa ghas*. Even though Arjuna is aware that the sons of Dhrtarastra are criminals (*tat yinah*) (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 (*kuladharmā*) 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 *Kuladharmā* of the ancient *Ga a-Sa ghas*. This demonstrates that Arjuna carries the ideology of the dying *Ga a-Sa ghas*.

In tribal societies, the division of labor increased output, and "Tribal or *Ga a* democracy had allowed the *varas* to develop their spheres of activity. . . ." (Dange, 1972, Falling, p. 109). *Ga a* rights, however, started to battle with *varā* rights as the varied divided *varā* economy matured within the womb of the old undivided *Ga a* economy (Dange, 1972, Struggle, p. 128). The new productive forces and the production relations that went along with them emerged within the old, undivided *Ga a* economy, and they came into existence not as the result of the conscious activities of the *Ga a* 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* would not have permitted the development

of the *var as* if they had realized that the *var as* 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas*. 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 s tra 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* fell apart, and the *var as* —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 *var a* in which it was placed with the advent of exchange, trade, private property, and money. The *var as* associated with war, commerce, and the flow of production became the economically dominant *var as*. Even in the *Br hma- K atriya var as* that were in power, the impoverished were expelled into the laboring *var as*, into *Vi halatva*. The *var as* were changed into classes in this process. Class affinity, loyalty, responsibility, and rewards have taken the place of *var a* affinity. The upper two *var as*, the *Br hma- K atriya*, became the exploiting class, and the other two, *Vaihya- h dra*, the exploited ones. The *var as*, however, were not hereditary. Except for the ' *h dra* slave', one could change his *var a* or his class from one into another according to his property and status. *Var a* or class rights became superior as *var as* were transformed into classes, and *Ga a* commune rights were ruthlessly suppressed (Dange, 1972, Mah bh rata, 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* and the society enters into the endless chasm of class antagonisms.

There were no state institutions when the Aryan *Ga a* commune first emerged. In the small *Ga a* commune, the whole *Vi ha* used to administer its affairs, electing the leader by the whole commune members. The elected *Ga a* 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 *Ga a*. The *Ga a* commune gave rise to private property, antagonistic *var as*, and slavery, and then the commune changed into the state (*R jyam*), and the leadership chosen "to rule" became the monarch (*R jans*) (Dange, 1972, "Gana-Samghas", p. 140). The state emerged on the ruins of the democracy of Aryan *Ga a* 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 *R jyam* 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 *R jyam*, 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 *Ga a* 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 gentile 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 *Ga a* sovereignty.

It was at this crucial point in Indian history that the old communist *Ga a-Sa ghas* 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 *Ga a* democracy. Kamsa of Mathura, Jarasandha of Magadha and the Kauravas of Hastin pura 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. (Mah bh rata, p. 157)

The old communistic *Ga a-Sa ghas* 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas* of the original inhabitants over the plunder of the enormous wealth created by laboring masses, the *Vai yas* and *S dras*, ultimately resulted in the Mah bh rata war (Dange, 1972, Gana-Samghas, p. 144; Mah bh rata, p. 157). According to native traditions, it is believed that the mythological *Kaliyuga* – *Kali* era began with the Mah bh rata war because it was an age of great social transformations from tribal to class society (Dange, 1972, Mah bh rata, 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 *Mah bh rata* has preserved the war's events as well as the ethics, morals, and values of the new territorial slave states. The epic was a *Sh stra* 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 *Sh stra* 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 *h stras* were 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 *G t*. The original *G t*.—the authentic portion of the *Mah bh rata*—is exhibited as a powerful ideological weapon for slave owners and the monarchs of the expanding territorial slave states. Kā is seen as an advocate of the ethics and morality of the new territorial slave states in the original *G t*. 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 *G t* encapsulates the general new-age ethics in II.31 and 37:

*svadharmamapi c'vek ya na vikampitumarhasi
dharmy ddhi yuddh'cchreyo 'nyat k atriyaasya na vidyate*

...

*hato v'pr psyasi svarga jitv'v bhok yase mah m
tasm'utti ha kaunteya yuddh'ya k tani caya*

[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.]. (Radhakrishnan's translation, 2010, pp. 127-29)

In the lines above, Kā makes it clear that it is a *K atriya'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 Kā advises Arjuna to fight in the war. According to Kā, 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 *K atriya* and *Br hmi* became the exploiters and the instruments of force in the exploitation of toiling *Vi has* and slaves once the *var as* 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 *var as*. Kā sees the war (*yuddham*) as the *K atriya's* open gateway to heaven (*svarga-dv ram-ap v tam*) (II.32, p. 79-80). If they choose not

to participate in the war, the *Katriyas* will incur sin (*pam-av psyasi*) and people will speak of their eternal infamy (*avyay m ak rtim*) (II.33-4, Gambhirananda's translation, 2014, pp. 80-1). This demonstrates that if the *Katriyas* 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 *Katriyas*. 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 *Gita*, Krishna seeks to persuade the doubting Arjuna, who was still clinging to the outdated *Gaia dharmas* and morals, by explaining this fact of the new age. According to the *dharma* of the old communistic *Gaia-Sa ghas*, Arjuna could not kill his kith and kins but Krishna makes him aware that according to the *dharma*s of the class state based on exploitation, he could kill anybody else whether he may be a kin, blood relation, teacher or grandfather, *Gaia* member or alien (Dange, 1972, "Mah bh rata", p.162). It is the primary lesson of the original *Gita*. The original *Gita*'s morals are in stark opposition to the morals of the old communistic Aryan *Gaia-Sa ghas*. This indicates that the original *Gita* was set during a period of intense conflict between the newly formed territorial slave states to each other and with the antiquated communistic Aryan *Gaia-Sa ghas*, which culminated in the historical Mah bh rata 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 *Gita* 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 *BhagavadGita* 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 *varnas*, which emerged along with the division of labor, began to be transferred into hostile classes and the bond of kinship of the primitive *Gaia* 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 *Mah bh rata* in which the warriors fought not for the protection of collective rights but for enhancing individual gains and luxuries. In the primitive *Gaia-Sa ghas*, the warriors fought for the protection of the rights of *Gaia* 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 Krishna in the original *Gita*

instructs Arjuna, the follower of *kuladharmā* of the ancient *Ga a-Sa ghas*, 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. Kāśīya, in the original *Gītā*, reminds Arjuna of the *Kāśīyadharmā* 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 Kāśīya's this 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 *BhagavadGītā* is 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 *Ga a-Sa ghas*.

References

- Chattopadhyaya, D. (1992). Samgha and niyati: Studies in illusion and reality. *Lokayata: A study in ancient Indian materialism*, by Chattopadhyaya, People's Publishing House, 459-524.
- Chattopadhyaya, D. (1992). Varuna and maya. *Lokayata: A study in ancient Indian materialism*, by Chattopadhyaya, People's Publishing House, 527-665.
- Damodaran, K. (1967). Chatur-varnya and brahminism. *Indian thought: A critical survey*, 56-72. <file:///E:/K%20Damodaran%20Indian%20Thought.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Contemporary lines of studies in Indian history. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 1-20. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). The falling commune moans and battles against rising private property. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 109-116. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Gana-samghas as recorded by Panini, Kautilya, the Greeks and others. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 135-45. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Gana-gotra, the social-economic and kin organisation of the Aryan commune. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient*

- history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 59-67. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). The Mahabharata war – the civil war of slave-owners and ganasamghas. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 154-167. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Preface. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, ix-xxvii. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Rise of varnas, private property and classes. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 97-108. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Sanguinary wars and the rise of the state and danda. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 146-53. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). The struggle of irreconcilable contradictions. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 127-34. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Yajna, brahman and Veda. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 50-58. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>
- Dange, S. A. (1972). Yajna: The collective mode of production of the Aryan commune. *India from primitive communism to slavery: A Marxist study of ancient history in outline*, by Dange, People's Publishing House, 37-49. <file:///E:/Sripad%20Amrit%20Dange's%20India%20Primitive%20Communism%20to%20Slavery.pdf>

- Desai, M. (2014). Arjuna's problem. *Who wrote the Bhagavadgita? : A secular inquiry into a sacred text*, by Desai, Harper Element, 54-79.
- Engels, F. (1983). The origin of the family, private property and the state. *Selected works*, by Marx and Engels, vol. 3, Progress Publishers, 204-334.
- Gambhirananda, S. (Trans.). (2014). *Bhagavad G t :With the commentry of Sankar c rya*. Advaita shrama.
- Kosambi, D. D. (1994). The historical perspective. *The culture and civilisation of ancient India in historical outline*, by Kosambi, Vikas Publishing House, 1-25.
- Kosambi, D.D. (1994). Primitive life and prehistory. *The culture and civilisation of ancient India in historical outline*, by Kosambi, Vikas Publishing House, 26-52.
- Marx, K. (1984). Division of labour and manufacture. *Capital: A critique of political economy*, by Marx, Vol. 1, Progress Publishers, 318-47.
- Marx, K. (1984). Preface to a contribution to the critique of political economy. *On historical materialism*, by Marx, Engels and Lenin, Progress Publishers, 136-40.
- Mishra, K. C. (1987). Conclusion. *Tribes in the Mahabharata: A socio-cultural study*, by Mishra, National Publishing House, 383-88.
- Mishra, K C. (1987). Development of tribal organizations. *Tribes in the Mahabharata: A socio-cultural study*, by Mishra, National Publishing House, 34-60.
- Mishra, K C. (1987). Social conditions. *Tribes in the Mahabharata: A socio-cultural study*, by Mishra, National Publishing House, 321-82.
- Neupane, K. (2015). *Conflict channelization in the Mah bh rata* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Nepal Sanskrit University, Kathmandu.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (Trans.). (2010). *The Bhagavadgita*. Harpercollins Publishers.
- Sardesai, S. G. (2012). The riddle of the Geeta. *Marxism and the Bhagvat Geeta*, by S.G. Sardesai and Dilip Bose, People's Publishing House, 1-38.
- Upadhyaya, G. (2070 B.S.). Upanisad ra Gita ma prakritik vaitikvada. *Prakritik vaitikvada*, by Upadhyaya, Nepal Pragya-Pratisthan, 171-304.