



The Shudras (II)

Mircea A. Tamas

If one has the curiosity to look at India's map, one will notice that various regions of the country are called *pradesh*. The word *pradesh*, in fact *paradesh*, means in Sanskrit "supreme region," from this word deriving the well-known appellative "paradise," a remarkable thing suggesting that, for a traditional mentality, any country has the right and even the obligation to represent a land of prosperity and peace, based on the concord (*cum – cordia*, "the union of hearts") government – people, on justice and natural laws (*dharma*).

In the Judaic and Christian traditions, the legitimate leader of such an ideal *paradesh* is the mysterious Melkisedek, "the King of Justice" (Ebr. *melek* = "king," *tsedeq* = "justice"), the Lord of Salem, that is, the Lord of Peace.

In other words, in a traditional society, the king, obeying the cosmic Law, was seen as a warrantor of peace and justice, his residence being the core of the World Wheel, from where he regulates¹ its rotation, interfering as little as possible with the public activities,² striving to realize a perfect harmony between himself and the people,³ establishing a prosperous and good government.⁴

¹ In the Hindu tradition, the king was Chakravarti, "the one who turns the wheel," and Dharmachakra, "The Wheel of Law," symbolizes the World; the king is the Latin *rex*, who regulates and guards the rules (the words *rex*, *regulate* and *rule* are related).

² The traditional leader had the duty to oversee that the natural regulations were observed; fewer artificial decrees he promulgated, less he interfered in the public details, more the country prospered.

³ Tit Livy affirmed: *Multitudo semper ferme regenti est similis* ("the people is always similar to its leader"). Yet Joseph de Maistre said: "No nation owes its character to the government; on the contrary, the nation owes its government to its character," that is, "each nation has the leader it deserves." Therefore, the people must contribute, in the same proportion as its leader, to the realization of the "paradise," obeying the Law (in the Islamic tradition, each member of the society is a Muslim, that is, "complying to the divine Will"). The **Yi Jing** stated: "The Dao of emperor signifies to supervise, from the height of his exceptional rank, the plan of the Providence, while everything contained inside the four cardinal points follows his government and obeys him; if the emperor realizes and operates the celestial Way (Dao), all the provinces enjoy the peace."

⁴ A good government means to respect and understand the *principal* Rule (in Daoism), the supreme Law (Dharma, in the Hindu tradition), means *eynomia*, the good legislation (see Plato). If the Law is tarnished and desecrated by ignorant, arrogant, and fake translators, who deceive the people, there are in that country no more "Muslims" but "anti-Muslims," and this truth applies to any nation, including the Islamic countries.

The Shudras (II)

“The emperor Yao strived to rule the people of the kingdom, and he thought he maintained a perfect government within the four seas. Having gone to see the four (Perfect) Ones [the Guardians of the Rule] on the distant island [the World Center, the Pivot], when (he returned to his capital) he admitted to have ruined his government [with his artificial endeavor]” (**Zhuang-zi**, 1, 6). The traditional perspective¹ is so different that probably the modern mentality is completely opaque to it. No modern Shudra would understand today that a leader of a country, region, company, organization, or group must do nothing in disaccord with the natural law and with the welfare of people, that he must forbid completely his individual impulses, and repress the desire to express his power by inventing all types of rules.

“Therefore the superior man, who feels himself constrained to engage in the administration of the world will find it his best way to do nothing. In (that policy of) doing nothing, he can rest in the instincts of the nature with which he is endowed. Hence he who will administer (the government of) the world honouring it as he honours his own person, may have that government committed to him, and he who will administer it loving it as he loves his own person, may have it entrusted to him” (**Zhuang-zi**, 11, 2).

In our modern world, the individual initiative is the supreme praised characteristic. It is the characteristic of a revolted Shudra, of course.² Even if various leaders will try to hide their initiatives under the cover of stentorian words such as “in the name of the people” or “it is God’s Will,” make no mistake: it is all about their own limited, pitiful and ignorant desires and ideas, it is about their own greed and arrogance. It is amazing how such people cannot learn from the natural laws, how they cannot see that a simple storm is impossible to be stopped, how they, like puppets on strings, play their dissolvent roles.

“Therefore, if the superior man will keep (the faculties lodged in) his five viscera unemployed, and not display his powers of seeing and hearing, while he is motionless as a representative of the dead, his dragon-like presence will be seen; while he is profoundly silent, the thunder (of his words) will resound, while his movements are (unseen) like those of a spirit, all heavenly influences will follow them; while he is (thus) unconcerned and does nothing, his genial influence will attract and gather all things round him: what leisure has he to do anything more for the government of the world?” (**Zhuang-zi**, 11, 2).

What Zhuang Zi described here was, of course, an ideal case, difficult to follow in the Iron Age, and we have to keep in mind that in Zhuang Zi’s times the tenebrous age was in full evolvment. The following anecdote will stress why today’s endeavour to “subdue the nature in favour of humankind” and “for a better life” is, in fact, a lethal peril, even if it is truly desired, and, again, only a Shudra usurper could believe that such an enterprise will have an auspicious ending. *Quidquid agis prudenter agas et respice finem*. But what we see today in the whole world is a tremendous appetite to act without any intellectual

¹ We always have to keep in mind the difference between “religion” and Tradition; too often the modern people confuse, on purpose or not, these two domains, and we witness the inanity of accusing the Tradition for today’s contradictions. The Shaikh al-‘Arabî ad-Darqâwî said in his *Letters*: “I understood the prophetic saying: «Better an hour of meditation than seventy years of religious practice.»”

² We must insist: when we talk about the modern or revolted Shudras we don’t have in mind the normal and natural Shudras, who have as main characteristic the obedience, a very important trait in any initiatory and spiritual process. We refer to the ages of disorder when the Shudras usurped the place of Brahmanas and Kshatriyas, becoming pseudo or unnatural Shudras.

The Shudras (II)

thinking, without any providential intuition, without any vision of the ending. When we witness the more or less “official” representatives of the three Oriental major regions (as defined by René Guénon with respect to their fundamental traditions) striving to change them in “super-powers,” in the worst materialistic and corporeal sense, accepting and enthusiastically adapting “the modern Shudra’s way,” we may wonder if Zhuang Zi is still heard outside the sacred kernel.

“Huang-di had been on the throne for nineteen years, and his ordinances were in operation all through the kingdom, when he heard that Guang cheng was living on the summit of Kung-tung, and went to see him. ‘I have heard,’ he said, ‘that you, Sir, are well acquainted with the perfect Dao. I venture to ask you what is the essential thing in it. I wish to take the subtlest influences of heaven and earth, and assist with them the (growth of the) five cereals for the (better) nourishment of the people. I also wish to direct the (operation of the) Yin and Yang, so as to secure the comfort of all living beings. How shall I proceed to accomplish those objects?’ Guang cheng replied, ‘You push your ambition to the limit, wanting to govern the nature. If you receive such a power, you will ruin all the beings. According to your government of the world, the vapours of the clouds, before they were collected, would descend in rain; the herbs and trees would shed their leaves before they became yellow; and the light of the sun and moon would hasten to extinction. Your mind is that of a flatterer with his plausible words; it is not fit that I should tell you the perfect Dao.’ Huang-di withdrew, gave up (his government of) the kingdom” (**Zhuang-zi**, 11, 4).

The next anecdote will elaborate about the difference between a real king and a Shudra leader, between a traditional government and a government of thieves and bandits. The major element of governing is, we must stress, the concord government – people, the peace of the kingdom and the welfare of the society. The slogan “fighting for peace” is a contradiction in terms, the real peace requiring a deep understanding of this metaphysical notion; and only the pseudo-Shudra mentality will be open for a continuous fight and revolt against something, since the Shudras are the climax of the series of revolts along the ages.

“Yao asked Hu Yu, saying, ‘Is Nie Kue fit to be the correlate of Heaven? (If you think he is), I will avail myself of the services of Wang Yi to constrain him (to take my place).’ Hu Yu replied, ‘Such a measure would be hazardous, and full of peril to the kingdom! The character of Nie Kue is this; he is acute, perspicacious, shrewd and knowing, ready in reply, sharp in retort, and hasty; his natural (endowments) surpass those of other men, but by his human qualities he prevents the Heaven, the Principle for governing; he exercises his discrimination in suppressing his errors, but he does not know what is the source from which his errors arise. Make him the correlate of Heaven! He would employ the human qualities, so that no regard would be paid to the Heavenly gift. Moreover, he would assign different functions to the different parts of the one person. Moreover, honour would be given to erudition, and he would have his plans take effect with the speed of fire. Moreover, he would be the slave of everything he initiated. Moreover, he would be embarrassed by things. Moreover, he would be looking all round for the response of things (to his measures). Moreover, he would be responding to the opinion of the multitude as to what was right. Moreover, he would be changing as things changed, and would not begin to have any principle of constancy. How can such a man be fit to be

The Shudras (II)

the correlate of Heaven? Nevertheless, as there are the smaller branches of a family and the common ancestor of all its branches, he might be the father of a branch, but not the father of the fathers of all the branches. Such government (as he would conduct) would lead to disorder. It would be calamity in one in the position of a minister, and ruin if he were in the position of the sovereign” (**Zhuang-zi**, 12, 5).

Various traditions dealt with this way of governing. In the **Dao De Jing**, Lao Zi stated: “In the highest antiquity, everything was in accordance with the Principle; (the people) did not know that there were (rulers). In the next age, they loved them and praised them (because of their benevolence). In the next, they feared them (because of their laws); in the next, they despised them (because of their injustice). Thus it was that when faith (in the Dao) was deficient (in the rulers) a want of faith in them ensued (in the people) (XVII). “Governing a large country is like frying a small fish. You spoil it with too much poking” (LX). “Why are the people starving? Because the rulers eat up the money in taxes. Therefore the people are starving. Why are the people rebellious? Because the rulers interfere too much. Therefore they are rebellious. Why do the people think so little of death? Because the rulers demand too much of life. Therefore the people take death lightly. Having little to live on, one knows better than to value life too much” (LXXV).

Lama Rajah of Dugyul affirmed: “The king who became rich by robbing his subjects, who rejects the white umbrella of the ten virtues, who does not reward or punish the good and bad deeds, such a king runs to his own end.”

Finally, in the Hindu tradition, the **Mânava-Dharma-Shastra** stated: “For, when these creatures, being without a king, through fear dispersed in all directions, the Lord created a king for the protection of this whole (creation)” (7.3). “Let him act with justice in his own domain, with rigour chastise his enemies, behave without duplicity towards his friends, and be lenient towards Brahmanas. The fame of a king who behaves thus, even though he subsists by gleanings, is spread in the world, like a drop of oil on water” (7.32-33). “The king has been created (to be) the protector of the castes (*varna*) and orders, who, all according to their rank, discharge their several duties” (7.35). “Not to turn back in battle, to protect the people, to honour the Brahmanas, is the best means for a king to secure happiness” (7.88). “That king who through folly rashly oppresses his kingdom, (will), together with his relatives, ere long be deprived of his life and of his kingdom” (7.111).

With regard to the Shudras, the **Mânava-Dharma-Shastra** declared: “A Brahmana who subsists only by the name of his caste (*gati*), or one who merely calls himself a Brahmana (though his origin be uncertain), may, at the king’s pleasure, interpret the law to him, but never a Shudra. The kingdom of that monarch, who looks on while a Shudra settles the law, will sink (low), like a cow in a morass. That kingdom where Shudras are very numerous, which is infested by atheists and destitute of twice-born (inhabitants), soon entirely perishes, afflicted by famine and disease” (8.20-22).

The **Mânava-Dharma-Shastra** also stated an apparent curious rule: “Day and night the king must strenuously exert himself to conquer his senses; for he (alone) who has conquered his own senses, can keep his subjects in obedience (7.44). Zhuang Zi said too: “Jian Wu went to see the fool (recluse), Ji-yu, who said to him, ‘What did Ru-Zhung-Shu tell you?’ The reply was, ‘He told me that when rulers gave forth their regulations according to their own views and enacted righteous measures, no one would venture not

The Shudras (II)

to obey them, and all would be transformed.’ Ji-yu said, ‘That is but the hypocrisy of virtue. For the right ordering of the world it would be like trying to wade through the sea and dig through the Yellow River, or employing a mosquito to carry a mountain on its back. And when a sage is governing, does he govern men’s outward actions? He gives example of virtue [rectitude, De], which people, if they want, they will follow it” (**Zhuang-zi**, 7, 2).

There is, in accordance with the traditional lore, a perfect analogy between macrocosm and microcosm, and also between a human being and the social organism. Therefore, the traditional leader, instead of governing the outside, will strive first to control his own being, realizing the inner kingdom,¹ the castle inside the heart, the Hindu Brahma-pura. As Plato showed in **Politeia**, the Cosmos (Gr. “order”)² is reflected accordingly in universe, city (or society), and in the individual’s soul, the royal man being the one who realizes, by way of wisdom, “the inner republic,” this realization being precisely the *politeia*!³

As Yoga or Dao means both the way toward the target, and the target itself, so Politeia designates not only the city or the kingdom itself, but also the realization of it; it represents the policy of the traditional leader, who, in order to establish a social and exterior *paradesh*, must first realize and accomplish an inner paradise, where will reign the Peace, the real Salem (identical to Brahma-pura and the Heavenly Jerusalem) residing in the heart, where *mishkat al-anwâr*, the tabernacle of Light, is placed.⁴

Such a *politeia*, for a traditional society, is the warrantor of a good government, but it appears nowadays as an ideal policy, much too different and incomprehensible for the modern mentality⁵; since it is clear enough that a *politeia*, to be successful today, requires a wisdom (*khawashsh al-khawashsh*) that facilitates avoiding the errors (*Al-Munqidh min al-Dalâl*), and that seems nowhere to be found in our profane world; the Buddhist adage *dharmam saranam gacchâmi* (“I seek refuge in order and laws”) is in the present days more neglected than ever.

Let us offer one more quotation, even if we know that so many modern minds prefer a plain, simple text, exempted of footnotes and quotations.

¹ It is said in the Christian tradition: *Regnum Dei intra vos est*.

² The Cosmos is, of course, not the “cosmos” of the modern scientists, who are completely sunk in the domain of quantity.

³ The monarch, through his orders, realizes the Order; placed in the center of the wheel, as Chakravarti, he, in a ritual mode, produces and regulates the Cosmos. In the Judaic tradition and also in the Christian one, the first order was *Fiat Lux*. In the Hindu tradition, the king is *antaryami*, “the inner ruler.” In the Islamic tradition, the realization of the “inner kingdom” means *el-jihâdul-akbar*.

⁴ Ghazali stressed that the true Light corresponds to the “eye of the heart”: “There is truly in the man’s heart (*qalb*) an eye (*ayn*), which possesses the perfection [to see the absolute Light]. (...) This inner eye belongs to another world that is the heavenly kingdom (*Malakût*).” The light that shines in Malkût, the inner kingdom, is Dante’s “silent light” and the Hesychastic “perfumed light.”

⁵ Without developing, we should mention the immense difference between the traditional civilizations of the so-called “native” people of the world, which were based on harmony and a complete accord with nature, and the modern civilization that destroyed them, in the name of “civilization.” The *politeia* of the native peoples meant a conformity to order that brought happiness, music and light, and all these without the help of a cell phone, a DVD player, or even an electric bulb.

The Shudras (II)

“A time arrived when a great disorder ensued in the world, and sages and worthies no longer shed their light on it. The Principle and its characteristics ceased to be regarded as uniform; other principles were invented, the discussions commenced, and everyone considered his opinion the right one. Many in different places got one glimpse of it, and plumed themselves on possessing it as a whole. They might be compared to the discussions among ear, eye, nose, and mouth. Each sense had its own faculty and was right, but their different faculties cannot be interchanged. So it was with the many branches of the various schools. Each had its peculiar excellence, and there was the time for the use of it; but notwithstanding no one covered or extended over the whole (range of truth). The case was that of the scholar who passes his judgment on all the beauties in heaven and earth, discriminates the principles that underlie all things, and attempts to estimate the success arrived at by the ancients. Seldom is it that such one can embrace all the beauties in heaven and earth, or rightly estimate the spiritual and intelligent ways; and thus it was that the Dao, which inwardly forms the sage and externally the king, became obscured and lost its clearness, became repressed and lost its development. Every one in the world did whatever he wished, and had his own rule. Alas! the various schools held on to their several ways, and could not come back to the same point, nor agree together. The students of that later age unfortunately did not see the undivided purity of heaven and earth, and the great scheme of truth held by the ancients. The system of the Dao was about to be torn in fragments all under the sky” (Zhuang Zi, 33, 1).

Zhuang Zi describes nothing else than the reign of the revolted Shudras; and all the more his sayings match the actual situation of the world. Each modern Shudra is so conceited, so arrogant of his pseudo-knowledge, so final with respect to his opinion, so thirsty for gossip, so ready and inflexible in criticizing any detail, any trivial mistake, but ignoring the essence and whole, that even the suggestion of such a notion like Politeia would be an insult for him.

The modern Shudras will try to persuade you that texts like Zhuang Zi’s are obsolete and the time for studying the sacred scriptures has passed; that to be traditional means to be anchored in the problems of actuality, and to express your individual opinion about the end of times, about Kali-yuga and what and how this will happen; that it is more interesting to read details about René Guénon, than to meditate over his work; that studying the Upanishads is old fashioned and much better would be to read some modern commentaries or essays about Vedanta.

The modern Shudras have no clue how important the spiritual activity is¹ and how this one occurs. They, who are the personification of selfishness, think that the salvation of the world could be done with common, individual and inferior means. They don’t understand what signifies the Liberation, as a result of an initiatory process, which is regarded as a selfish enterprise, a non-action; they don’t understand that the sage in his non-action develops a tremendous spiritual activity and this activity is not egoistic but regards the welfare of the whole world. Such an activity, like meditating upon a sacred text, during the initiatory realization, and plunging deeply into its real significance, represents enormously more than any humanitarian or militant actions.² The modern

¹ To prevent any misunderstanding, we must insist that “spiritual” has nothing to do with what the modern world tries to suggest it represents, and is not connected with religious notions like “faith” and “believe.”

² The Shaikh al-‘Arabî ad-Darqâwî said in his *Letters*: “Strike neither Jew nor Christian nor Moslem, but

The Shudras (II)

Shudras have no idea that there are other ways, beside the corporeal ones, much more efficient, which lead to Salem.

There are people who describe the Center of the World as a Christian center; there are others who think that the Center is an Islamic center.¹ These individuals should not even talk about the center, since they understand nothing. Only a revolted Shudra could give an attribute to the supreme Center, “his attribute.”

The Center, which is *Oriens*, has no place for this unnatural Shudras.

strike your own soul (*nafs*) and do not cease to strike it until it dies!”

¹ In a normal traditional society, even from an exoteric point of view, the center had no epithet. Each secondary tradition had the right to pretend that it is the only genuine one, but all the more its center wouldn't be particularized; the Incas, for example, never called their center “the Inca Center.”