

asked Manu to become the first king. Manu declined, saying that a king will have to punish other persons, put them in jail and so on; he was not prepared to commit all these sins. Thereupon Brahma said, “Your actions in the capacity of a king will not constitute sin, as long as they are aimed at securing conditions under which the society can live peacefully and according to *Dharma*. This will be your duty, your *Dharma*. Not only that, but you will also have a share of the *Karma* of your subjects, whereby you will gain *Dharma* considerably if your subjects maintain conduct according to *Dharma*”. Although it is not explicitly stated here, I believe that if the society under any king committed sin, a part of that too, must automatically go to the account of the king. It is not proper if only good things are shared by the king and not the bad ones; both must be shared in the same proportion. Thus the State came into existence as a contract. This contract theory can be applied to the State, but not to the Nation. In the West, it was exactly opposite. Society as a Nation, according to them, was a contract, but the king claimed a divine right and proclaimed himself the sole representative of God. This is wrong. In our country, the king may have been first recognised in antiquity, but the society as a Nation is considered self-born. The State is only an institution.

Multiple Group Loyalties

Similarly, other institutions like the State, are created from time to time, as the need is felt. Every individual is a limb of one or more of these institutions. A person is a member of his family as well as his community; he may also be a member of some association of his fellow professionals, if he pursues a profession. Above all, he is a member of the Nation and Society. If we consider even the larger sphere, he is a member of the whole of mankind, and then the entire universe. Truly speaking, an individual is not merely a single entity, but a plural entity. He is a part of not just one, but a number of institutions. He lives a variety of lives. The most important is that, despite this multiple personality, he can and should behave in a way which does not bring different aspects of his life into mutual conflict, but which is mutually sustaining, complementary and unifying. This quality is inherent in man.

A person who uses this quality properly becomes happy. On the other hand, one who does not do so reaps unhappiness. Such a person will not have a balanced development in life. As an illustration, a man is the son of his mother, the husband of his wife, the brother of his sister, and the