
Dialectics of Good and Evil: Reading Anand Neelakantan's *Asura: Tale of the Vanquished*

Priyanka Francis

Research Scholar, Department of English and MEL, Lucknow University, Lucknow

ABSTRACT

Publication Info

Article history :

Received : 15-10-2024

Accepted : 21-10-2024

DOI : 10.30949/dajdtla.v20i2.16

Key words:

Theological philosophy, binary formations, representation of evil, narratives, re-working.

Corresponding author :

francispriyanka5@gmail.com

A divine benedictory presence has been envisaged as the originator and controller of the cosmos by many theological philosophies around the world. The existence and recurrence of evil in the pristine cosmic design has been explained variously by theologians. Narratives promoting these philosophies in circulation in most cultures, mythological narratives being prominent amongst them. These narratives pivot on the binary formations of good and evil, employing the plot of perennial opposition between the forces to expand on the contradictory nature of earthly existence. There are theological schools of thought which interpret or decode these narratives. This paper intends to view the significance of evil in accordance with one such branch of theological philosophy, which is known as the Samkhya school of Indian thought. In order to provide the context for the representation of evil in Indian narratives, the fictional work *Asura: Tale of the Vanquished* has been explored. Authored by Anand Neelakantan, this re-working of the Ram-Ravana narrative, brings out various aspects of the phenomenon of evil which are demonstrably crucial to the intended study.

Exploration of the idea of evil in the Indian mythology is constituted by a multifaceted approach. There are in existence, different schools of thought, that have conceptualized evil, differently. Philosophical explanation proposed by the *Yogacharya* school presents evil as a construction of the consciousness while the *Nyaya* school professes evil to be an objective phenomenon that is an inherent part of our embodied lives, but something which ceases to exist after liberation or *moksha*. The *Samkhya* school of philosophy is at variance in its conceptualization, as it perceives evil to be an eternal phenomenon which might be brought down or minimized but it is not considered to be a phenomenon which can be entirely negated (Bhattacharya 13). The Samkhya approach rationalizes the presence of evil as a constitutive force that is integral to the universe. Thus, in Indian philosophical thought, evil cannot be deemed to be a wholly strange phenomenon or something that is not intrinsic to the divine scheme of things.

Quite often, the myths or folklores in India exhibit these philosophical underpinnings in their portrayal of evil. The narratives of deities are invariably inhabited by demons; when found in the character of the divine, evil functions to lend humanness and relatability (hence credibility) to them, on the other hand when the presence of evil is embodied in an adversary, it allows the greatness and invincibility of the deity to be displayed abundantly. In "Evil and Theodicy in Hinduism", Sunder Willett mentions that the phenomenon can be considered to be an indispensable tool as 'there must be evil in the universe which pushes humankind towards the gods' (48-49). Evil validates the divine presence not merely in the narratives, but also in the

life and consciousness of humans, emphasizing the need to keep faith in the supremacy of the divine. Abiding faith in the gods inspires a consistent worship of divinity, which in turn, is generally considered to be central to the salvation of mankind. Hence evil's presence becomes imperative for humankind to be free from the illusions of the cycle of births, to achieve "release, which is beyond dharma and adharma" (O'Flaherty 378). Moreover, in the Indian theosophical thought, tracing the origin of evil further elaborates the significance of the phenomenon. Wendy Doniger mentions in the *Origin of Evil*, that according to the Hindu thought, evil is in fact one of the default traits of the universe; its presence is justified in moral terms and also in terms of cosmological necessity. The moral significance of evil lies in lending value to the good, because it is only when contrasted with it, that the true worth of goodness can be gauged. The second argument in favour of evil, has to do with the nature of universe itself, which Doniger observes, is an ambivalent entity. She mentions that in the *Devībhāgwata*, all beings, including gods, are believed to be influenced by drives or passions. The explanation that is offered is that a dynamic universe constituted by both good and bad elements requires diversity to keep developing. Thus, she states that '(n)ot only is evil inevitable, it is desirable" (47).

In their conception of evil, Christian or Abrahamic theodicy appear to provide a point of contrastive reference to the portrayal and perception of the phenomenon in the myths of India. Sunder Willett points out that the Christian bias of understanding evil as "unnatural, wrong and in need of subjugation" (40), is not the understanding that exists in Indian theological perception. Instead he mentions how according to the Indian theological viewpoint, evil is believed to have been "created alongside the rest of the universe" (44). This explains why the *rakshasas*, *asuras*, *daityas* and myriad other kinds of monstrous beings that feature prominently in the mythological narratives of India are not believed to essentially differ from the characters that represent the forces of good. Interestingly, the *suras* and *asuras* share the same paternal figure, the deity named Brahma or Prajapati. Despite not being identified as essentially dissimilar, the *asuras* are associated predominantly with evil, and the *suras* depicted as the enforcers of good conduct, despite the lapses in their own conduct being frequent.

The manifestation of evil in the Indian narratives tells a conflicting tale. As mentioned earlier, even though monstrous beings are often found at the centre of human plight, they are not merely identified as evil. There are stories of beings who are deified as gods in some narratives, while simultaneously appearing to be evil in other accounts. The mythological character of Mahishasur, for example, is quite commonly known to be the buffalo demon who was defeated by the Goddess Durga; on the other hand, he also happens to be a figure of veneration for some tribes of Chattisgarh, located in the Bastar region. Rajan Kumar in his essay "Asur traditions in Madhya Pradesh and Chattisgarh," mentions that the Gond and Halwa tribes consider Mahishasur to be their village god (33); he is worshipped for providing them with protection or for blessing them with better crops. Such paradoxical portrayal in the Indian thought, serves to heighten the ambiguity around the phenomenon of evil. Besides contradictory representation, what is also observable is that some of the beings categorized as evil or monstrous don't justify the categorization; they are not found to be demonstrably villainous or irrevocably depraved, and can often be seen displaying heroic valor, some of them even exhibit immense potential for greatness. Prahalad, the son of an *asura* named Hiranyakashipu, is considered to have been a staunch believer of the deity Vishnu; he is

venerated for his steadfast devotion in the face of the mortal threat posed by his own father. Another example is that of Ghatotkacha, the son of the demoness Hidimba and Bheem, one of the Pandava brothers. He proved his mettle in the *Mahabharata* war; answering the call of his kin, Ghatotkacha sacrificed himself in the war against the Kauravas. Thus, scions and kin of asuras and rakshasas, the afore-mentioned beings exemplify the ambiguous nature of demons in Hinduism. Such portrayal besides allowing for ambiguity in the monstrous character, makes the category of demonic beings not entirely suitable for bearing all the blame for the perpetration of evil.

In Doniger's opinion, theological narratives in India, bifurcate evil into moral and natural evil. Gächter mentions that while the moral evil is believed to have originated in the baseness of "human thoughts and deeds" (393), natural evil is identified by her as originating "independently of human actions: bacilli, earthquakes, storm, draughts, tornadoes, etc." (393). Based on where the evil may have originated from, the phenomenon has been categorized variously by philosophical schools of theology in India; considering the classification proposed by the Samkhya school of thought, we come across three kinds of evil, namely *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika*, and *ādhidaiivika*, keeping in mind whether the source of evil is our own body and mind, whether it is the result of external factors that are earthly, or if the suffering is caused by certain cosmic factors. Evil that is distinguished by its supernatural origin, can be caused through either, demonic or divine intervention. Thus, evil appears to be a functional category, and not an essential marker of identity.

Significantly, besides the discourse around the diverse embodiments and instruments of evil, the subject that assumes singular significance in the understanding and representation of evil in the Indian context, is the concept of dharma. The fight between *dharma* and *adharma* is considered to be central to the human existence and resultantly, it preoccupies the imagination of philosophical theologians of India and predominates as the theme of mythological narratives. Othmar Gächter mentions Ramchandra Dandekar's view about dharma being the socially sanctioned behavior which is deemed proper with respect to other beings, which includes other humans, different species of creatures or even supernatural entities (395). It is also associated with one's nature and what is behaviorally normal for someone as an individual or as part of a group identity that they share. Doniger elaborates on the two predominant levels of morality that characterize the Hindu belief system, namely, the 'relative "morality that is termed *svadharma*, and the absolute morality, which is called *sāmānya* or *sādhāraṇa dharma* (95). The relative morality is understood to be the "particular dharma" of the individual, while the absolute morality is explained as the set of obligations that is the "same for everyone" (95). What is noteworthy is that there is an attempt in the mythological narratives, to reconcile both the types of moralities, but Doniger points out that often in contradiction with each other, they 'cannot always be resolved...there are irreconcilable contradictions'(95).

In the case of *asuras* and *rakshasas*, the *svadharma* and *samanya* dharma are considered to be particularly irreconcilable. The *samanya* dharma for everyone is often determined with respect to the conventional cultural norms of the dominant group. Actions that challenge or disrupt the carrying out of the established conventions are more likely to be deemed evil, as it is likely for the group or the individual responsible for the action, to be branded likewise; even the probability of such an occurrence can determine the fate of someone. We may consider the example of Ghatotkacha, whose selfless act of sacrificing his

life for the *Pandavas*, gets ignored by a jubilant Krishna. Krishna claims that Ghatotkach's death is justified, as being a *rakshasa*, he was a disrupter of vedic rituals and had he not died, Krishna himself would have punished him for his abhorrence of the holy practices. Ghatotkacha is not known to have harmed any practitioners of these rituals, but it is assumed that his identity, and by implication his *svadharmā*, is sufficient to determine his actions. Thus, even though Ghatotkacha has only ever been helpful to his kin and respectful to their acquaintances, amongst whom were also yogis who performed rituals, he is readily believed to be evil.

On the other hand, there are deities (*suras*), whose moral choices are often questionable, but they are not annihilated for their transgressions, or even if they are held accountable, often they manage to get away with penance and a show of penitence. In this context, the king of *devas*, Indra, merits a mention. The divine personality often appears as a philanderer and a molester, but interestingly, despite flouting the requirement of *samānya dharmā*, he does not get categorized as evil. Immoral actions do not appear to be decisive determiners for the categorization and representation of entities; there persists considerable ambiguity on the theme of evil as it is understood in the Indian thought. In order to better explore the theme, the novel *Raavan: The Enemy of Aryavarta* by Anand Neelakantan, has been included in the analysis. In the selected narrative, Indra is presented as the leader of a maurauding tribe. He, along-with other *devas*, infiltrates the culturally and materially rich kingdom of the *asuras*, defeats the complacent race through trickery, and then razes their prosperous territories to the ground. The narrative mentions that the perpetration of extensive war-crimes had earned him the "title, Purendra or 'Slayer of Cities'. Thousands were slain; women irrespective of age, were gang-raped, children burnt alive and granaries plundered" (20-21). He is held responsible for decimating the kingdoms who populated India before his arrival, "(t)he Asuras lost everything and they fled to the south. The Nagas withdrew to the eastern hills and the Kinnara and Yaksha kingdoms were wiped out. The Gandharvas became a wandering tribe and soon got long lost in the bylanes of history and mythology" (21). Thus, Indra is presented as an unscrupulous plunderer who establishes the foundation of the *Deva* empire on the ruins of earlier kingdoms. Similarly, Varuna, another divine entity is shown to be a mercenary who helms a fleet of pirate ships and plunders kingdoms whenever he gets the opportunity. The immorality of both the characters has been established beyond the scope of doubt, but at the same time, most other characters in the narrative appear to be morally dubious as well, barring a few, who are consistently uprighteous. The complex characterization employed in the fictional work, thus precludes any attempt at simplistic binarification.

To comprehend the narrative better, we will turn towards the analysis of the central characters and the primary themes. The narrative is a re-writing of the conflict between Ram and Ravana from the perspective of the *asura* king and also through the eyes of Bhadra, a character who in the words of the author "was one of the many common Asuras who were inspired, led, and betrayed by Ravana" (4). The story has two first person narrators. While the narrative commences with Ravana's musings, it is continued through the perspective of Bhadra, a poor man employed in his service. As the narration shifts between the two characters, both of them share their life and exploits with the readers, in the process of which they reveal the journey of power as it changes hands between kings and invaders, pirates and leaders, monarchs and their treacherous kin. Through the course of narration, it is portrayed how the methods employed to wrest control become increasingly violent and inhuman. Neelakantan associates human baseness with superhuman mythological characters. Contrastingly, through

the reflection of human failings in the personality of the central character Ravana, the author plausibly re-imagines the character who had formerly been demonized and divorced from most human traits.

The defining trait that underlines Ravana's character, is his inexhaustible hunger for life, which makes him equal parts human and equal parts demonic. When the novel commences, we find Ravana dying and delirious, wishing for another chance at life, willing to make the same mistakes again, "love the same people, fight the same enemies" (14), to forsake an eternal life. Ravana's objective is clear, he declares, "I didn't want...heaven. I only wanted my beautiful earth...My aim is neither become God nor achieve moksha...I shall live like a man and dies as one. I will never try to be a God" (14-37). This unbridled lust for life drives Ravana's journey from being a dirt-poor kid to the emperor of the Lankan islands, and it is the same instinct that compels him to commit blunders of catastrophic proportions, which not only jeopardize his family but also bring about ruin and devastation on his people and his kingdom. As a young lad, Ravana reflects about the unequal distribution of power and the unjust societal structure, "wherever I looked, I only saw oppression. Money, caste, rituals, traditions, beliefs and superstitions all conspired together to crush the humble majority" (18). His will to power is accompanied by an instinct for the amelioration of those who were unprivileged like him-

An entire civilization and its people had been crushed and their spirit annihilated. A great race had been taught to think of themselves as inferior creatures, to hate the colour of their skin and believe that fairness was equivalent to greatness. But now, the time of reckoning had come...a man with no royal blood or great ancestry, a half-bred Asura, was going to claim the lost lands of an old civilization. (176)

But power transforms him and his egalitarian principles; he becomes more self-centered, segregated from the masses and begins to cater to the demands of the privileged. In his last moments, he regrets not having done all that he set out to do- "(w)hen I strove for bigger things- for bigger cities, magnificent temples, wider roads...I forgot my people. I thought glittering cities marked progress. I forgot about the people who lived in gutters" (373). Despite his failings though, there are many instances in the narrative that exhibit his sensitivity and humanity. Though he does not exhibit his love for his family, it is under adverse conditions that the depths of his emotions are revealed. The reprehensible behaviour of Rama's brother, Laxman towards his sister Surpanakha, upsets Ravana immensely. This incident drives him to such a state of anxiety that he becomes apprehensive about the safety of his daughter Sita, who is married to Rama. In Neelakantan's narrative, Sita is Ravana and Mandodari's daughter who had been abandoned in childhood. Ravana's council of ministers had been behind her abandonment, as they had wanted to avert the prophecy according to which, Sita would bring about the destruction of the Asura clan. Not having been in a situation to bring back his daughter initially, Ravana had always been vigilant about her welfare. But upon witnessing Soorpanakha's sorry state, Ravana decides to bring back his daughter, disregarding the implications of taking such a step. Blinded by concern for his daughter, Ravana kidnaps Sita, and in the process, loses his beloved uncle Maricha. He goes on to stake everything in the war against Rama that follows, and as opined, his efforts to ensure Sita's well-being result in the destruction of the *asuras*.

One after the other, Ravana loses his loved ones. Even before the war has begun, Hanuman's entry into his royal gardens brings death and destruction upon Ravana's capital, Trikota. When Hanuman is caught, and brought before Ravana's court, a disagreement escalates and Hanuman

manages to flee the palace and the city, all the while arsoning the palace, the buildings and the houses in his path. Tragically, Ravana loses his younger son Akshay to the fire- “(m)y boy, my little prince, had been burnt alive...I took the charred little body in my arms...My boy mocked everything about me...my vanity, my life, my achievements, my ego”(288-89). During the on-going war, when his palace is under a surprise attack, Ravana's wife, Mandodari gets raped by Rama's ally, Angad and his troops. They had intended to seek out Sita and take her away, but on realizing that the woman they were carrying wasn't Sita but Ravana's wife, they “violated her” (343) and abandoned her some distance away from the royal grounds. Ravana has yet to recover from a string of personal losses, when in yet another late-night siege on his palace, Ravana's son Meghnad is attacked and killed while praying in his chamber. Ravana is devastated to witness the gory scene, “Meghanada's head rested on the foot of Shiva, severed from his body...Four arrows had pierced his back. It was evident my boy had died before he knew what was happening” (364). These tragic incidents, besides emphasizing the vulnerability of Ravana, point towards the absolute lack of morality in the troops fighting for Rama. A bitter Ravana reflects, “(w)e are dealing with an enemy who has no scruples, no sense of fair play and dharma. They are ruthless barbarians who will stoop to any level to achieve their goals. And we are infested with spies and traitors” (320). Betrayal at the hands of his own brother, his friends and allies eventually prove to be nails in the coffin of the Asura monarch.

Portrayed through the eyes of an unprivileged man Bhadra, the reality of those in power, is revealed comprehensively throughout the narrative. It is displayed how possession of the different kinds of power- social, cultural, religious and political, allows for a complete lack of accountability in the empowered sections while simultaneously resulting in the disenfranchisement of the oppressed. In the case of Bhadra, the brutality of *devas* alters irrevocably, the course of his life. Bhadra becomes witness to the violent end of his family at the hands of *deva* forces who had laid seige on the small village, perpetrating indiscriminate loot, arson and rape throughout. Afterwards, with the painful incident etched in Bhadra's memory, he enlists in the motley army of Ravana in order to exact revenge on the *devas*, for their wanton savagery. The man risks his life to enable Ravana's rise to power, and even afterwards, throughout Ravana's rule, whenever he has the need for a resourceful volunteer, Bhadra always comes forward. But his efforts go shamefully unacknowledged. Having hoped to be considered an ally of Ravana, in his war against the *devas*, Bhadra instead experiences a cycle of disappointments as Ravana remains distrustful towards him, and time and again ignores his existence despite his continued support to the monarch- “I felt betrayed. I had risked my life, had been tortured, and now I lay here forgotten, thrown out like a curry leaf after use” (113). Despite the hand dealt out to him, Bhadra not only survives his travails, but he even manages to pull through the eventual destruction of Ravana's empire.

Besides serving to depict the marginalization of poor *asuras* under Ravana's regime, Bhadra also performs the role of a witness to the oppression of his community during the rule of Rama. After the death of Ravana, Bhadra along with other *asuras*, travels to Ayodhya and takes up the job of a *dhobi* (a washerman). In the course of time, an *asura* child from the *dhobi* community comes to acquire an in-depth knowledge of the Vedas. Education being the sole domain of the Brahmanas, when the priestly class finds out about the child, they claim that being an untouchable, he had broken caste laws by gaining Vedic knowledge and hence should be punished. Despite his reluctance, Rama is prevailed upon by them to be-head the youngster for this criminal offence. Significantly though, Bhadra does not remain merely a witness for long.

One day, while arguing with his wife Mala, in a half-drunken stupor, Bhadra tries to shame her by publicizing her past, "I screamed her entire past history...as a whore in Lanka, her past lovers, her being raped by Ravana" (426). Thereafter, to rile her up, he continues his mock outburst, claiming that he was "neither Rama nor Ravana, to accept a soiled wife" (426). When the matter is brought before Rama, it results in the priestly class casting aspersions on Sita's chastity, and resultantly the king is directed to abandon his pregnant wife into the forest. A few years later, Bhadra reports that Rama is reunited with his exiled wife and his sons who had all been living with the sage Valmiki. And absurdly yet again, Sita's chastity is called into question by the court advisors, and she is expected to "jump into a fire to prove her chastity again" (427). An extremely disappointed and disgusted Sita, then jumps off the cliff where the pyre had been prepared, leaving behind a shocked Rama. Bhadra feels that through the events triggered inadvertently by his actions, he had managed to fulfil his promise to a dying Ravana, about exacting a revenge on Rama.

Bhadra wonders at the irony of the fact that despite having managed to get his wife back from a powerful king like Ravana, Rama loses Sita to the scourge of orthodoxy. Acting as the author's voice, Bhadra points out that despite some of his errors, Rama had been an able administrator, "he genuinely cared about people. As long as his subjects did not stray from the straight-laced path of caste duties, they could lead a peaceful life...It was difficult to be a just ruler when the entire system was based on discriminations and privileges based on the accident of birth" (430). Bhadra spells out the theme of the narrative, revealing the machinations of the oppressors and how they operate-

The Ravana's of the world are dangerous to those who wish to use the scriptures for their own purposes and lord over others, exploiting everyone. The Ramas of the world are used by such oppressors...But as time passes, even the Ramas and Lakshmanas become dangerous, as their inherent humanity starts rebelling...what they truly delight in are men like the Vibhishanas, Kuberas and Varunas. It is not the righteous...(or) rebellious...who inherit the world, but the men who do the bidding of the fanatics; men who can kill, maim, fight and do any inhuman thing in the name of religion and the scriptures. (432)

Despite Bhadra's disillusionment with Ravana, he maintains that the Lankan sovereign was a better human being in comparison to his younger brother Vibhishana. Vibhishana abandons his own brother in favor of the opposing forces, so as to obtain the throne of Lanka. A chance encounter with Vibhishana confirms what Bhadra suspected, that his humility and religiosity were a veneer to hide his unscrupulousness, "...with his sword poised to thrust into me and the mad gleam in his eyes...I was sure he was the most cunning and ruthless of all men...He was unlike his brother, Ravana, who, though an egomaniac, was a nice person with compassion in his heart and a sense of justice and righteousness" (163).

If Ravana and his kind are to be recognized as evil, according to the Samkhya philosophy their existence is justified because they serve to highlight the goodness of Rama and his allies. But in the *Tale of the Vanquished*, Neelakantan portrays the devas and the asuras in similar scenarios and the impact of the portrayal is surprising, as no one emerges to be morally superior; there are no clear heroes and those that are villainous, merely display varying degrees of villainy. What can be gleaned from the representation, is that in the grand scheme of things, the cycle of life is going to come to an end for all beings, and the philosophical understanding dictates that both *devas* and *asuras* being part of the cosmological consciousness, are mere manifestations of the universal energy. Recurrence of battles, vicissitudes, victories and accomplishments signify

the impermanence of our embodied existences. There can thus be no real oppositions, because every being shares the same essence. Mythological narratives might be interpreted as advocating this larger cosmic perspective which doesn't discriminate, but when viewed objectively from a more immediate perspective, what can be observed is that representations have cultural moorings, and victory becomes significant in terms of power and social privilege. In this context, it can be noted that Neelakantan's narrative displays a marked absence of valorization of any character. But simultaneously, what is also significant is that the humanization of an erstwhile demonized character like Ravana, can be perceived as an attempt at critiquing established binary representations that function to promote the victor's (privileged/conventional) point of view.

In this context, what is additionally evident is that, evil does not have much to do with the fight between the *devas* and the *asuras* because there are no concrete factors differentiating them. Moral stipulations have not been so much a part of the design of the earlier theological texts in India. It was the later texts that began "to apply new moral codes to the characters of individual gods and demons in myths...for the two groups, as groups, are not fundamentally morally opposed" (Doniger, 58). It is explained by Doniger that the distinguishing factor between *devas* and *asuras* is not dharma or morality, but power, "therefore when demons become powerful (often through virtue, though sometimes through trickery or brute strength), they must be destroyed...moral categories simply do not apply to the two superhuman factions" (63).

In the narrative, the workings of power and privilege, and the ways in which these factors disenfranchise the poor, the untouchables, and even the female gender, have been depicted through the functioning of mighty kingdoms and their monarchs. Neelakantan highlights the plight of those who are under-privileged and made to live according to the diktats of the empowered. An elaborate tale of wars, sieges, losses and victories shows how the vulnerable are the worst hit under adverse circumstances, standing to lose everything to crisis. Moreover, even when the conditions of life are normal, they are forced to live unenviable lives. More often than not, this section of the populace is frequently labeled evil and punished for their decisions. An example of this can be traced in Vibhishana's diatribe against his sister-

I am ashamed to say, Soorpanakha, my own sister, started this war. She cannot be blamed completely. She was a product of our culture that allowed women the freedom to lead a loose life. She tried to seduce the handsome Lakshmana. This impudence of a widow to fall in love cannot be tolerated by any man. He punished Soorpanakha by mutilating her nose and ears.
(400)

Arguably, Soorpanakha's actions could have been objectionable, but the reaction was exceedingly disproportionate and barbaric. This demonstrates that needless violence which would otherwise be viewed as evil, gets justified when it is indulged in by the privileged; in such cases, it is not identified as evil or immoral. It is imperative to draw attention to the fact that even though, the phenomenon of evil is identified as integral to the scheme of things, the persistence of a pejorative association with it, remains very evident in the mythological narratives. Contrastingly though, Neelakantan presents an alternative perspective through Ravana. In one instance, Mahabali while tutoring Ravana mentions the ten evils that should not be encouraged to grow within a being. This injunction is summarily overturned by Ravana, who replies that these traits are the pillars of human development and hence necessary for civilizational growth. He claims that "...it was not the maharishis or sages who built

civilizations but extraordinary men, who never controlled their emotions, but let them flow in the direction which nature intended" (37). The ten traits that are mentioned are namely anger, pride, vanity, jealousy, happiness, sadness, fear, selfishness, love and ambition. Not only does Ravana advocate for the existence of evil, but he also espouses the worldview that good and evil co-exist together in the cosmos, with the good quite often originating in the purportedly evil. This viewpoint suggests that the universal forces which can often be witnessed at strife with each other, also simultaneously display convergence so that the lines demarcating them continue to become blurry, precluding clear and absolute categorization and theorization.

Works Cited

- Bhattacharya, Joy. "The Problem of Evil: Some Indian Approaches." *Bulletin of the Ramkrishna Mission Institute of Culture*, vol. LXXIV, no. 11, pp.10-14. Nov. 2023.
- Gächter, Othmar. "Evil and Suffering in Hinduism." *Anthropos*, vol. 93, no.4/6, pp. 393-403, 1998. Jstor, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40464839>. Accessed 11 Aug. 2024.
- Neelakantan, Anand. *Asura: Tale of the Vanquished*. Leadstart Publishing Pvt. Ltd. May, 2012.
- O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger. *Origin Of Evil in Hindu Mythology*, Motilal Banarsidass, 1976.
- Ranjan, Pramod (Ed). *Mahishasur: A People's Hero*. Rajan Kumar, "Asur traditions in Madhya Pradesh and Chattisgarh" Forward Books, 2016.
- Willett, Sunder. "Evil and Theodicy in Hinduism." *Denison Journal of Religion*: vol. 14, 2015.