CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
HISTORY AND ENVIRONMENT

The study of history is the study of human society or civilization. A society is to be studied in terms of its geography and chronology. In space and time man and his civilization emerged in various parts of the world. E. Adamson Hoebel and Everett I. Frost observe that "a human society is sure to occupy an identifiable space. Territorially it may be localized even though its boundaries may not be marked an iron curtain or Great Wall of China." History should understand the geography of a people. The location of the Meitei, the Ahom, the Shan and the Tai civilizations are an important factor in understanding their history. However, it will be wrong to think that history depends on geography because both are interrelated. Generally, evolution takes place in each and every society. But according to their geographical variation, the degree and speed of evolution occur in different manner. The river valley society has more advanced degree and speed of evolution than the mountain society because of their ecological and environmental variations.

It was George Adam Smith who first used the term historical geography. History and geography are the science of time and the science of surface. While the dynamics of
geography deals with identification of locations which are recorded in ancient literary works, the dynamics of history explain how the facts came into existence and how they changed with the passage of time. It is often said that man and nature are the two active forces of human civilization. The description of their mutual actions and reactions are the history of mankind. Man by his intellect tries to mould the circumstances according to his will. Since the appearance of mankind on earth, their activities were restricted in many ways by natural environment. Man like any other species is adapting to his environment by inventing, manufacturing and producing various tools and crops, Friedich Ratzel points out that man's relationships to environment are conditioned by technology. But, he further mentions that the extensive probability is more in this modern world than the ancient and medieval worlds respectively. Man is a successful animal on this planet since he possesses culture. Having adapted to diverse environments, temperature and altitude; man build up his social and cultural life which was influenced by their ecology and environment. The functions of every culture are also conditioned by their respective surrounding environmental conditions.

The study of South East Asia is of great importance
in the contemporary time. Like the other great river civilizations, the Hai-t'ai, Shan, Tai and Ahom civilizations developed on the valley of the Irrawaddy river, the Salwin river, the Mekong and the Menam rivers, and the Brahmaputra river. The fate of these civilizations was largely influenced by the monsoon i.e. South West and North East monsoon.

Before the advent of the Europeans, South East Asia was known to the Chinese, Arabic, Egyptian, even Greek and Roman and Indian writers. The Chinese divided South East Asia according to the points of a compass and in terms of distance. The generic term Nanyang was used by the Chinese to refer to the region of the Southern seas. The term K’un-lun referring to island states in southern seas was also coined by them. Finally, they divided the region into Burmæ, Laos and Annam. The Japanese named South East Asia as a Nan-ya. The Arabs called South East Asia as term Yâmar. In place of it they again used to call it as a Waq-Waq which was meant all of the little-known area from Madagascar to Java. This region was known to the Arabs as Zabag. The Indians called South East Asia as a Suvarnadvipa. Later on its name was known to the Indian writers as Further India.

While the Shan and Tai built their society and
civilization in south west China, upper Burma and Thailand, the Ahom and the Meitei civilization are beyond the geographical limit of South East Asia. The Ahoms of Assam and the Meitei of Manipur politically are within the fold of South Asia. Though both of them have both geographical and cultural heritage with South East Asia. Gangawmon Kabui states that "Manipur is a gate-way of South East Asia." Culturally, Manipur is closely connected with the South East Asian countries and politically her fate was profoundly influenced by her eastern neighbours. Her natural position makes her closer to the South East Asia than the South Asia.

Manipur is bounded by Nagaland in the north, Chin hills in the south and Kabaw valley in the east, and Assam in the west. It stands between the latitude 23.50° and 25.30° N and longitude 93.10° and 94.30°E and its extension is about 22,356 kilometres. The valley comprises 9/10 of total area. The 700 sq. miles valley of Manipur is the cradle of the Meitei civilization.

The boundary of the Meitei state was decided according to the might and powers of her king. For the first time, during the reign of Kayamba (1467-1501 A.D.), the kingdom’s boundary expanded beyond the valley. The Royal chronicle,
Cheitharol Kumbaba records that during Kyamba's period, Keitei state boundary touched Mungkong in north east, Loi-jiri hills in the west, Kiyotong in the south and the western portion of Shamjok in the east.  

During the reign of Shagamba, the political boundary of the Keitei kingdom extended from the Gwai (Barak) in the west to the Chindwin in the east and from Karam hills in the north to the Tui Vai river in the south. Sometimes the boundary spread three or four days journey east beyond the Ningthi river and formed eastern boundary. The plains of Cachar was also made as a part of the kingdom. In the early part of the 19th century A.D., the forest between the oyeng and Bhunsiri was forced as a boundary of the kingdoms of Manipur and Assam.  

In the ancient time, Manipur was named differently by her neighbouring kingdom. To the Shans or Taungs of Upper Burma, she was known as 'Cessay' and the Burmese 'Kathe'. The Cacharies called her "mogli" and to the Ahoms she was known as "Kakeli". Gangumei Kabui states that the original or indigenous names of Manipur were Kanglei (pak), Foirei (Pak) and Meitrabek.  

The modern state of Assam is bounded by Jhutan and
Arunachal Pradesh in the north, Meghalaya and Mizoram in the south, Tripura, Bangladesh and west Bengal in the west and Nagaland and Manipur in the east. The state lies between the latitude 26°18' and 32°15'N and longitude 89°46' and 97°4'. The river Brahmaputra runs through the heart of this state. The Ahom civilization appeared on the upper part of this valley.

Practically, Shukapha, the great, conquered the whole of the Upper Assam, the tract South west of the Chutias and the east of the Cacharhis to the Patkai range at the border of Upper Burma. During the reign of Suhumung, the kingdom extended to all directions. It extended to Miri and Saile in the north (north west) to the Saga and Patkai ranges in the south (south east). It was bounded by Cachar in the west (south west) and in the Nishmi, Singpho and Khamti ranges.

During the period of king Pratap Singh, western boundaries were demarcated to Barnadi river north of the Brahmaputra and Guwahati south of the Brahmaputra and in the south it touched Cachar (upto Dimapur) and Jayantia. However, the kingdom’s north and east boundaries remained unchange throughout the successive period.

King Rudra Singh expanded western boundary upto the
the Maneh river and he annexed the Jayantia and Cachari
kingdoms. Now his kingdom's south boundary was fenced by
Khasi hill and Muslim empire. During the time of Gauri-
nath, the western boundary was pushed back from the Maneh
to Saradi river. The kingdom of Jayantia, and Cachar re-
grained their position. Therefore, the southern boundary
was bounded by Cachar and Jayantia. During the first half
of the 19th century, the Ahom kingdom was ravaged by the
Burmese invasion. Meanwhile, the kingdom of Ahom was forced
to confine to the northern part of the Brahmaputra
valley, while the Maneh river was western boundary, the Bur-
messe empire stood in the eastern boundary. In the south,
the kingdom extended up to the north of Kangpuri. 19

The kingdom of Ahom was named differently by her
neighbours. They were known to the northern Shans as -then
or -ithali or -aisali, Teochu to the Siitsie and Fung-lung
to the Siamese. 20

Chen Lufan mentions that during the olden days, the
Shans used to settle an area covering what is now the Assam
state of India, the southern part of Yunnan, the Shan states
of Burma and the northern part of Vietnam, in an area stret-
ching for more than seven to eight thousand li in length. 21
In present day, the major Shan inhabited area was brought under the Burmese union. They occupy most part of northern Burma. The main concentration area is about 50,000 sq. miles. It stands approximately between latitude 20° - 24°N and 96° - 101°E longitude.\textsuperscript{22} Salween or Mekong river valley was the seat of the power of the Shans. Hsen-ki chronical records that "the golden town of Hsen-hse-Han-se, the mother of countries had no Governors, and was governed by four Elders", the Elders of No-tu, Mong-ton, Hsen-se, and Hto-wo respectively. They laid the foundation of Shan states. These four Elders are further explained as the Ha-tu, An-Hpu, An-Su and No Tigers.\textsuperscript{23}

It is learnt from the Kao-Shan and Buddhist chronicles that the political history of the Kao-Shan certainly commenced with the reign of two heavenly Princes like Hkun-Long and Hkun-Lai. In the beginning both brothers jointly ruled over the Mong-Ki Mong-Ram and as soon as Loi-Loi was annexed.\textsuperscript{24} During the period of Hkun-Long, the Kao-Shan state expanded from Chieng-Nai in northern Siam in the east, the neighbourhood of the Lohit (Brahmaputra) and the Assam Hills in the west. It covered almost the whole of Upper Burma and a part of Thailand to the west of the Mekong river with probably the rich area of Kyaukse to the south of Ava. It is
realized that the Kao-Shan country was a confederacy country of many states. While Sao Khun-Kum (A.D. 1164-72) ruled in the northern Shan states, his son Sao Tai-Tong ruled the rest of the southern Shan states. After the death of his Sao Tai-Tong, Sao Khun-Kum annexed the southern Shan states ruled by his son. Thus, Sao Khun-Kum became the master of both southern and northern Shan states expanded from the upper Salween and the eastern tributaries of the Irrawaddy in the north, the Chindwin river in the west the upper Mong-Henam in the south and western bank of Mekong river in the east.  

During the reign of Hao Hkan-apa (1225) the Kao-Shan country was expanded from Assam in the west to Xeng Hlang, on the east (Thai settlement of the middle Mekong and the Henam), and his supremacy was acknowledged as far as south as Toumein land he over-run Arakan as well as Manipur, and expanded his suzerainty up to Yung-Chang in the north. Hao Hkan-apa, the great, became the master of vast empire. He consolidated the Kao-Shan country up to Yung-Chang in the north, imposed his suzerainty on the Tai settlements of the middle Mekong and the Henam in the east, overran a part of Arakan as well as Manipur in the south west and formed the Hkamti country and a part of eastern Assam in the west. After the death of Hao Hkan-apa, the Kao-Shan territory could not be properly protected from any external aggression. During the reigns of
Sao Hso-Pem-Hpa and Hkun-Tai-Pem-Hpa, their dominions or territories in Yunnan were lost to the Mongols. 26

Once again united Mao-Shan Kingdom was maintained by Sao Hso-Hom-Hpa but he was not master of vast territory as Hso-Hkan-Hpa possessed. He made his capital at Kong-Kao. His sway was extended over the mongs or states of Hnaw (Jhano), Mong-Yang (Hohniai), Mong-Song (Hogaung ?), Mong-Aung-Ai, Lampalam and Rare-Kong-Kao. After the fall of the Mughol power, the Shans regained their freedom, but it was uncertain that how far did they succeed in uniting their kingdom. However, Mughol-Chinese power was replaced by Ming. Kong-Kao was once again reduced as tributary state to China. Fortunately, Sao-Ngan-Hpa successfully ruled over the Shan states and he extended his sway over the Shan states to the east and south-east of his country and then elated by success, marched on and conquered Tai-Lai or Tai. 29

The Hso-Shan power after the death of Sao-Ngan-Hpa declined due to lack of unity among themselves and the blow of Ming power. Considerably, the rise and fall of the Hso-Shan kingdom caused a great impact on the fate of the Shan states of Burma. It is realised that different Shan independent mongs or states rose up from time to time but they remained
united and failed to restore former glory. With the height of Toungoo power in Burma and the death of Mao Long brought to end the Mao-Shan kingdom.  

The Shans were differently named by their neighbours. They were known to the Chinese as Fa-i, to the Manipuris as Kabo or Pong, to the Assamese as Jam and to the Acoyens as Sam.  

Thailand is bounded by Burma in the west, China in the north, Cambodia in the east and Malay peninsula and sea of Siam in the south. It lies on longitude 97°30' E to 106°30'E and latitude 5°30'S to 21°N. It covers an area of about 200,000 sq.miles.  

Prince Prohm (A.D. 657), who was regarded as the first real Thai ruler in Siam, set up Huay Fang as the first Thai capital. At that time, the territory of the Thai state was uncertain because the Thai immigrants in the Indo-Chinese peninsula became very numerous. At Huay Lao (modern Luang Prabang) another Thai state was also installed. In 1396 A.D. the city of Payao which became the capital of an independent Thai state was set up by king Dhama T'amma. He was the descendant of Prince Prohm.
After defeating the Khmers at Sukhothai, Ramkhamhaeng assumed the new title known as King Sri Intragit and he founded the Tai kingdom of Sukhothai. The kingdom of Sukhothai under its first king Sri Intragit covered a small area like Sukhothai and another city Jalieng.  

King Ramkhamhaeng became the master of a vast empire. His kingdom comprised of Phrae, Nan, Luang Prabang, Phitsanulok, Lom Sak, Wiang Chai, Kiang Khot, Suan pine, Harang, Keng, Tenasserim, Davao, Martaban, Taungu, and several other districts which can not be identified. These cities, towns and districts were either directly subjected or tributary to him. After about 50(fifty) years, Prince of U-tong set up a new city at Ayutthaya in 1350. He assumed the new title of Rama Tibodi I. This was the beginning of the present kingdom of Thailand. He extended his kingdom over the districts of Ayutthaya, Lopburi, Kanchanaburi, Phetchaburi, Nakorn Narum on, Srisaramarat, Singora, Chantaran, Tenasserim and Davao and suzerainty ran as far as Malaya. He was considered as a first king of Siam who ruled over a Malay state.

In addition to the territories left by King Rama Tibodi I, Boromaraja was able to bring the submission of Sukhothai as a vassal state to Ayutthaya. Particularly
western part of Sukhothai including Kampengpet was annexed. During the reign of King Ramasuan, the kingdom of Chiang Mei and Cambodia were brought under his powers and he was successful to protect the territories left by his father and uncle. But the Tai kingdom was completely submerged under the wave of the Burmese, during the reign of King Nakhon for the first time. Thus, the Tai Kingdom was put a vassalage of Burma till the coming of King Naresuan or Naret. King Naresuan became the master of mighty kingdom. His kingdom extended to the frontier of China (covering whole of Pegu and Shan States) in the north and touched the shore of the Bay of Bengal covering Tenasserim and Tavoy in the east, reached Pattani the frontier of Malay in the south and Annam was made the eastern frontier of Thailand. His son King Ekatosarat properly guarded the territories left by his father.

The territorial boundary of Thailand in seventeen century after King Ekatosarat extended from the Straits of Malacca in the south to Chingmei in the north and from west bank of Mekong river in the east to the eastern part of Pegu of Burma. The boundary of Thailand during the early Siamok period (from Rama I to IV) spread from China in the north, to Malay in the south and from Annam in the east to eastern part of Pegu of Burma in the west. During the reign of Rama V the
boundary of Thailand was from Chiangmei in the north to Malaysia in the south and from Laos and Cambodia in the east to British Burma in the west. 38

The Tai or Siamese was known to the Burmese Shan as Yodia Shan, to the Chinese as Sien-Lao and to the Assamese as Yutara. 39 Thus the geographical canvas of the Tai states cover south China, Thailand, Upper Burma, Assam and Laos, while the Meitei country was confined to Manipur.

THE CONCEPT OF STATE FORMATIONS: A BRIEF SURVEY

The human beings habitually adapted to different environments. They developed their own arts and possessed different tools in order to adjust with the natural objects and to protect themselves from the danger of the nature. With the evolution of mankind, various social phenomena take place. The birth of the state brought by the evolution of human beings is also a stage of social evolution. This new dimension makes a deep influence to bring an undergone change in the history of mankind. Man is the basic element of society and state is the product of him. The emergence of state intensifies the complexity of society. A. Cohen states that “as a
sociopolitical system, state permits greater inequality within its population". 40

The idea of human evolution was first propounded by Herbert Spencer but later on different scholars developed it by supplementing and renewing. They interpret the different stages of human society in their own ways. Modern anthropologists, sociologists and historians realise the pre state societies and even the ancient state societies with the help of literary works and archaeological works.

**DEFINITION**

Henri J.M. Claessen and Peter Skalnik define that "The state is an organization, as specific kind of social organization expressing type of social order in a society. They further point out that the state is a specific, historically limited type of human organization". 41 Norton M.

Fried also defines that "The state is a geographically delimited segment of human society united by common obedience to a single sovereign. The term may refer either to the society as a whole or, more specifically, to the sovereign authority that controls it." 42

Ronald Cohen classifies the definition of state into
three - (1) stratification (2) authority structure and/or information processing (3) diagnostic trait.

A. Cohen's study of the definition based on stratification started from the time of Rousseau to Marx and Engels and it expands up to contemporary scholars. In his Discourse on Inequality, Rousseau states that "state is originated out of the rich man's need to protect himself against those who could attack his position." The state, he thinks is state of inequality stratification. Hence, the state destroys liberty, supports the inequality between rich and poor through fixed laws of property and makes the ordinary citizen as permanent labour, slavery and wretchedness. Engels believes that "the state is a product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The state arises where, when an insofar as class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled". According to Marx also, "the state is an organ of class rule, an organ for the oppression of one class by another; it is the creation of "order" which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between the classes. Both Marx and Engels believe that in a state different antagonistic classes possessing unequal economic status were prevalent. They point out that in the primitive society, the existence of special group of people like tribal chiefs,
seniors, and village elders who managed the tribe's affairs, and it shows also the existence of another group of ruled class. In state society also, there developed ruling class of society and the rest of the society composed of the oppressed class. Thus, the society was divided into exploiters and exploited classes. Marxists believed that in each social stage, the order of stratification was maintained. Lawrence Krader states that "the state is the product of that society which is divided into two classes of people; one class directly engaged in social production, while another one class who is not directly engaged. The direct producers in the society do labour, work and toil both for themselves and for others whose relation to social production is either indirect or non-existent. The class divided society composed of the rulers who have appropriated the social surplus and the ruled who are the producers in the society." Fried also argues that "state is originated out of social stratification or institutionalized inequality, especially a system whereby different members of a society enjoy invidiously (illfeeling) differentiated rights of access to the basic productive necessities of life. It is not enough that the society should provide different or even grossly unequal levels of prestige for its members; it is essential that such differences of rank be interwined with inequalities of economic access. Indeed,
the state needs something more than is a formal organization of power including but going beyond the social control functions of kinship. Such formal organization of power has as its control task the protection of the order of stratification.46

The definitions highlight on the structure of the governmental system itself trace from the time of Herbert Spencer, Louis Henry Morgan, Hobhouse, Wheeler and Ginsburg are the contemporary writers who define the "state as a centralized and hierarchial system in which local political unit lose their autonomy, becoming districts whose local or regional heads or chiefs are subordinated to control government".47 Wright and Johnson define "state as a total decision-making organization in which specialized administrative centres decisions affecting the action of lower level settlements and their activities". In a centralized and hierarchical state organization, there are three or more levels of hierarchy to work in a state system in which information is preserved, processed, summarized and transmitted. Thus, information at the higher level decision making is able to affect behaviour at lower strata of hierarchy.48

On third and final set of definition, Ronald Cohen pleads that "the key diagnostic feature is that of fussion."
All political systems except true states break up into similar units as part of their normal process of political activity hunting bands, locally autonomous food producers and chieftancies each build up the polity to some critical point and then send off subordinate segments to found new units or split because of conflict over succession, land shortage, failure by segments to support another in inter-group competition and hostilities, or some other reasons. These new units grow in their turn, then split again. The state is a system specifically designed to restrain such tendencies. All this capacity creates an entirely new society: one that can expand without splitting, incorporate other politics and ethnic groups, and become more populous, more heterogeneous, and more powerful, with no known upper limit on its size and lengths. 49

**SURVEY OF THEORIES ON STATE FORMATION:**

The idea of state and the discourse on it was started from the ancient Greek. Many theories cropped up regarding the origin of the state. Here is specially to survey the theories of 19th and 20th centuries.

States emerged in different ages under different circumstances. It has been attempted to make a historical survey
of the state formation in different periods of history.

Both in ancient and middle ages, the state was defined in theological terms. In Egypt, 3rd millennium B.C. in the proverbs of Plathotep, the word 'God' was often identified with the word Pharaoh (king). In 8th century B.C. in the 'The Speeches of Iguever', the king's will is announced to be the cause of all happenings which take place in the state. These ancient laws ascribe the religious idea to the origin and role of the state. Besides these, some of the modern ideologists plead the ideas of the divine-origin of state predestination. A medieval philosopher and theologian St. Thomas Aquinas (C 1226 - 1274) also advocated that state emerged out of divinity factor.  

The classical Greek and Roman philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, Stoics and Epicureans assumed the state as conterminous with society itself. 

Ibn Khaldun of Tunis was an Arab historiographer freed from the religious menace. In his Introduction to History (1377), he advocated the Arab idea of historiography which is more relevant to modern historiography. For the first time, he discussed the distinction of the socio-structural factors
of nomadic and sedentary cultures. This dynamic relationship of the two societies caused the conflict of societies. His approach, of course, was adopted by the modern sociologists of the conflict school. Niccola Machiavelli assumed that the state was originated out of the motivation of human activity. Being diverted to moralistic, theological and metaphysical attitudes, like Ibn Khaldun, in real and perspective way, Niccola Machiavelli who separated the ethics from politics, perceived that the state was originated out of the motivation of human activity by studying the nature of state and the goals of government. Jean Bodin of France continued the study of the realistic and naturalistic nature of political formations witnessed the anarchy of the country due to the failure of an efficient government. His idea of state differed from the ecclesiastical dogmas of God-given state. He was the first man to make a study of politics comparatively and inductively from the historical materials of Western Europe. Like Ibn Khaldun, Jean Bodin believed that conflict was the main spring of the outcome of a state. But his idea of conflict was at least harmony. 52

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was the first English modern thinker who formulated a scientific approach to political theory. During his lifetime, he was testing the turmoil of both
civil and foreign war. He refers to the state of nature. In this state of nature, men are in a condition of anarchy. Force and fraud, nasty and brutish, no law, injustice and no common superior are the common character of it. However, he assumes that the turmoil of war occurred due to division of power. In his 'Leviathan', he formulated the Social Contract Theory of state. According to him, only the way to escape man from anarchy caused by the church and state conflict, was to establish a totalitarian monarchical state. Thus, in the Social Contract of Hobbes the people is created and state is established.

John Locke (1632-1704) was the father of philosophical liberalism and the great champion of human rights. His state of nature entirely different from his predecessor particularly Hobbes. The Lockean state of nature is a state of goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation of peace. On the contrary of Hobbes, Locke proposed a Social Contract Theory for the creation of limited monarchy with a number of restriction or republican state.\textsuperscript{53}

The coming of Jean Jacques Rousseau brought a great significance in the history of modern political philosophy. Rousseau's ideal state of nature is a state of perfect equality, perfect freedom and perfect fraternity. Its nature of
society is highly sentimental. In his social contract, Rousseau advocates that "Man is born free, however, he is everywhere in chains". According to him, man surrenders his natural ego to society rather than state. The individual members of group sacrifice their own interests (ego) and united together in aiming of some common good of the group as a whole. Hence, the General Will comes into existence. Obviously the General Will embodies the real will of all individuals. However, the general will of society is formulated and a legitimate government arises of a society governed the general will.

Auguste Comte (1798-1857) is regarded as the father of academic scientific sociology. According to him, social order is closely related to the distribution of functions (division of labour) and the combination of efforts. He considers that the state is the conterminus with organized society.

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) advocated his concept of universal evolution and social organism. As an evolutionist, he was a strong believer in social Darwinism. He uses to consider society as a system analogous to the structure, functioning and specializations of parts of a living organism. It is the credit of Spencer that he applied the biological thought to politics and gave new and solid support to the organic conception of the state. He attributed the rise of the state
itself to warfare, and also with important developments in legal, economic and religious organization. According to him, warfare may select the stronger, more efficient society. The stronger is sure to supress the weaker and brought the unification of disparate parts. Probably Spencer failed to clear a clear-cut distinction between the state and non-state. As on the question of the origin of the state, Spencer endorses two kinds of state. One is basically militant in which the individual is subordinated to collectively and other is industrial state which directly seeks and subserves the welfare of individuals. Hence, Spencer combined the conflict theory and the social contract theory in accounting for the origins of regulative and political organizations.55

There were some of the prominent conflict theorists in modern times. Most of them were sociologists like Ludwig Gumplowicz, Franz Oppenheimer, Albion Small and Lester Ward, who were profoundly influenced by “Darwinism” conflict and survival theory. They argue that the vanquished groups of people in war was permanently subdued by the winner. Thus, they believe that the state is a product of conquest as well as conflict inspired selection and survival.56

Lewis Henry Morgan was the first person who depicted
the idea of a definite stage of human history. In his book "Ancient Society", he described that more or less mankind began their career from the bottom of the scale and different stages evolved through the peril of time by accumulating practical knowledge. Such order of stages of social development can be divided into three main epochs such as savagery, barbarism and civilization. He also gives a detailed picture of subsequent developments of socio-political of human civilization. His writing makes conscious the development structures of primary state. He considers centralization of state and hierarchical system of authority relation. He also highlights circumstances that played the leading role and immediate responsible factors for the birth of state. The responsible leading and immediate factors are different according to the different development nature of society and its environment.

In his work 'Family, Private, Property and State', Frederick Engels describes the successive development stages of mankind propounded by Morgen by supplementing important informations of politics and economics. His idea of state formation is based on stratification theory. He emphasises the relationship between the growth of state and the establishment of permanent social class. In his Anti Duhring,
Engels explains about the socio-economic class formation and development of state. He discusses the emergence of surplus production, the growth of population, close contacts between agricultural communities as an important factor in society, emergence of exploitative power and birth of private property which is required to be protected.

The protection of private property in antagonistic society required a military class, which led to conflict and conquest. According to Engels', the early state arose out of the conflict or conquest brought by the military class managed by a chief or king. 59

Morton Fried's idea of stratification is near to Engels' view of stratification. He also accepts Morgan's idea of the evolution of human society stage by stage. Like Morgan, he also refers to the classes of human i.e. egalitarian, rank, stratified and state society. In the stratified human stage, it is recorded that the population was divided into different status relation, possessed inequality of wealth and belonged to different unsimilar socio-economic classes. Thus, society is distinguished by different stratifications. More or less, stratified society is the final form of human stage on the way of the rise of the state. 60

In this 'Oriental Despotism', Karl Wittfogel strongly
pleads that once large managerial programmes or wide scale irrigation work existed in a society, a hydraulic economy, characterized by the division of intensive cultivation and co-operation on a wider scale and in which the state took role of managerial work, came to develop. He suggests that irrigation leads to the development of state.61

A. Carneiro, in his "A Theory of the origin of the state", points out that the population pressure was the eventual factor towards development of state. By combining population pressure with war and conquest, he strengthened his theory. And he advocates that these factors under dynamic circumstances could create the state only under specific conditions (i.e. either environmental circumscription or social circumscription).62

**ASiATiC MODE**

In his article Asiatic society published in the New York Tribune in 1853 as a consequence of journalistic criticisms of British foreign policy, Marx investigates to study the Asian societies. Marx's discussion on Asian societies primarily conducted around the new concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production.63 He highlights to discuss the relationship
between the concept of the early state and his new idea of Asiatic Mode or Production. For better understanding of such relationship, it is worth discussing briefly the characteristic features of Asian society advocated by Marx.

(1) **Oriental or Asiatic Despotism or the Character of Asian State:**

Marx characterized Asian State as the despotic and hypertrophied state. He primarily concerns the Asian State through geographical and climatic factor. He believes that the arid land of Asia cannot be brought under cultivation in a wider scale without irrigation canals and water works. Usually, the village communities were unable to organise separate association to undertake large-scale irrigation. Therefore, such large scale irrigation was undertaken by the king or government. The successful irrigation/water work attributed the existence of centralized powerful despotic Asian state. This developmental relation caused the emergence of dichotomic relation between agricultural communities and state organization, occasioned by the necessity of constructing and maintaining irrigation systems.

(ii) **Absence of Private Property:**

Marx understands that in Asia, the direct exploitation
of producers living in village communities was not based on private landowner but mostly work under the direct dependence on a despotic ruler the head of the state. No doubt, the surplus product of these communities was appropriated in the form of taxation by the government so that ground rent and taxation coincided.

(iii) **Village communities and forms of communal Property**

Marx discovers that a basic feature of the Asian village communities is the communal property in land. He believes it as an early social formation. The formation of Asiatic despotism is based on communal property. In this form, the individual had the right of possessing that is the right to work on land. The individual is not an owner in separation from community but the individual is only the owner of a particular part of it. Consequently, the individual exists in direct unity with the community. Thus, numerous village communities embraced to despot who appears as the sole proprietor of all land.

(iv) **Village Communities and Economic Self-Sufficiency**

The Asian villages were self-sufficient and self-
contained and these possess arable and waste lands of its own, resulted to form a little world in itself. Marx explains that the circle of production is self-sustaining, unity of agriculture and craft manufacture which is described as a basic feature of the Asian property form. He asserts that the self-sufficiency and isolation of the Asian villages were further strengthened by their independent and separate political and social organization. Both Marx and Engels point out that these self-sufficiency village communities were the fundamental social formation of Asiatic despotism.

(v) **Trade and Towns**

Marx believes that in Asian Society, there are absence of internal commerce, independent merchant capital, and commodity production and exchange. The important part of the products of the village community is destined for direct use by the community itself. This community production does not take the form of a commodity which is not entered to the market. As a result of it, the division of labour is confined to non-commodity products. He thinks that within the village, the craftsmen enjoy an unchanging market. Basically, they are unable to get a change to produce more. It helps to develop division of labour like that in
the manufactures in case of the growth of population. Such development does not lead to the rise of the market but it leads to the establishment of a new community in an unoccupied land with its own quota of non-commodity producing craftsmen servants. In Asian society, there is a lack of separation between town and country in the development of exchange of commodities. Marx assumes that in such Asian society a large part of the rural produce goes to the state and becomes a commodity (i.e. the surplus production is paid to the state as rent in kind not in cash)."64

(vi) **Stagnation Stationariness and Changelessness**

Marx postulates Asian society basically as stagnant, stationary and changeless. The society ever remains on the stage of primitive communism. He states that the absence of private ownership of land caused to make social stagnation in Asian Society. He assumes that there is no periodic changes in the political organization of Asiatic society from dynasty struggles and military conquest, and in such society there is no radical change in economic organization due to the ownership of the land and organization of agricultural activities remained with the state as the real landlord."65
(i) **Conquest:**

German sociologist Oppenheimer believes that conquest is the main basis of the origin of the state. He states that the operation and inequality of society originated out of the conquest and subjection of one people by another. Fried justifies that the basic idea of Oppenheimer's conquest is the conquest of a full stratified (super stratified) society by a full stratified society (super stratified society). He assures that both conqueror and conquered advocated by Oppenheimer were already internally stratified. Therefore, what he thinks the state which originated out of the conquest is the secondary state. 66

(ii) **Population:**

Population is the backbone of a state. The study of state is the study of mankind. The realization of changing trend of population provides an advantage to construct the development of the nature of state. The transformation from pastoral economy to agricultural economy proves that mankind started to settle permanently with larger compact of people. The society's position was brought to change under population pressure. The growth of population caused the reclamation
of large settlement and agricultural areas main factors of surplus production. Population, thus, was stratified and private property came into existence. Competition for the possession of wealth amongst the people came to intensify. R. Carneiro pleads that the population pressure is the fundamental basis for the birth of a state. He justifies that population growth follows war or conquest. Such happening takes place in the geographically circumscribed areas. There was a moment when the weaker tribes inhabited definitely surrounding areas were conquered by stronger one. Of course, stronger ethnic group became successful in setting up a state by subjugating neighbouring tribes.  

Volume of population was also expanded by the absorption of various successive ethnic migration. The immigrants were adapted to the parent tribe and population growth automatically happens. It causes to transform and enlarge the social political institutions. This changing pattern of socio-political organs is the sign of the appearance of state society.

(iii) **Circumscription:**

R. Carneiro refers to the environment circumscription and social circumscription which are the important factors of the birth of state. He thinks that the environmental circumscription is good habitable area surrounded by sea, mountain
and desert. Once, migrants enter to such an area, they do not get any favourable chance to go beyond the boundary because of either the hazardous natural position or abundant availabilities of livelihood materials. They are automatically absorbed to the parent tribe. On the other hand, social circumscription means that a tribe inhabits an area without natural boundary but surrounded by loose tribes. Therefore, there is a moment that all weaker tribes are either absorbed to the parent tribe or conquered by the stronger powerful one. 68

(iv) Irrigation:

Marx also states that irrigation is an instrumental factor of the centralization of administrative apparatus (state apparatus) to co-ordinate and develop large-scale hydraulic works. Despotism and the ruling bureaucracy are responsible for such type of public work. He believes that irrigation work prevailed on the first form of Asiatic Society. 69 Karl Wittfogel using Marx's idea about Asiatic society, has characterized the prototypic irrigated society on the basis of the model of China and South East Asia. His idea of irrigation is well advanced and it applies to some specific society. He believes that if such type of organization once existed, a hydraulic economy characterized by
division of labour, intensive cultivation and co-operation on a large scale and state took the part of managerial role played by ruling bureaucracy. 70

Some scholars successfully adhere to the Marxian idea of irrigation and its managerial power despotism. They, however, plead that both irrigation and despotism are the secondary traits. 71 Since irrigation is secondary trait, its work i.e. water work is an essential force to bring a mature state. According to Millon, "There is the implicit relation between irrigation and political processes leading to changes of social". 72 Thus irrigation or water control favours to develop centralization tendency towards the development and maturation of a state.

(v) **Stratification:**

The stratification factor is also a mechanism that would produce the state. No wonder, the process of the beginning of stratification in a society almost coincides with commencement of the state formation. Having stratified, a society is distinguished by establishing different social relation among the members of the society. Eventually, the different members possess unequal subsistence means of resources. The unequal access of property leads to the rise
of social differentiation. Thus, basically the stratified society was segmented into various interest groups (i.e., property class and poverty class) possess unequal private land holdings. Korten H. Fried assumes that "stratified society was the basis for the complex division of labour and it brought to rise various unequal socio-economic classes". The political role of the individuals in such society become a commanding feature and their role have been fairly considered as a determining factor of the status of their respective kin or clan. Hence, supra-kin or supra-clan grow with the following the process of social evolution. Fried's argument, however, came to realise that "the emergent state, than, is the organization of the power of the society on a supra-kin basis". Thus, he concludes that "the state emerged from stratified society".

Lewis Henry Morgan also thinks that stratification was the main basis for the foundation of a political society or nation. He assumes that a social organization founded on the basis of gentes, phratries and tribes was gradually substituted by a political organization established on the basis of property and territory. According to Friedrich Engels, state is originated on account of higher division of labour and the classification of society into classes. The primitive
society was distinguished by the communal mode of production and gradually it was transformed into class-based society. The class-based social formation is the main-spring for the foundation of the institution of property. In this society, the individuals commences to monopolize the allocation of access of land and resources which are responsible to make different classes led to establish a stratified society. F. Engels, thus, assures that stratification was the immediate social formation towards the emergence of state.

In addition to these general theories, other specific theories like locational trade and religious work have been considered in connection with concern topic. According to topography, either the internal riverine trade or internal land trade or seaborn trade and cross continental land trade emerged in prestige society. However, the centre of trade attracts large population which marks the development of trade communities and ports which were the key factors to create centralization politics. Thus, the emergence of such circumstances (i.e. internal riverine trade and internal land trade and seaborn trade and cross continental land trade) by natural process or without awareness became an influential factor to exaggerate prestige state. Whereas in secondary state trade is often put under the control of the head of the state. With
the establishment of trade institutions, trade is monopolised by him. On the other hand, manpower is organized not only to utilise human labour but also to exploit natural products. Obviously, the head accumulates wealth by reproducing the natural products i.e. by selling and buying. He gained massive loyalty from his people and trade became a key factor in the emergence of a successful secondary state.

In prehistoric society, the head of the community or tribe or clan not only became a military head but also acted as a virtual chief priest. As a chief priest, it is liable to protect his people from the disease, infant mortality, witches and misfortunes and he was responsible to foster the welfare of his people. Hence the people accepted him as their spiritual leader and such ritualistic works became an effective factor to make a kingship institution which was highly correlated state apparatus i.e. prehistoric state.

The king invested to promote religious work such as construction of temples or mosque or churches (through the organized manpower) and established many religious institutions. Besides this, he granted wealth and land to the religious body and persons. By performing these works, king distinguished himself as the incarnation of the god. His
religious programme could gain people's loyalty which was a very helpful factor in his centralization politics. Undoubtedly, the king was able to materialize his aim of making a kingdom by doing religious works. As an important factor the religious works have been oftenly seen mostly to the secondary state.

**TYPELOGY:**

The theory of the state is approximately considered in two ways. One is social structural element i.e. long development of society through different human stages and its hierarchical or structural social stratifications; and another is contemporary social circumstances i.e. surrounding happenings, water work or irrigation, conflict or conquest, migration meaning changing trend of demography etc. gather in the course of the changing development of human history to enable the complete formation of either primary or secondary state. Both social structural elements functioned in a society to thrive up integrated norm of society and contemporary social circumstances go together hand to hand on the way of state. The coincidence means intersection between the social structural elements and contemporary social circumstances took place, when the social structural elements or
institutions developed in full scale. But both terms may not be treated as synonymous. While social structural elements have undergone changes and passed through various human stages, contemporary social circumstances are always ready in the position of nourished socio-political structural elements to either primary or secondary state.

Morgan strongly emphasised that the early state finally emerged out of consensus confederation of different tribes which were a little developed social and political institutions and conquest of smaller tribes by a powerful tribe. Having got accurate examples, he pointed out that the Iroquois confederacy, Roman nation and Grecian confederation which were formed by means of consensus confederation but the Aztec confederacy had been installed by means of war and conquest.77

The ideas of both Frederick Engels and Morton H. Fried are that the primary early state came into existence through developing different social structures. Engels believes that on the final stage of social structure, a military clash leads to conflict and conquest, emerged and out of this a state structure came to hatch out.78 While Morton Fried pleads that the early state emerged from the stratified society in an inexorable way.
Another trend of Fried's which is not touched by these two predecessors is secondary state formation. Therefore, in his opinion conquest is the main instrumental factor for the creation of secondary state. The conquest of other society or tribe, which developed its own institutions that might be regular or irregular, by other tribe, which possessed institutions, marked the formation of secondary state.

The discussion of Franz Oppenheimer about the conquest is super-stratification but not stratification. His super-stratification is the genesis of the union of the conquered and the conqueror societies which were perhaps already being internally stratified. 79

In general, the early state is neither dependent nor based on its antiquity but in a strict sense, the understanding of early state is mainly determined by the development nature of state. The pristine state created under the influence of its own internal development character and accelerated by external influences, is called the early state. Its formation consumes long process, when it develops through different structures.

On the other hand, the conquest of already developed
state by the early one or state brought to happen a subsequent integration of their respective socio-economic structures. Either total transformation or gradual transformation of the structures took place but it is realised that a modified developed state inspite of conquest emerged. Such type of state is designated as the secondary state. 80

Norton H. Fried briefly states that a pristine state develops sui generis out of purely local conditions. On the other hand, a secondary state is greatly effected by one or other means and it is brought to form a higher organization like state by any external power which has already been raised to statehood. 81

SCOPE OF INQUIRY:

There are a number of works dealing with the state formation i.e. definition, theory, typology and factor. In their respective works, various scholars make a comprehensive study by explaining ideas and theories and describing the different features and aspect of the state. The present work attempts to reassess the definitions, theories, typologies and factors propounded by different scholars. These mechanisms are applied to investigate the nature of the Meitei, Tai and Ahom states and their relevant factors to emerge as a state.
This comprehensive work largely is based on historical data; it highlights the typologies and factors while influenced the formation of these concerned states. Besides this, the work surveys specific geographical boundaries where were these civilizations like Meitei, Tai, Ahom and Shan emerged and further describes the changing trend of these geographical boundaries in different periods according to their political fates. The work again attempts to study the socio-political evolutions of only two civilization like the Meiteis and the Taís. But in the conclusion, the work investigates to survey an intensive study of the systems of Kingship, feudalism, slavery and military of the Meiteis, the Taís and the Ahoms.
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