CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

Among various aspects the political aspect always has been acting as the most determining factor because of its far reaching consequences in a particular nation. It becomes more relevant in a country like India where a regular standing professional army constituted by a large Kṣatriya caste from Vedic period onward. Usually the ultimate motive of wars in India was regarded either to expand territories of the empire, to collect abundant wealth, to become popular and influential monarch, to raise the status high among the other kings, etc. Moreover, many a times the ambition of princes to establish their supremacy further manured the concept of war as conceded by Agnipurāṇa which address the king to declare war either to attain more supremacy or to defend oppression over others. Significantly, the war was considered to be the sole monopoly or dharma of warriors in India. On the contrary the effected king preferred to take up the challenge of war so that he might die bravely than to surrender to his foe meekly. Thus bravery and chivalrous spirit compelled many a chieftains to wage many wars which could have been easily avoided. Besides their glory, the aspects of power and prestige compelled the kings to fight
wars. In addition the successful kings also performed the Rājasūya and Asvamedha sacrifices to show their strength. The similar viewpoint can be found in Arjuna's statement where he suggested his eldest brother Yudhiṣṭhira that being a powerful king, it becomes his duty to set out on the world conquest. With the performance of the Asvamedha sacrifice, the king was recognized as a sovereign holding right to collect annual tribute. For the same objective he even did not care the aspect of annexation of the territory. Besides, satisfying thirst for territorial aggrandizement invasions were launched without questioning their properties. Regarding it, whenever they became ready to fight, numerous excuses were concocted as well. For example, Kaliṅgarāja expressing his desire to fight, asked his ministers to find out an excuse. They advised him to send his daughters seated in a chariot to various villages and capital towns. The war could be declared on a person who would dare to detain them. Hence the war was declared on the Assakarāja.

Sometimes when a son had to ascend the throne of his father he was required to reconquer the whole of his dominions. Sometimes violation of treaties and compacts also served as a cause of war. Drupada told Kurus to give back the Pāṇḍavas what was dictated by morality. There was a pact to give back the kingdom when the Pāṇḍavas come back. But
Duryodhana being a cunning politician tried to justify his case even on the strength of contract. He threw the responsibility for its violation on the Pāṇḍavas. Wars for acquisition of territory and establishment of sovereignty were also fought.

Digvijaya means world conquest or to establish an empire at all India level. The concept was propagated to unite the country under one dominion and the king was called chakravartin or digvijayin. His chariot's wheel was supposed to role from Himalayas to ocean without any obstacle. In this way, the covered area was called chakravarti-kṣetra. Although the concept was in practice onwards Vedic period but received a defined term during Mauryan period. In this regard, Kauṭilya was the first Indian thinker who has actually defined the digvijaya concept in its real sense. Indian imperial rulers were not supposed to extend beyond the boundaries of Bhāratavarṣa. However, some of the emperors such as Kaniska, Chālukyas and some others also while crossing such limits did not heed to the so called instructions. They went beyond Indian boundaries to conquer lands which were under political and commercial influence of India and this was brought under the chakravarti-kṣetra.

The concept of digvijaya got originated along with the establishment of kingship which was the outcome of the
origin of state. The king and the state were usually regarded as synonymous in ancient India. Pre-existing non-regulated condition which was termed as mātsyanyāya tended the origin of kingship in ancient India. The kingship meant practically the collective powers of the entire tribe was voluntarily transferred so that the peace and security could be possible in the society. In the beginning, the king was made through election but later on it turned into hereditary. The nature of state during early Vedic period was tribal and small in area but in course of time it began to be extended to territorial in character as well as in size.

Some sacrifices like Rājasūya, Vājapeya and Asvamedha in ancient India bearing political significance were also attached to the doctrine of digvijaya. The Rājasūya sacrifice which was performed for making a raja consisted of a series of scarifies and lasted even upto couple of years. The Vājapeya sacrifice was performed in order to attain the post of empororship. Holding the chariot race as characteristic feature it enabled the sacrificer to establish his universal sovereignty. Later on, it converted into a mere mock race in which the form continued but the substance departed. So far as the Asvamedha sacrifice is concerned it was performed by kings who had desire of
offspring. Subsequently, it was also performed by such kings who wanted to institute it in conquering the other kings and thus to become king of kings. Although these sacrifices hold political significance yet were sanctioned by religious customs. Infact, the idea of their association with the ultimate motive i.e. formation of national state and its acceptance by subjects was working behind. It was glorified that the Asvamedha raised political status of the winner king and helped the performer in his departure towards heaven. Hence, the ideology of digvijaya was put forwarded before the king so that he could take initiative to unite the country and establish the empire at all India leave. Consequently, the forthcoming kings entered into series of fray to achieve their ultimate goal.

Kauṭilya seems to advise a king who wished to go on a vijaya or digvijaya that he should have understand and keep in mind the policies or nature of the states around him. He even formulated a theory called maṇḍala theory which meant a sphere of influence. It seems to underline the idea of the Balance of Power which pervaded the entire speculation on the subject of inter-state relations. Regarding the vijayas the ancient authorities made their threefold classification viz. dharmavijaya, lohavijaya and asuravijaya. Among them dharmavijaya was aimed at mere submission or obeisance and
lobhavijayin was aimed at gaining land and money. The third, i.e. asuravijaya was aimed at robbery of wealth of the defeated kings, his son, wife and life besides his land.

The early Vedic society being tribal in nature generally remained kingless. The tribal leaders were to lead his group men in warrior activities. The same leaders began to be known as king later on. They were assigned to maintain peace and situation of law and order. Besides, they worked for the progress of common people. Then came the period for formation of big towns and states in late phase of later Vedic period. Consequently, empires arose as a result of the struggle for supremacy among congeries of states. The state seemed to be a part of the empire.

The origin of state and its size depended on king’s rank. The sovereign kings or digvijayin was not expected to annex the territory of subjugated king. He issued villages or land pieces to his loyal persons. Both of the reasons were imminent in the origin of feudal states. The paramount king keep the feudatories under his control as per his own capacity. It also enabled him to impose checks and balances over them. The imperial orders were expected and exacted by feudatories. The internal autonomy depended upon the military strength of feudal state making payments of a certain amount as a tribute; they enjoyed internal autonomy.
Such feudal lords even could appoint their own feudataries. It is noteworthy that whenever the centre became weak they could turn into rebellions. This way, they tried to become independent which was basically their minimum aim.

The dethroning of defeated kings as feudatories was not a single sided business. In fact, it was a reciprocal need. It served the aim of paramountcy at one hand and protected vested interests and favoured local autonomy on the other. However, it also instilled an element of instability in the body-politic of the state as a regular feature. The imperial king could not disarm them because he needed their forces during war time.

With the growth of feudalism the imperial powers were becoming more and more parasite on their feudatories. Sometimes disloyalty of feudal army had become the serious cause of the king’s death. Therefore, the emerging trend i.e. growing decentralisation of powers was pulling down the pre-existing utility and role of kings authority. Besides the extraction of the state's resources which were locally exhausted on the other hand further weakened him. Royal rituals were also liberally opened to all those who had political aspirations. All these developments played a decisive role in the disintegration of ancient Indian state.
The prosperity of state or king depended by and large on its economic stability. Further the political and military achievements, peace and security also depended on the economic prosperity of the country. Therefore, the political thinkers and the statesmen in all ages have been laying emphasis on the development of the economic life. Infact, the interdependence of both, the state and the economic life of the people, worked as a joint venture for betterment of people.

That is why the \textit{kosa} was proposed to be used to meet out the needs and requirements of the warfare. It was included as a prominent limb of state and a part of \textit{saptāṅga} theory. Both army and treasury acted as the two basic pillars of the state in ancient India.

The principal source of filling up the treasury in ancient India was taxation. It was suggested that tax should be collected at a specified time and place with a definite proportion or percentage. The war either conducted for the purpose of digvijaya or for some other reasons severely effected the economy of both the states i.e. victor and vanquished. Sometimes in order to raise a powerful army, even farmers and artisans were forced to join military forces. Consequently, their crops and crafts severely suffered. During march for war, usually took place in the
month of Mārgasirṣa, fields falling on routes were destroyed which again gave a set back to the agriculture. All communications might have been effected with the declaration of war. As a result trade also declined.

Further, during course of war several causalities took place and the dependents of these deceased persons had to face the financial hardship. Furthermore, with the accomplishment of digvijaya the kings used to perform Asvamedha which resulted the expenditure of a big amount of state revenue.

The war as discussed above, aimed at establishment of supremacy over others. During such a course, their intentions caused maximum loss or destruction of each other. Sometimes crops, bridges roads etc. were destroyed even by themselves so that the invader may not utilise them. Sometimes, the land remained uncultivated due to the probabilities of war. Simultaneously, industrial production stood paralyzed. Under the rules of kūṭayudha the invader was allowed to attack at any time and under all circumstances; the enemy's state was to be devasted; trees were to be cut; crops, stores, towns and villages were to be burnt down; and civilians were to be taken in captivity. As a result enemy's economy was systematically destroyed.
Religious institutions exerted considerable influence over state into spiritualistic favour. *Dharma* was to be promoted by the state not in sense of championing particular sect or religion but by fostering a feeling of piety and righteousness by encouraging virtue and morality and by extending help to the establishments. Keeping the spiritual flourishing in mind as an ultimate goal, the thinkers purposefully associated the aim and objectives of the state with religion. It was rightly understood that the prevalence of disorder affected not only the material interest of the people, but also their normal and spiritual interests.

The early Indian literature cites a similar debate between the king and the church. Not only in theory but we find in practice also that at the time of the coronation, the king bowed three times before the Brāhmaṇas. The priests tried their level best to extend their influence over the monarch as well as the state. Interestingly, in order to ensure the success of their attempt various punishments and curses etc. were propounded by the priestly class against such rulers who confiscated their cows. Thus, the efforts of the priests to forge a theocratic state were taken in hand.

Another development in regard to religion was evolving kings' concentration to promote the *dharma*. Significantly they were neither promoting a specific sect nor were they
attached with a particular sect. In a harmonious environment all the existing sects were growing with according to their philosophies. In other words it was religious tolerance of the thinkers and kings as well as state which never allowed to originate the theocracy in ancient India.

Besides the affects on politico-economic structure, the doctrine of *digvijaya* also affected the social order of the then society. In fact, some of the social institutions which were associated with the political system and institutions, such as the custom of *sati*, child marriage, decline of social values, etc. got effected. Further endless series of wars contributed to the formation of warrior classes called *āyudhajīvī samgha*.

In the peroration, the following finds can be fairly put forward. The concept of *digvijaya* was propounded in order to unite India politically under one domination. However, alongwith its development, it also led to disintegration of the state. Earlier, the area or *kṣetra* of *chakravartin* for *digvijaya* was concentrated only within Indian territory. While crossing the limits of *Bhāratvarṣa*, the *digvijayins* extended their empire beyond India as well. Furthermore, royal rituals like *Rājasūya, Vājapeya* and *Aśvamedha* lost their meaning in the course of time. In order to justify the idea of establishing the national
state, wars were forced by political authorities on the king by associating it with an idea of vijīṣu. Side by side, dharmavijayas were expected by the authorities. What is noteworthy, in this context, is the policy of kūṭayuddha which enabled the kings to win wars through foul means which led them towards the asuravijaya.

The main objective to appoint a king or war leader was to maintain peace law and order and to make progress in society. Infact, this idea could create only tension and destruction in the society. So far as the political unity is concerned, its failure became the cause of disintegration of empire which resulted into numerous petty states as a growth of feudalism. The emperor intended to promote feudal states so that he could obtain military strength and tribute for central power. But failing in his objective it resulted in the headache of the emperor to control the ambitious feudatories. Consequently, the idea to form a strong and vast nations left behind.

Usually the king intennded to make his koṣa rich so that he may spent maximum share of koṣa for the betterment of his subject. In this context, more and more taxes were to imposed on his subjects. Such intentions even led to the growth of loot. The endless series of war greatly caused resulting in the massive destruction in agriculture, trade
and commerce, mercilessly burnings of towns and villages, etc.

Although some patronizing trends to religious sects tried to establish theocracy in state but policy of religious tolerance and equal treatment to various sects never allowed the theocracy to emerge. Side by side, various social institutions got affected. As a result, the custom of satī, bāla vivāha etc. rapidly grew. Further decline of moral values became the order of the day. Moreover, rising number of war slaves and emergence of a specific warrior class like āyudhaṅji samgha also came into existence in the society.