

C O N C L U S I O N

Telangāna assumed for the first time politico-economic significance with the organisation of sāmanta network in the region by the Cālukyan emperors, Someśwara I and Vikramāditya VI. The sāmanta rulers tried to augment the economic resources of their feudal principalities by developing wetland agriculture under tanks. For the first time in her long history Telangāna became the seat of sovereign power. The Kākatīyas, who rose to the position of sovereigns in A.D. 1163, gave further stimulus to the process of resource mobilisation, providing their state with a strong economic base in the form of industry and trade in addition to agriculture.

Neither the Cālukyan nor the Kākatīya state can be described as 'despotic' or segmentary. The rulers shared the political power with a number of mahāsāmantas or mahāmandalesvaras and māṇḍalikas. The sāmanta chiefs owed nominal allegiance to their overlords and ruled their principalities almost independently. They discharged the sāmanta obligations such as participating in the wars of their imperial overlords. The Kākatīyas maintained a standing army otherwise neither Rudradeva nor Ganapatideva would have been in a position to make such extensive conquests. At times the māṇḍalikas received land for their service in lieu of salary. Instances are also found that land was granted as a reward for service without any obligations.

Rudra and Ganapati not only created māṇḍalika principalities all over Telangāṇa, but also developed an elaborate bureaucratic machinery with 72 offices (niyogas) headed by a high-ranking official the Bāhattara niyogādhipati. Officials like Mahāpradhāni, Śrīkaraṇādhipati, Puravari, Katakaraksapāla, Sarasvatī Bhāṇḍārika, Sunkādhi-kāri and the like looked after various branches of administration. The sāmantas and māṇḍalikas also had officers like Pradhāni, Preggaḍa, Adhikāri under them. The bureaucratic machinery reduced the evils of the semi-independent māṇḍalika system and functioned as a bridge between the central authority and local authority.

Some instances of subinfeudation are found in the Cālukyan epoch, but no evidence of it is seen in the Kākatīya age. The king and the māṇḍalika were directly related without any intermediaries and under the māṇḍalikas only state officials and āyagars in the village functioned.

The existence of an official machinery leads one to the conclusion that the administration was not completely vassalised. It must also be noted that most of the civil officers were also military men holding the rank of danda-nāyaka but that was necessitated by the demands of the medieval state.

At the local and village level, people's councils like sthalamu samastapraja, astādaśasamayāla samastapraja

were managing the local affairs. The several communities and guilds had their own codes of conduct known as samaya. The āyagars of a village that appear during the Kākatīya period were drawn from the village community itself. The Pedakāpu or Gavunda, the village headman, was not a vassal. He was a leading member of the village community, a link between the village and central bureaucracy.

As such, it may be said that conditions of political feudalism were not full-fledged by the middle of the 13th C.A.D. But, after the death of Gaṇapati, Rudrama and PratāpaRudra had to make changes in the māṇḍalika system in order to cope up with internal revolts and external aggression. Some historians have pointed out that the nāyankara system, started by Rudrama and strengthened by her successor, had elements of political feudalism. The kingdom was divided into more than seventy small principalities and their administration was kept under military chiefs. However, the feudal elements between the king and the nāyankara and the one below nāyankara are not known. But the Kākatīya kingdom fell before the nāyankara system took a definite shape. Not much information is forthcoming from epigraphs regarding the relations between a nāyankara and a monarch. It may be said that the nāyankara system was the fore-runner of the amaranāyaka system in the Vijayanagara period. In view of such a balanced system of administration no traces of segments - either power or

territorial are found either in the Cālukyan or in the Kākatīya kingdom.

Agriculture being the mainstay of the economy, all sections of people took interest in developing it. The kings, the sāmantas, officials merchant guilds and individuals showed interest in providing irrigational facilities which is very rare in medieval times. Moreover, by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa times viṣṭi or forced labour which was the backbone of feudal economy disappeared. The Kākatīyas were probably the last of such families engaged in viṣṭi. Agricultural production, both wetland and dryland, witnessed tremendous expansion. Tank irrigation led to new techniques in agriculture. A variety of food and money crops were raised. There were marketable surpluses in every commodity as evidenced by the development of inland and overseas trade.

The problems of landholding pattern is the key to the understanding of the socio-economic situation. As documented in Chapter II that the cultivable and uncultivable land was distributed among many institutions such as the government, agrahāras, temples, civil and military officials and peasant communities. In the agrahāras, the brāhmanas held individual proprietary and hereditary rights in land. The temple land such as the devabhogās and devamānyas were distributed among various temple servants.

The temple servants held individual vrittis, which were generally hereditary, in the peasant villages. The uncultivable land was held in common for purposes of cattle-grazing, house-building etc. Inscriptions reveal that the cultivable land whether wet or dry, was held individually. The individual enjoyed the right to purchase, to mortgage and sell away his land. The condition of the cultivators on the government, or devabhoga or agrahāra lands was not unsatisfactory. They were called arthasiris i.e. they were allowed to retain for themselves half of the raised produce, which practice led to remarkable socio-political developments in the long run.

The agricultural surpluses were channelised into industrial activity. In addition, iron, coal and diamonds were mined and since about the middle of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa period there was considerable development of different industries. Tank and temple construction and growth of industry became complimentary of one another. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas encouraged Arab merchants who became very active in the western Deccan and on the Arabian Coast. As a result a huge nakaram network, both local and itinerant had spread all over Telangāna conducting commercial operations.

Most of the nakarams maintained temples of their own and the itinerant guilds had bands of armed men to protect them and their merchandise. Throughout Telangāna,

several trade centres developed like Warangal, Polavāsa, Alampūr, Gangāpuram and Perūr. Moṭupalli on the east-coast was a great mart of foreign trade and the charter of Gaṇapatideva (A.D. 1244) indicates the interest taken by the rulers in the expansion of foreign trade.

The foregoing analysis shows that the concept of Asiatic Mode of production is not applicable to the age under study. Villages were not isolated. They were connected with neighbouring villages and towns by a marketing network nursed by several merchant guilds. The peasant in the village did not produce everything only for consumption. The surpluses were channelised into industries for the production of various commodities for local consumption as well as for export through market towns. Agriculture ceased to be the only occupation of the people.

However all was not rosy in the economic field. Taxation was heavy and the state took away a big share in the agricultural and industrial produce. Traders were also taxed heavily. Thus the state resorted to taxation as a method of surplus appropriation. Still, it may be said that neither the peasant nor the artisan or the trader was reduced to abject poverty. Industrial production and commerce gave scope for a variety of occupations which had its own impact on the society.

The structure of the society had undergone many changes as to fit neither into the ancient order of the Caturvama system nor in the medieval concept of astādaśa-mahāpraja. The number of castes and communities got multiplied because of several factors such as the absorption of hill and forest tribes, new economic occupations and religious movements. As such, the society was divided into a number of occupational groups such as 1. priests, 2. rulers, 3. farmers and peasants and 4. artisans and traders.

The bulk of the population belonged to the peasant community who depended mostly on land for livelihood. There were many branches in the peasant community such as tammadi, reddi, īdara, golla, boya, uppara etc., who were engaged in various occupations depending on land such as wetland agriculture, dryland farming, horticulture and animal husbandry. The peasant class may generally be classified into big landowners, small farmers and landless peasants. But in the period under study, no big landlords are noticed. Most of the peasants were either small farmers or landless labourers. Tank and temple building, forming of new villages resulting in expansion of agriculture facilitated mobility of labour. Some of the peasants were engaged on the crown lands or on brahmadeya or devabhoga lands on ardhasīri basis. The ardhasīri system steadily improved the economic status of some of the

members of peasant communities who joined military services as required by the frequent wars of the medieval period and rose to high social status. Such families naturally strove to rise in ritual status as well. The prevailing heterodox religions like Jainism, Vīraśaivism and Śrīvaiṣṇavism provided the means to them for gaining ritual purity as well as canonical and secular learning. Some members of this class were so highly learned as to write in Sanskrit on subjects like rājanīti, dance and music. They described themselves as satsūdras and claimed equality with brāhmanas.

The members of this new community of peasant-warriors or nāyakas dethroned the traditional ruling class, from positions of political power. The Kākatīyas and their successors - Proclayanāyaka, Singamanīḍu and Prolaya Vemā Reddi were all of that community.

The factors of social change affected the brāhmaṇa community also. The community lost its solidarity by breaking up into several endogamous branches such as vaidikas, niyogis, ārādhyas and śrīvaiṣṇavas. Though the community enjoyed ritual status, they lost their monopoly of learning and domination at the court. But most of the karanams in villages were brāhmanas. But, in the higher echelons of administration, they were out numbered by the members of the fourth varṇa.

The fact that the society of the period was not stagnant is borne out not only by the cases of social mobility outlined above but also by the process of urbanisation that resulted in the growth of populous towns and cities in the region. The development of strong agricultural base, large scale building of temple complexes, brisk internal and external trade and growth of sāmanta - māṇḍalika - nāyankara capitals resulted in the formation of a number of urban centres. Alampūr, Gaṅgāpuram, Poṭlacheruvu, Kollipāka, Pānugal, Perūr, Polavāsa, Nagurūr, Pillalamarri, and Vardhamānapuram etc. The biggest of all such cities was of course the metropolis, Warangal which became the most prominent city in the Deccan. Warangal grew up into a triple city with a highly cosmopolitan population. The developed urbanism of the age reflects in a variety of art forms - literature, dance, drama, music and painting and more than all in the magnificent temple architecture and handsome sculptures which are an eloquent testimony to the high aesthetic sense of the people.
