CHAPTER I

Polity In The Pañcatantra
POLITY IN THE PAñCATANTRA

The King is an inevitable agency for the welfare of the people, who in the remote past had realised his importance for the protection of their social and economic institutions, as they were unsafe without a ruling authority to hold and inflict the Danda upon those who did not follow the rules of law. He is the root cause of all success and happiness and creates spiritual atmosphere by protecting the Dharma. He is the person, who causes the development of arts and culture in his kingdom, he is essential for all round development of the people. The Arājaka type of state is the most disastrous, so, the people have to appoint or select a king for their protection. The dialogues between different characters in the Pañcatantra stories and also the assorted ślokas from different smṛti and Niti writers, found in the Pañcatantra, throw considerable light on the necessity of King for the protection of Lokadharma and people.¹

As monarchy was the common form of government in ancient India, the science of polity and government was naturally called Rājya-dharma or Rājyaśāstra.² Still the subject had a few other terms. The works of polity written by Usanas and Prajañati were
The term *Nitiśāstra* also became very popular to designate the science of government. Kāmandaka and Śukra prefer to call their works as books on *Niti* and not on *Daṇḍanīti*. *Arthaśāstra* is another term for the science of politics. According to Kautilya *Arthaśāstra* is the science which deals with the acquisition and protection or governance of territory.

Systematic literature on the science of polity does not go back to a time earlier than 500 B.C. The name of well known works like *Manusmṛti*, the *Yājñavalkaṃśṛti*, the *Parāśara-ṃśṛti* and the *Śukranīti* show that in ancient India authors often prefer to remain incognito and attributed their works to divine or semi divine persons. We need not therefore suppose that works on polity attributed to Brahmadeva, Manu, Śiva or Indra existed only in the imagination of one Kautilya or on one author of the Mahābhārata.

The *Tantrākhyāyikā* refers to and discusses the various views of *Vṛgu*, *Parāśara*, *Manu*, *Bṛhaspati*, *Śālaḥkayana*, Cāḍākya and other scholars of the Science of polity. The *Pāṇcatantra* though not exclusively a book on political study have many important ślokas and small passages that give us valuable glimpses into the contemporary political theory and administration.
There is considerable difference of opinion as to whether the kingship was elective in ancient India. There is no doubt that monarchy had become normally hereditary long before the late Vedic period. Epigraphic and literary evidence shows that almost all the dynasties subsequent to 600 B.C. of which we have any knowledge, were passing the crown on the principle of heredity. People did not have any choice in the election of the king. But the Pāñcatantra does not find this system satisfactory. As the representative of the people in general it voices preference towards acceptance of the king by the public. We have this suggestion in Book III. In Story II we have the birds electing their king. They decided that they would install the owl as king. As they set about the ceremony of the coronation the birds saw a crow flying through the air and they halted saying, "Me also must without fail have a part in the assembly". and asked him, "Sir, do you also agree to this that the owl shall be the king?".

Though the kingship was not elective in ancient India great emphasis has been given to the proper training of the heir-apparent. So we see in the introductory section of the Tantrā-khyāyikā, the king Amaraśakti becoming extremely worried at the ignorance of his three sons and called his ministers. He called his ministers and took counsel with them. Kingship might be divine
but it did not dispense with the necessity of proper training. In the early days the study of the Vedas and Philosophy loomed large even in the princely curriculum. But gradually economics and politics became the main subjects of theoretical study. And Visarjusarma made a vow to the king Amarasakti that he would make the princes completely versed in the science of polity within the space of six months. The ministers also gave stress on the study of grammar and the systematic study of religion, polity and love. Practical education included training in administration and the military art and tactics. He should have natural deftness and efficiency in handling weapons and acquiring food stuff. He should be a good bowman, a skillful horseman and an expert controller of the elephants. When the training was complete and the prince had attained majority he was formally appointed as heir-apparent.

We may add here a few words onṃpābhiṣekah or the Coronation Ceremony, which was performed at the time of the accession of the king. It required parasol, chowrie (fans), throne, royal seat, linen garments, sacred vessels in the form of mystic diagrams and some other emblems of royalty. The king was annointed and then seated on a throne covered with tiger skin, where he was sprinkled with sacred waters brought from the holy rivers and seas. The priest first perform this ceremony with the proper Vedic Mantra.
The sacred texts require the king to take an oath, wherein the king bound himself to govern righteously and refrain from oppressing the people.

At the first chapter of the first Book in the Tantrādhyaẏikā we have an exact and ideal picture of a good king. Under cover of the description of Pīṅgalakī it depicts the grand life style of an ideal royal personage. Though the sentence is rather long and complicated it tells in exact details how a good king should behave. He should possess pride and undaunted valour. Possessor of boundless power he is ignorant of mean words. His speech expresses impatience, wrath, quickness and vigour. His valour does not know fear or baseness, it is independent and the embodiment of heroism. It shines with the glow of endeavours. It considers good deeds for others as the ultimate goal of life. The valour of a king is insurmountable. A brave king does not pay great heed to durgāpratisamśkāra or self defence. He does not bother to check his budget. His prowess is endowed with pride and unconquerability. He does not care for the application of six guṇas or the collection of weapons or ornaments. He never does anything underhand. He ignores the threats of cowards and the tears of woman. Without training he is clever with weapons and he can attain food and shelter without help from his acquaintances. Though the luxury of royal umbrella, chowries and carriages and the assembly of friends, relatives and loved
ones enhances the grandeur of regency, even without this ornamentation a king always out-shines others simply by the magnanimity of his nature and character.

While analysing the ślokas of the Tantrākhyāyikā on political thinking we gather the impression that most of these ślokas deal with the vices and addictions of the king. A good number also warns the king on his attitude towards his servants and advises him to be kind and tolerant towards them and to assess them correctly. It is perhaps exactly for this purpose that Viṣṇuśarmā took his pen and under the guise of animals and birds he ventured to

warn the king of his faults and shortcomings. As the monarch was the absolute power it was not an easy task to open his eyes to his wrong-doings. The fables with their lucidity and shrewd technique were able to hit the nail in the head, the kings got the message without the sting of reproach or abuse. On the other hand the author saved himself from the wrath of the king accused.

There is no doubt that ancient thinkers regarded the king as one who is ideal, whose life was dedicated to service and welfare of his people. But human nature, being what it is, the average king however was not likely to follow the ideal with a firm will and determination. The pomp and power often
made them whimsical and capricious, and royal power tended to become unjust and oppressive. It must be admitted that no constitutional checks in the modern sense of the word were devised by our ancient thinkers. So the public from the mouths of birds and animals in the Pañcatantra voiced complaints and grudges against the king and we have slokas like: A king favours only the man that is near him, though he be ignorant, of base extraction and a stranger, kings embrace whatever is beside him.  

Karataka, the jackal in Book I compares the king with a mountain. It is rugged, crowded with beasts of prey and treacherous because of its so many unexplored clefts. Like it a king also is always harsh by nature and surrounded by vicious men. They are on the look out for faults and they make use of frauds.  

A king who follows his own desires takes no account of duty. He stays after his own lusts uncontrolled, like a rut-maddened elephant. So when puffed up with pride he falls into a pit of grief, then he throws the blame on his servant and fails to recognise his own conduct. Those who are dependant on kings have their fortunes at the mercy of another. Their
minds are ever discontented. They cannot be sure even of their own lives. No one can trust the intimacy or the friendship of the king because of their inconsistency. In his anger a king makes nothing of the zealous obedience that has been rendered him for a long time. It is like dust washed away by clouds of rain. So Damanaka aggrieves with comments like: Who, pray is a friend to king? A king as a rule cultivates unworthy folk.

A service of a lord of the earth is always dangerous for even when his servant is devoted and helpful and apply themselves to friendly and useful activities, and knows all about the business of service and are free from treachery, even for him disaster is certain if he once makes a false step.

Kings' minds are hard to grasp, and their humours are unstable. For many a kindness rendered to them by men of affectionate hearts still leads to hatred, while injury treacherously inflicted by others still leads to nothing but favour. The king surrounded by means folks can never do good to his dependants.

So in Book I Samjivaka soliloquise

"Kālōṇyajanāpāvāpāpiśunaiḥ Kṛṣṇāraṇāryaiḥ jñitam
duḥkhena prabīghyate sacakitaṁ rājñāṁ manāḥ sāmayaṁ"

Most often kings turn their faces wholly away from a man of good qualities. A king whose physicians, seers and ministers speak only pleasant things, soon loses his health, virtue and wealth. When the mind of the king is totally defiled by mean,
lying and ignoble man it is hard for timid servants to penetrate them. Kings who follow the advice of the base, and do not walk in the path taught by the wise, enter a tangle of misfortunes containing all manners of afflictions, and the way out is hard.

In this connection we must mention the seven evils that pertain to kings and cause their downfall. What the Pāñcatantra defines as evils is a technical term on political science, based on the same material that is found in the first part of the eighth book of Kautilya. These seven evils are namely—women, dice, hunting, drinking, harshness of speech, severity in punishments, and violence to property.

Viṣṇuśarma defines that in actuality there is just one evil named Vice. He says it has seven forms. There are five basic evils in this world, namely: Deficiency, Tumult, Vice, Affliction, and Sad policy. The Deficiency evil occurs when there is a deficiency of even a single one of the following: ruler, minister, nation, stronghold, treasury, army, or ally. When the internal elements or the external elements are in a state of agitation against the king—either one at a time or all at once, that evil is to be known as Tumult. Vice has already been explained above. Of the seven, women, dice, hunting and drinking are the vice due to pleasure, while the rest constitute the group that are due to wrath. The vices due to
pleasure, are easy to comprehend, so Vignusarma illustrates the second group. If the king is inclined to hate others and is given to reciting their failings and faults heedlessly, that is harshness of speech. The merciless application of the penalties of death, imprisonment and mutilation — when they are not called for — is harshness in punishments. Relentless grasping after the possession of others is violence to property. Such is the sevenfold evil of Vice.

Affliction is eightfold. It comes from accident, fire, water, disease, pestilence, cholera, famine, and excessive rain.

Bad Polity is the erroneous application of the six forms of policy. The six are peace, war, march, waiting policy, alliance with a powerful helper, and double dealing. When one makes war at a time appropriate to peace, or peace at the time for war, or when in like manner he runs counter to any other of the six forms of policy, then that is to be understood as the evil of Bad policy. The king must refrain from these seven forms of Vice.

Though in ancient times there were no constitutional checks upon king's autocracy, in order to curb the tyrannical tendencies the political writers have made full use of religions and spiritual sections which had the greatest terror in ancient India. The threat of hell and punishments from gods served as a
great deterrent in ancient India. Great emphasis had been laid on their proper training. A King ought to be modest and self-controlled, pious and religious, sweet in speech and seantly in behaviour, eager to wait upon the elders and preceptors, careful to keep good company, sensitive to public opinion and criticism. It was hoped that a prince trained on the above lines would hardly ever go astray and become a source of troubles to his people. There are many passages in the Pañcatantra in praise of a good king. He should have a disciplined mind endowed with the study of sāstras, possessed of a treasury of valour, well disposed towards brahmanas, of generous nature and devoted to truth and dharma. Amarākṣiti the king of Mahārāṣṭrapāla in Book I was a tree of wishes granting the desires of all suppliants. His feet were illuminated by a flood of radiant beams from the crown jewels of noble kings (who bowed before him). He was completely skilled in all the arts and versed in all the science of polity. In Book III Story seven we have the description of King Sibi. He was extremely compassionate and kind hearted. He used to fulfill the expectations of all people. Because of his benevolence and charity his fame reached heaven. King Sibi was ready to sacrifice his own body in order to save the life of a dove.

Red-eye, the minister of Foe Crusher, the king crow in Book III says that by protecting a terrified fugitive who takes refuge with him a man gets more merit than by performing the
Horse-sacrifice complete with all its excellent accompaniments. The king who does not delight his subjects with protection and other benefits - his name is meaningless (as the word rājā means one who pleases 'raṇjayati iti rājā'). He who loves virtues, despises vices, and takes delight in good policy, long enjoys the royal majesty.

The notion of the kingship as a trust was also there in ancient India. The king must regard his own happiness as indissolubly connected with that of his subjects. According to some political thinkers, however, the duties of the king are even more burdensome and exacting than those of a trustee. The king must sacrifice his own conveniences, inclinations and pleasures in order to be of the maximum help and service to his people.

"nityam rājāḥ tathā bhāvyām garbhiniḥ sahadharriniḥ yathā svam sukhām utṣpjet garbhasya sukhāmavahet"

The Pāñcatantra echoes the same thought. To the hero who sacrifices his own pleasures to the pleasures of others comes responsibility, to the learned wisdom, to the wise good qualities, from good qualities comes wealth, it makes him a ruler and from ruling comes kingship. He who possesses valour and has the sense of sacrifice attains kingship.

The king should be very learned and well versed in Danda-nīti as well as in military science. He should speak sweet
words to attract others towards him, should be gentle, should offer gifts and perform sacrifices. He should be physically and mentally strong. Those who are haughty, malicious, greedy, lustful, false, puffed up with arrogance, and easily angered, fail to grasp the science of polity. But the same are maintained by those who do not overstep the proper bounds, who are well instructed, self-controlled, all patient and not stupid. The king should be a person of high abilities, must listen to others and should not act according to the situations keeping in view the time and place, forces, duty and political methods.

He should apportion properly his income and outlay, his agents should be secret and his counsel private, he should not speak unkindly to his ministers. The king who commits himself to the practices of the noble and makes the six forms of policy his support prospers undoubtedly.

The people make such a person as their protector who is efficient, noble, of pure heart and is charitable. He should be a righteous person, must protect and nourish the people. He must show compassion to his dependants and be always ready to share the same lot with them. Bright neck, the dove king in Book II when caught in the hunter's net, along with his followers, requests Goldy, the mouse friend, to free his followers first and afterwards him. Thus the king should devote himself to...
relieve the distress of his followers without taking account of his own.

At the same time the Bāṇcatantra reminds us that a kingdom cannot be ruled according to the common standards of men. For what are vices in men in general, the same are virtues in a king. Like a harlot the conduct of a king is often changeful, true and false, harsh and gentle in speech, savage and at the same time compassionate, avaricious and generous, lavish in spending, yet taking in great amounts of wealth from many sources - king's nature is unfathomable and beguiling. A tender hearted king must be shunned.

Thus we can see from above what high ideals were placed before the king and how he was exhorted to regard himself as a public servant or a trustee of the people. He was to regard his subjects as his children strive like a loving father for their welfare like Ėṣyanta in Abhijñānaśākuntalam, as Kālidāsa's pen describes:

"prajāḥ prajāḥ svā iva tantrayitvā niṣevate śrāntamanā viviktim"

- He was to realise that he can himself be happy only when his subjects are contented and prosperous.

Though no constitutional steps were devised to protect the people from the whims and caprices of a tyrannical king, we should however note that in ancient times it was not so difficult
to dethrone or execute a tyrant as it is in modern days. As we see in Book IV, "As Wrinkleface, the ape king had become weak with old age, another ape, who was young and vigorous in his impatience raised a revolt against him and drove him out of his own herd. So in Book III after the defeat of the owling Poe Crusher, Long-lived says to Cloud Colour that though he has attained the kingdom by resorting to violent means it is well first to show humility. The king should not delude himself with the pride of good fortune, thinking: "I have got possession of the kingdom", because the fortunes of kings are unaccountable, it is apt to fall the moment it is mounted. With many beautiful similes and metaphors the unstability of a king's fortune has been explained by Long lived at the end of this book. He says that when one reflects on Râma's punishment, the humiliation of Bâli, the dwelling in the forest of the sons of Pându, the destruction of the Vrûnis, King Nala's loss of his kingdom, the dwarf existence of Viśnu and the slaying of Arjuna, and what happened to Râvana, the lord of Lanka or Ceylon, it is clear that none can save anyone from the power of destiny. Where has gone Daśaratha, the friend of the king of the gods, who fought in heaven? Where has gone king Sagara, who controlled the sea's flood? Where is the son of Vepa, that sprang from the palm of his father's hand? Where is Numa, the sun's flesh and blood? But time that first opened their eyes closed them. In spite of the absence of constitutional laws these few slokas of Viṣṇuārmā have very effectively served the purpose of checks
on king's tendency towards tyranny.

In Book I we see the Lion king Ringalaka taking the position of the four circles. The four circles are the Lion, the Lion's retainers, the Kākaravas and the Kimārttas. Of these, the lion alone is local ruler in all the places of the country - villages, towns, cities, settlements, farming and mountain hamlets, parks, villages - granted to brahmans, woods and forests. There are a certain number of Lion's retainers, who are the office holders. The kākarava group are the middle classes. The Kimārttas are those that occupy other positions. These four constitute the body of the Central Government in ancient India. The second circle that consists of Ministry or a council of Advisers has been regarded by ancient Indian political thinkers as a very vital organ of the body politic. In the Pañcatantra we have the names of the eighteen high functionaries of the king. They are Mantā (the advisor of the king) Purohitā (the royal chaplain) Sanāpati (defence minister) Yuvarāj (the crown prince) Dauvārīka (the Lord Mayor of palace) Antarvāmaśika (lord chamberlain) Prasastṛ (the officer in charge of jails) Samāhārata (Revenue Officer) Simidesto (treasurer) Pradeśā or Nāyaka (Generalissimo) Paurā (the Lord Mayor) Vyavahārīka (chief justice) Adhyaksha (the premier) Kamāntika (Minister for industry) Daṇḍapāla (the officer in charge of peace and order) Durgapāla (officer in charge of the fort) Antapāla (officer in charge of frontiers) and Atavika (officer in charge of the Forest Region).
Generally eight ministers were appointed, Manu refers to the number of ministers either seven or eight but Manava school as cited by Kautilya is in favour of 12 ministers and according to the Rāmāyaṇa there should be eight ministers. The king should appoint ministers and form the council of ministers. If the king wishes prosperity of his kingdom, he should always consult with his ministers, when the king is in great danger he should call a meeting and discuss the problems with his ministers. There whatever the majority approves should be taken up as the way out.

The scope of the work of the ministry included the whole administration. It was to introduce new policies, to ensure their successful working, to remove any difficulties that may crop up. Therefore a following of excellent counsellors is by all means necessary for the complete success of the king. The Arthaśāstra and other works show that opinion was not unanimous upon the point of excellence in a minister. Some regarded ability and others loyalty as the most important criterion in ministers. The Pañcatantra says that counsellors must be heroes proved spotless by all trials, they must be wise and far-sighted; like the pillars of a temple the kingdom is held by the ministers, who possess excellent knowledge, straightforwardness and firm loyal
devotion.  The counsellors must have ever present wisdom and should be able to remove doubt and approve decisions. The king must never take his counsel with him who makes his living out of a mere pretence of council and are quite ignorant of the use of the six forms of policy and shows no regard for the attainment of the three objects of human desires.

Curiously enough Śrauti and Niti writers do not emphasise military leadership and ability in the minister, perhaps they anticipated its danger. They passingly observes that ministers should be brave, but do not emphasise upon military qualifications and leadership. The Pañcatantra is emphatic in pointing out its risk. In the Pañcatantra we find the kings being repeatedly warned against the danger of ministers being more powerful. It says that the protection of ministers is important but more important is self protection. So the king should be ever watchful. The minsters may be ambitious to usurp the throne. Then they may conspire to multiply the difficulties and calamities for their rulers. This we see again and again happening in modern era, often military generals or minister in charge of military force raise coups. They dethrone kings or the present government and usurp their power. Viṣṇuṣarmā warns that when minister and prince are raised to too high a position, Fortune lets one of the two fall. When a king gives one minister...
absolute power in the kingdom, the minister is inflated and grows proud, with the indolence of pride he develops a loathing for the service because of this loathing grows a desire for independance and in his desire for independance, he plots against the king's life. Even a wholly devoted minister, if he is managing the affairs of state in a way that injures the king's interests, must not be let alone by the king. If let alone he ruins him. Those who depart from salutary policy and practise the reverse of it, are ministers only in outward guise, but are really foes of the king. Even the noble are assuredly destroyed, like darkness at sun-rise, if they are forgetful of the proper place and time for actions, because of having a foolish minister. The king should always keep in mind that no one approaches a king, even if his qualities be noble, if he has an evil minister, and that true ministers are they whose political skill enables them to settle by mere peaceful negotiation matters which others would accomplish by strenuous measures and which would lead to extreme force and violence. But as for those who seek small and unsubstantial advantages by the ill advised use of force, they by their imprudent conduct set the king's fortune in hazard. Though the Śrītis and Hitis recommend that ministers should be selected on the hereditary principle, Viṣṇuśarma disapproves the theory. He says that it is not an invariably sound principle. But the king should select him a minister who possesses as many qualifications as possible.
The Tantrākhyāyikā stresses a great deal on the appointment of royal servants, their requisite qualities and qualifications. The king should be ever discriminating in regard to his kingdom and his people, for (quoting Viṣṇuśarmā) success depends solely on recognition of the differences between men. Servants and ornaments are to be used only in their proper places. For a man does not fasten a crest-gem on his foot simply because he has the power to do so. If a king knows how to distinguish between his servants saying, "This one is wise, this one faithful, this one both, that one foolish he gets an abundance of servants." If he is levelled with his inferiors, if he fails of the respect shown his equals, and if he is unworthily employed; for these three reasons a servant may desert his patron. If he has any other place to go, no noble man will stay for a single moment where no distinction is made between right hand and left hand. If a gem worthy to be encased in an ornament of gold be set in tin, it makes no complaint and does not cease to be resplendent, but the blame falls on him who uses it so. When a lord makes no distinctions but behaves in the same way to all his servants then even the vigorous ones lose their energy. A king should be capable of recognizing the difference between horses, elephants, and metals, between woods, stones and garments, between women, men and waters. As horses, arms, scientific knowledge, a lute, a speech, a man and a woman are either
useless or useful according to differences in the men to whom they belong.*

The above passages show how the king must have clear conception on the necessary qualities of the royal servant. A mean retinue destroys even a man of fine qualities, while even one lacking in virtue becomes virtuous if his followers are above meanness. He should neither appoint one who is faithful but incompetent nor the other who is competent but injurious. Also this is not an invariably sound principle, that a servant born in the household and of long standing is always preferable like a house born in the household, he may be injurious and unfaithful. One who does his work properly on high or low ground should be considered as the best one.

The king must not make only one member of his staff his soulmate. As we see from the first book of the Tantrakhyāyikā a great intimacy grew between piṅgalaka and Saṁjīvaka. Piṅgalaka the forest king, passed his time in affectionate intercourse with saṁjīvaka, the ox. He conferred alone with him in secret matters. So the rest of the beasts were separated and they became one group. This endangers a king's career. If a king shows too much regard for one person, be he his own son or another kinsman, he surely steals from him the heart of Fortune.
Also one should not honour newcomers and reject servants of long standing. Nothing is more serious than this rule as it totally destroys the kingship. The king should always keep this in mind that there is no man who does not long for the majesty of kings. If a man is without understanding it follows that he has unintelligent men in his retinue. Then because of their dominance no wise man will appear in his train, since the kingdom is bereft of wisemen, its statesmanship is ineffective. And with the loss of statesmanship, the whole tribe goes to certain ruin and the king along with it.

Servants who are close to the king can discern the causes of his displeasure and his grace, so the covetous one gradually gains the ascendancy over the king even though he resist him. A deceitful attendant just to gain his own ends creates dissension by slanderous words and separates the king from his faithful friends.

A king with many followers is glorious, never one who is isolated. Those who wish him isolated are declared to be his foes.

Whatever good befalls a minister, the same is profitable for the king as well, like oceans with waves he rise on high and gleam like gems. The king should join the strong with the skilful and the skilful with the quick and energetic.
A king should bear this in mind that the loss of wise servants is the death of kings, lost land is more easily regained than good servants. A tender hearted king, a brahman that eats everything (without observing the caste regulations of diet, a disobedient woman, an illnatured friend, a refractory servant, a negligent official; these must be shunned.

The king is the head of both the civil and military administration. He takes pride in his valour and warfare was regarded as a part of kingly virtue. It is the sanctioned Dharma of the Kṣatriyas to fight, as for them there is no greater or superior duty than to fight on the battlefield and kill the enemy. It does not matter even if they have to sacrifice their lives in discharging their duties. It is the duty of the Kṣatriya to fight battle and this has been justified by Lord Kṛṣṇa while encouraging Arjuna to discharge his duty on the battlefield of Kurukṣetra. And the Śāṅcatantra quotes Śrīkṛṣṇa, According to Him, every Kṣatriya should fight without caring for life, and it is beneficial in all cases, as He says to Arjuna: "Either slain in battle you will attain heaven or gaining victory you will enjoy sovereignty of the earth, so, arise, determined to fight."
The king should invade his enemy after acquainting himself with the real strength of his foe. He should know the comparative strength and weakness of himself and of his enemy, and having ascertained the power, place, the time of marching and of recruiting the army, the consequences, the loss of men and money, the profits and danger he should march with full force. The king must ponder every moment on these questions: What is the time? What friends have I? What is the place? What are my income and expenses? Who am I? and what is my power? In warfare a king must assess the power of his enemy. Damana advises Samjivaka and for an instance tells him the story of the strandbird and the sea and shows how the sea ignorant of the strandbird's prowess came to grief. In Book III Long Lived says, who-ever blindly rushes into action without taking account of his own strength and weakness and of his enemy's too, courts disaster. The king should have respect for his enemies, even those of little weight. For fruitless are the undertakings of those who acts otherwise. One should be watchful and distrustful of an enemy that is patient and wise, that attacks at the right season and that knows the strong and the weak points of himself and his adversary. The king should not despise even one who his cowed.
who has been surely handled, who is in flight or has been deserted, nor even one who is disarmed or alone. Foes find occasion to strike at their foes — if they are not careful in regard to things both seen and unseen — when they are sitting or lying down or on the march, or when occupied with eating or drinking. So the king should always be watchful and act accordingly.

A ruler should always aspire to conquer territories. For an exalted foe, even at a distance destroys the majesty of a king. A mean spirited one can accomplish nothing even though he be armed and close at hand. The king should always go on capturing his enemies and stretching the boundary of his own kingdom. This has been considered as one of his virtues. So the king should possess valour and be always eager to fight his enemies. Fortune or Lakshmi does not regard descent from an old family line as a rank of excellence, nor handsome appearance, nor even acquisition of knowledge, but she clings to the man who is brave and attended by good counsellors and to him alone.

The king whose energy is conquered without trouble is the true victor. To attain this title he should follow all the
duties and functions of a Vijīgīṣu king prescribed by the Smṛti and Nīti writers. Viśnuśarma also follows the same path and quotes the principles and policies set by them to conquer the enemies and save one from their attacks.

There are seven essential characteristics of a state technically called prakṛtis or angas viz. 1. King (rājā) 2. Ministers (amātya) 3. Country side (janapada or rāṣṭra) 4. fort (durga including fortified towns) 5. treasury (kośa) 6. army (daṇḍa or bala) 7. allies (mitra or suhṛt). All this is termed prakṛti sampad. The king element of state if highly qualified can raise the quality of the other six elements. The king should take account of his prakṛti sampad and also the demerits of the enemy and which will ultimately become the cause of his downfall and total elimination from the political arena.

Next the king should apply carefully and successfully the sixfold causes of political action in diplomacy (technically called the śādgunya) namely peace (sandhi) war (vigraha) expedition or campaign for conquest (yāna), neutrality (āsana) dubious attitude (dvaidhibhāva i.e. the clever way of applying the double method of peace and war with the enemy) and alliance (samāśraya). Augmentation of all resources in his kingdom ought to be the target towards which every Vijīgīṣu king should
strive by means of an intelligent application of śāṅgāṇya in
the field of diplomacy. In consideration of the disadvantages
and hardships involved in waging war with an enemy a king
should always try to prefer peace to war. The Central Indian
policy even in old days was peace and not war. The prosperity
and security of the community depend on peaceful calmness and
adventurous energy. The ancient political treatises refer to
four upāyas or stratagems (expedients) viz. sāman (conciliatory
negotiation) dāna (gifts or bribery) bheda (sowing dissension
and danḍa (punishment by warfare). Among these four sāman has
been suggested as the best means. So Kāraṭaka reproaches

Damanaka for adopting the means of violence
and says "True ministers are they whose
political skill enables them to settle by
mere peaceful negotiation matters which others would accomplish
by strenuous measures and which would lead to extreme force and
violence. But as for those who seek small and unsubstantial
advantages by the ill advised use of force they by their impru­
dent conduct sets the king's fortune in hazard. Conciliation
is the means which should always be tried first by him who knows
his business. Policies that are carried out by conciliation do
not end in disaster. By conciliation alone is dispelled the
darkness born of enmity. Of the fourfold political methods
violence is the worst, therefore it should be avoided, and be
used only as a last resort".
The Pañcatantra mentions a fifth device namely deceit and says it is not to be found in the authorities. When the first four are inapplicable one should resort to this in order to conquer and humiliate the enemy. Powerless adversaries can succeed in tricking their enemy by their wits.

Kauṭilya names this as Kūṭayuddha. If a state has immense superiority over its opponent it should follow the chivalrous code (dharma yuddha). Otherwise it should have recourse to all methods of warfare, whether fair or foul. Before adopting a particular diplomatic policy out of the six expedients (ṣaḍgūnyā) the Vijīśu king should consider well and beforehand as to whether he is superior, equal or inferior to his enemy in strength of arms, wealth, resources, position etc.

The king has three kinds of powers, namely mantra śakti (the king's power of deliberation with his ministers) prabhu-śakti (the power due to adequate possession of treasury and army) utsāha śakti (his personal physical power and energy). In case he finds himself inferior to his enemy in respect of these three śaktis he may resort to any of the various sandhis or alliances. Among the six expedients mantra (deliberation of counsel) declared by the wise is the most important factor. And intelligence and understanding are the abiding place of good counsel.
There are six doors to counsel - one's self, a minister, a messenger, a secret agent, the process of the three daily ablutions and the expressions of the face and gestures. Every counsel must be kept strictly confidential. So it says - he who apportions his income or outlay, whose agents are secret and whose counsel is private and who speaks not unkindly to his ministers - shall rule the earth to the edge of the ocean. Counsel falsely applied is sure to destroy him who uses it before it can be stopped. Division of counsel among ministers leads to naught but destruction for one's own party and the exaltation of the enemy. It can never be profitable.

The states in ancient India were inclined to regard the spies as highly indispensable and their work was considered to be of utmost importance. A king wishing to oust his foes could not hope to attain success unless he employed spies to gather informations about the military installations of the enemies and the attitudes of the subjects in that country. On account of these reasons the spies were considered as the eyes of kings through whom they see.

The ambassadors were very important agency for carrying out the inter state relationship. The relationship among the
states depended more upon the working of the diplomats. By beholding a messenger or a letter from a king (unseen) one could perceive whether that king was wise or unwise. For a messenger could cause union and could also sunder those that were united. A messenger performed the work by which men prospered. Victory, the hare was selected as the messenger of all hares to the elephant king because he possessed all the qualities that befits a good messenger. He knows the essence of the teachings of the books on political science and knows how to distinguish right from wrong and places and time for actions.

Regarding the diplomatic privileges to be granted to the messengers, the ancient Indian books furnishes many informations. The most remarkable thing is that they were immune from being killed on the ground that they were only messengers, and what they were directed to say by the sender.

If, on the other hand the king is weak in power and finds himself attacked by a stronger king he may either submit to him or leave the country. But the king must not leave his stronghold all of a sudden and without good cause. He may spend time pendulum fashion, when danger threatens he may withdraw, and when it is safe he may stay right in his stronghold. But this business of constantly going back and forth may be fatal. He
may have to transport back and forth the poor, the blind, the cripples, the deformed, those with withered arms, the lame, the sick and all their baggage. This will be enough to ruin the king. In this case he should hasten to make peace for the welfare of his treasury, army and himself, or he may resort to Kūtayuddha mentioned before. As we see in Book XIX Long Lived recommends this to Cloud Colour saying, "My lord, of the six political methods (namely, peace, war, waiting policy, march, alliance, and double dealing) peace and war have already been referred to. But at present we have no opportunity for a waiting policy, march, alliance, or double dealing. Because, waiting policy, in the face of a more powerful enemy, leads to the destruction of one's citadel (and oneself), and march evidently means the abandonment of one's citadel, and with what powerful ally could we ally ourselves? and to whom could we apply the policy of double-dealing? Now under those circumstances there is no chance for us to apply the four devices of conciliation, bribery, desension and violence. There is however a fifth device namely deceit - not found in the authorities. This I approve, and I shall resort even to this in order to conquer and humiliate the enemy."

Thus the crow King won the battle by applying successfully
the science of polity and destroyed the Owl King foe Crasher, with all his followers. After the victory Long Lived warns Cloud Colour saying, "Even if your purpose has been attained by resorting to violent means, it is well first to show humility." Prajāraṇjānasāmarthyam — or king's proficiency in pleasing and protecting his people is the ultimate word in ancient Indian Polity.

While estimating the merits and limitations of the ancient Indian polity found in the Pančatantra, we should not however forget that ancient Indian thoughts and institutions cannot be judged by standards then not known anywhere. We shall have to make due allowance for the circumstances and surroundings in which the ancient Indian Polity and thought were developed. Monarchy was the order of the day. It cannot be denied that our political writers placed the highest possible ideals before the kingly order, but in actual practice many king's failed to live up to the ideal. So the percentage of vicious or tyrannical kings in ancient India was very high. There were no constitutional checks. And here in this context the Pañcatantra serves as a remedy, with the help of a huge number of assorted slokas, stories and examples it fights against tyranny and shows the princes the right course that should be adopted while ruling the kingdom. This book is invaluable for grasping ancient Indian science of polity, because most lucidly and in the simplest way possible it guides and advises both king and the commonfolk.