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The concept of democracy comes in our mind during my studies. In the sense of India it is too old. During Buddha period it was the greatest period to rise up the democracy in the world, because all the traditions and values we are seeing in the Indian system is due to this glorious period. Actually, the Indian History starts from 6\textsuperscript{th} cent. B.C. It was periods of rise up of states. They were sixteen in number called Mahajanapadas. The mode of administration was republican as well as monarchy. I was astonished to see in Virji constitution that 7707 people were the part of administration they have to titled 'Raja' or 'King'.

A brief review of the opinion expressed on Ancient Indian Polity in the modern works and the environmental bias of the several writers would in the opinion of the present writers be helpful in understanding it as a prerequisite. The occidentals who have wielded their pen on various aspects of Indology during the second half century proclaimed that monarchy was the type of any government known to Orientals. Thus according to them the republican form of government drawn first on the western horizon. Such authors translate 'gana' variously as a 'tribe' as 'autonomous clan' 'a corporation' etc. and not as a republican state.

In pre Vedic period there were several steps to develop a state. Kula-state, Gramma, Visah (tribes), Jana, Rasthra. Kula was the symbol of family. Kulapa was the chief of Kula.\textsuperscript{1} Gramma was the group of the Kula. Gramma were surrounded by the
forests, wells and cattles.\textsuperscript{2} The peoples of gramma were see to have cattles specially cows (\textit{godhana}).\textsuperscript{3} The chief of Gramma was called \textit{Gramini}. Visah was big institution than Gramma .The chief of Visah was called \textit{Visahpati}. Jana was big than Visah.\textsuperscript{4} In the sense of early India \textit{Panchjana, Yadavjana and Bharatjana} were established. The king was called ‘\textit{Janasgopta}’\textsuperscript{5} First time Prof.Rhys Davids emphasized the term ‘\textit{gana}’ as a autonomous clan.Rasthra was the donation of state, country etc.

The process of evolution of ‘\textit{Janpada}’ in early India and the city of Greece consists of same stages. In India we find references of large number of gana in the ‘\textit{samhitas}’ of Rgveda and Artharvaveda. Similarly, in Ancient Greece a number of Genos are traceable. The Janas or genous gradually formed the member of the family known as Kula or Phraties. The necessities of defense and aggression known as Janpadin or Phulai with the formation of military grouping the rulers and ruled were differentiated and first known as primary status of Janpada or Polis emerged.\textsuperscript{6} Janpada was equivalent as genous. Kula was equivalent to Pharatry Janpadin Phulai, Janpada-Polis. Term ‘Gana’ means give or takes birth & has been used in sense of people as a whole e.g. ‘\textit{Paura Janpada}’.

Yaska however used the word in the sense of a people of a particular Varna or caste as it’s evidenced and Nishad or Gandharavas, Pitares, Devas Asuras and Rakasas.\textsuperscript{7} The word ‘Jana’ as such of sociological signification. Samhitas in the sense of ethnic tribes it began to connote the people of classified society and has ultimately come to mean people in general and some times in particular as well.
Term 'Rajas' English translation is king not as a chief, but in primitive books 'Raja' is designated as a chief. In later phase Raja was known as holder of land. In Vedic hymns Raja was the leader of battle and safe guard of people. The function of Raja cleared that he was equivalent to the God Indra. Term Raja Originated from Rajj or Rigz means to shine. In Latin Rex means those who leads, or shower of path.⁸

In later Vedic phase it seems that all the democratic tradition and values were present in monarchy:-

1. Election of Raja from the people.⁹
2. During consecration some prohibition were checked to his right.
3. Raja was dependent of his council.
4. Sabha and Samiti were the two old institutions who check the king not to be autonomous.

In Atharveda there is found the election of kings in sukta of 87and 88. It is also found the king have desire for the strength of people.¹⁰ In Atharveda Rajas were throned and dethroned. The Indian Rajas was different from the Rome and England .He was a chief but in Indian sense he was the guard of Public .So the term Raja was democratized in Indian sense.

Mr.K.P.Jayaswal first took a bold step to lift up the concept of Republics in Indian Polity, because some scholars thinks that it comes first in India after Western large number of Indian scholars with the pro-western bias belief that all the modern concept of
democratic republics comes from great Britain, Greece Rome and U.S.A. They refuse to certain view that the republican trend has gained up in root of Indian soil long before the democratic attained civilized form.

Some scholars like K.P. Jayaswal, R.C. Majumdar, U.N.Ghoshal, Bhandkar brothers, N.N.Law, Prof. Oldenburg and Rhys Davids an eminent Indologist were agree with K.P. Jayaswal they it comes India first. Thus, according to them the light of democratic ideas and republican form of government drawn first on Western horizon, such scholar prefers to translate ‘gana’ as autonomous clan or a corporate etc. Another term ‘Samgha’ of different gana in the past was also misinterpreted. Dr. K.P. Jayaswal, Beni Prasad and other eminent scholars drew our attention towards the real facets of Indian Polity and the republican system of government in early India. This fresh output completely exploded the theories propounded by the Western scholars who looked upon ancient Indian political traditions with an imperialistic bias.

Today we are living in the age of democracy our Indian politics depends on three things in which caste, custom and religion are associated. The insight of Sri Arvindo could not miss the subjectivity of early Indian scholars of the nationalistic school, he said, “Indian scholars have attempted to read the modern ideas and type of democracy and even a parliamentary system in to the past of India but this seems ill-judged Endeavour. “There was a strong democratic element if we must use the western terms in Indian Polity and even the institution that present a certain analogy to the parliamentary form but in reality there features were of India’s own mind and not all the same as modern democracy.”
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Krishna remarks, "A national historical school arose much to determine of schlorship." Similarly, Drekmier accuses modern Indian scholars of trying to final a democratic tradition in Indian Political History so as to exploit it for purposes of nation building. According to Prof. K.A.N. Shastri to impact associations of democracy to the interpretations of early Indian records because one of them happen to mention election and ballot is unconsciously to raise fresh obstacles in the way to correct understanding of the atmospheric surrounding the working of these and other institution in early India --- but it seems handily worth wise to make the attempt for the doubtful satisfaction that may be derived from claiming under wisdom for our ancestors is purchased at the cost of any chance of an knowing them as they were.

According to Arvindo modern democracy is a product of history an outcome of centuries of political thinking experiment and experiences. The democratic ideas refined and crystallized and development in to the better vehicle for support. Therefore, the use of modern political term like democracy republics etc has to be circumscribed at the very outset. They are not to be understood in their modern sense but in their ancient setting.

It is said that in 18th and 19th cent. A.D. the imperial historians have been resulted from the Indian Polity that the Indians do not have nationality, political awareness and ideas. The mode of administration in nature and politics was independent of Dharmasastra and spiritualism that types of theories were against to the local self government. These historians depicts as a story of loss. They adopted the Indian culture in the sense of unchangeable and present form. They evaluate the Indian past only in the form of consecration of the kings, well decorated elephant, dancers and assumed puranic
traditions fanimine, stories blacknagas, mosquitoes, intouchability and tradition ----

Oftenally the western scholars being the demerits of old tradition, caste system, social complexity and spiritualism. They try to tell that India was the country of ‘dark and lessiness’. It is possible they were in the favor of British sovereignty. Oftenally, it is seem that the vectored country has diminished the History of conquered country, because they want to present only glorious part of the vectored country and crushed the coming generation’s mental intelligency. Victored country first of all crushed the history, inspired persons, culture, literature, education system and all over the inspiration of the defeated country, so that we tolerate their sub-ordination.

Seeing the Imperial historian’s reaction the nationalist in 19th to 20th cent. A.D. tries that all over progressive thought, situation, modern invention and element was present in the past. During the Indian National movement the historians wanted to tell us about Indian Polity is a fully democratic with limited monarchy, constitutional monarchy and secular. The researcher wanted to prove that all the tradition and Values were present in early democratic system. That’s why Jayaswal books ‘Indian Polity’ becomes the Vied to the nationalist. Such type of hypothesis gave us pride and glory to the Indians which inspires the people’s self pride and firm determination to fight against Britishers during Indian National Movement.

In 1916 P.C.Banerjee published his work ‘Public Administration in Ancient India’ he wrote that the administrative system of the state was constitutional monarchy. Actually, it was secretary system.\(^\text{13}\) Again he wrote that in Ancient Indian Polity there was not only monarchy but also republican assembly has great value.\(^\text{14}\) Majumdar in his
corporate life he writes that there were a co-operative assemblies in Ancient Indian Polity. He was very sad that modern system of administration adopted from the western horizon but it was present in early Indian system. In 1922 B.K.Sircar wrote that Indian states were secular in form. It was away from religion. In 1923 U.N.Ghoshal wrote in his book ‘A History of Hindu Political Theories’ criticized Maxmullar and Bloomfield theory that Hindus were not in favor of states. He was disagreeing with Willobi, Gane and Dunning like some western historians thinks that the Indians thinks about ‘Heaven state’ Prof. U.N.Ghoshal says that they have less knowledge about the Indian Political system. Dunning says that the Aryans does not develop Political Science as an independent theme like European Aryans and does not free from Dharmasastra and spiritualism.Willobi says that Indians assumed that the entire universe was the creation of Divine. They were believe that they can not think about so much and never inspire towards towards any other institution.

Dr. V.R.R. Dikshatar wrote in his book that the Indian past was more glorified. He said that the Hindu system of administration was not modern as the European says. They say that Indian have no knowledge of patriotism is quite wrong ha says that there is no doubt seeing the ideal king. Then he writes a famous slok ‘Janini janambhoomish swargadip griyasi’ like Jayaswal he wrote that Hindu administrative system was the golden age in the past but not in future.

In 1916-25 all the written was concern with the local self government as well as international laws. Dr. Radhakumud Mukherjee in his book he writes that local self
India the historians described such monarchies in power to control the king similar the modern concept of the historians. Proving the nature and secularism in India it is forgetting that in European country that secular state has not been present before 17th to 18th cent. A.D. The aim of the present research is to emphasize such concept and facts regarding ancient secular and democratic states will be emphasized.

Notes and References

1-Rgveda 10.179.9.
2-Ibid 10.90.8
3-Ibid 10.62.11,107.5
4-Ibid 1.37.8
5-Ibid 10.84.2
6-Ibid 8.6.46,48.3.43.12
7-Ibid 3.43.5
8-Glotz : Greek city, See chart no.1
9-Ibid forward IX page 5-8
10-Mahabharata Asram Parvan 9.18.10;18,25
11-Nirukta 3.2.7
12-Benwenist E.:Indo European language and society, 1973 page 311-12
13- विशासता वृणतं राज्याय।
government was found in early India. Village and central administration was found in Indian content.\textsuperscript{19}
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