CHAPTER I

Introduction

1.1 Definition of State and Administration in General

The term “state” has more commonly been used to refer to nation, as in “nation-state” or “affairs of state”. Various terms have been fixed to the office of government which governs domestic matters e.g. “Secretary of state”, “Department of state”, “Internal affairs” or “Home Ministry”. Therefore, most people observe that the term “state” refers to a nation, and more often to one’s home country. A nation-state, since the ancient history, has been designated as a tract of land, a territory, of certain dimensions nowadays these are given precisely, that upon which the capital is established and fortified, and there is much activity conducted within. As the first tribes of people were gatherers and hunters, the predominant activity was agriculture; it included gathering, herding, and food production. It could be seeds, grains or similar things. In the capital, there was the king’s fortress guarded by soldiers (warriors, in the early period) who the king paid from his treasury, the treasury and the cabinet of ministers. In the section 1.2, the office of these men is defined in detail.

The term “administration”, or what is now called “public administration”, as government is referred to as “public sector”, refers to the ongoing process of running a government. It also refers to a government, as in the phrase “the administration of Gordon Brown” for example. The process of administration includes assignation and follow-
up of duties of the offices of the government ranging from the leader to the lowest rank of staff. The *Arthasastra* of Kautiya, mentioned in section 1.2 is one of the earliest known descriptions of ministerial duty.

1.2 Types of Government in Pre Buddha and Buddhist India.

1.2.1 Some more common types:
Governments can be classified into several types.

1. **Democracy** The word "democracy" literally means "rule by the people." In a democracy, the people govern.

2. **Republic** A literal democracy is impossible in a political system containing more than a few people. All "democracies" are really republics. In a republic, the people elect representatives to make and enforce laws.

3. **Monarchy** A monarchy consists of rule by a king or queen. Sometimes a king is called an "emperor," especially if there is a large empire, such as China before 1911. There are no large monarchies today. The United Kingdom, which has a queen, is really a republic because the queen has virtually no political power.

4. **Aristocracy** An aristocracy is rule by the aristocrats. Aristocrats are typically wealthy, educated people. Many monarchies have really been ruled by aristocrats. Today, typically, the term "aristocracy" is used negatively to accuse a republic of being dominated by rich people, such as saying, "The United States has become an aristocracy."
5. Dictatorship A dictatorship consists of rule by one person or a group of people. Very few dictators admit they are dictators; they almost always claim to be leaders of democracies. The dictator may be one person, such as Castro in Cuba or Hitler in Germany, or a group of people, such as the Communist Party in China.

6. Democratic Republic Usually, a "democratic republic" is not democratic and is not a republic. A government that officially calls itself a "democratic republic" is usually a dictatorship. Communist dictatorships have been especially prone to use this term. For example, the official name of North Vietnam was "The Democratic Republic of Vietnam." China uses a variant, "The People's Republic of China."

This can be used as background information in further discussion. The government current in Buddha’s period was broadly of this types = Monarchy and what may be called a tribal republic or gana. A brief survey of both will be useful in further discussion.

1.2.2 The Gana or Tribal Republic

The Yaudheyas and Malavas are referred to as ganas, or tribes, like the Pandavas of Mahabharata. But A.S. Altekar in State and Government in Ancient India adds that they assumed republican governments. Gana meant a state apart from a monarchy. Altekar mentions a report of travelers:

“In the countries of some of us, there are kings; but in those of others, there is gana or republican government.” (Majumdar, 1977, p.95)
Hence, *gana* refers both to state and to those vested with power. It was similar to the cabinet of ministers or mantrilaya. The Greek accounts of governance systems of Ancient India favored republics and democracy. Accounts of governments in the time of Alexander the Great mentioned a tribe called *Sabaracae*, which had a democratic government. The *Yaudheyas* were governed by a group of five thousand *Ksaytryas* and commons did not act in the governance of the tribe. Thus, neither democracy nor republic as we know it functioned in those days. Republics of those days were similar to the Greek or Platonic republic. Aristocrats here refer to the descendants of *kshatriyas*, who founded the state. New arrivals to the state did not gain access to the ruling class for some time. Altekar mentions four types of *kshatriya* in those days:

1. rajas, or founding fathers
2. rajanyas, or immediate descendants (sons and heirs)
3. rajans, or *ksatriya* outsiders
4. rajanyakas, or descendants of rajans (113)

Buddhist literature on the *Lichchavis* of Vajja mentions that there were totally 7707 rajas, equal to the number of founders and colonizers of Muzzarfarpur. Amarakośa describes two *ganās*; the former is the rajanyaka- *ganā*, governed by the descendants of the original founders of the state; the latter is rajaka-*ganā*, governed by *kshatriya* families regardless of their status.

The *Yaudheyas* were a confederation of three republics. Altekar places their capitols. He mentions them as the just and moderate republics in the time of Alexander the Great. The Buddhist canon mentions the Lichchavis, Videhas, Mallas and Sakyas. For the Sakyas, they were ‘monarchial’ but in the sense that each founding member of the ruling class called himself *a raja*. They also built and used an Assembly Hall.
Although the Rajans of the Sakyas held meetings at the assembly hall, they considered themselves to be an *ajña-pravṛtti sthāna*, or vassal state to Kosala.

The monarchies of Magadha and Kosala frequently targeted the Videha and Lichchavis and therefore the confederation was started with the Mallas. Magadha had conquered the Mallas and Videhas by 500 B.C. but the Lichchavis proved worthier adversaries and reestablished independence from Magadha in 300 B.C.

Republican governance was performed by a Central Assembly, then and now referred to as Sangha. Overall attendance was determined by state dimensions and by practice of members. Altekar mentions that not all councilors attended and that country people preferred other activities. Out of the 5,000 members of the Yaudheyas or the 7707 members of the Lichchavis, only 2,000-3,000 members attended. In referring to state dimensions, Altekar gives the aforementioned numbers in contrast with the thirty odd members of Nyasa.

The Central Assembly elected its own Executives and generals for military campaigns. Altekar mentions that the Ambashthas selected three valiant generals to fight against Alexander. However, although there were political parties, there were no elections as we know them in Ancient India. The Executive Council was controlled by the Central Assembly. Book XI of the *Arthaśāstra* tells that any assembly president (*samghamukhya*) or executive councilors who violated a law would be dismissed and punished by trial. Lust for personal power or personal rivalry led to factionalism, and the skilled and energetic
members could wrest power for themselves. An ideal state had no political parties, but was governed harmoniously. Such was the Lichchavis as reported to be taught by Buddha.

*Santiparvan* refers to the ideal ganā or republic, in the following ways: the younger generation was taught proper education and manners, and told to follow the path of the elders; vital work and posts were entrusted to experienced statesmen; the officers of rather government worked together harmoniously on behalf of the state; ambassadors and spies were elected carefully and attention was paid towards implementing a sound economic policy for the state. (Altekar, 1949, p.130)

In referring to the procedure, the *ganā titha* could have been the precursor of the Assembly or party whip. The *samghamukhya* acted as the chairperson or President and regulated each debate, as with the Central Assembly, so with the Central Executive. It varied according to size and local tradition. The Mallas were a small state and had only four members in their Executive Assembly. However, whereas the Lichchavis were more numerous, their Executive Assembly had only nine members. In confederation with the Videhas, the number of executives doubled (total: 18 members).
Presumably, the Samghamukhya of the Central Assembly presided over the Central Executive.

Altekar believes that the decisions of the Buddhist Sangha were modeled on the premise of the Central Assemblies. E.g. a quorum of twenty monks may have come from a similar quorum in the political assembly.

He remarks that the Buddhist Samgha was divided between assenters and dissenters. Assenters remained silent whereas dissenters could and would voice their disagreement. The Sangha voted in three ways: (1) by gulhaka, or secret ballot (2) by sakarnajapakam, or whisper and (3) by vivatakam, or ordinary ballot. The ballot was a colored stick collected by a salahagrahaka.

The Arthasastra mentions two forms of Samgha. The former concerned the kshatriyas of the Kambojas. It may refer to a professional guild, as existed in early Europe, because the members practiced trade and agriculture. D.C. Sircar mentions that terms such as sangha and ganīa were exchangeable. He mentions later that Northern Bihar [Magadha] hosted a vast confederacy of eight tribes including the Lichchavis, Mallas, Videhas, Kurus (Kauravas) and Vrjis. (D.C. Sircar, 1995, p.237-238)

Megasthenes reported that most of the city-states of the Ancient India of his time had adopted a ‘democratic form of government.’ Let us recall that democracy was a Greek term referring to ‘rule by the people’. He claimed that several tribes such as the Malticorae or the
Singhae had no kings. The emperor allowed them autonomy and their own traditional system of administration.

Between 100 and 199 A.D. (2nd Century) the Buddhist Avadanasataka referred to two types of territory: the former was called *raj-adhina desa*, or a territory subordinate to a king, a vassal state. The latter was called *gan-adhina desa*, or a republic. They existed simultaneously in the land of Madhyadeśa.

An inscription in Allahabad mentions republics in both Central and Western India, including the *Malavas* and *Yaudheyas*. However, D.C. Sircar(1995, p.237-238) explains that *gan-adhina* territories suffered political setbacks under the later Gupta monarchs and that, after that period, there was no further mention of republics.

He continues to mention other forms of democratic systems of the period. A *mahajana sabha* was presided over by Brahmanas whereas trade guilds were called *nagaras, sva-desis* or *paradesis*. They were organized according to craft or profession, like their modern descendants. (Ibid. p.243)

The guilds were supervised by a *nigama-sabha*, which acted like the *pañcayat* board. The nigama-sabha of the Gupta dynasty was composed of a *nagara-saresthin* and a team of the representatives of all the trades.
1.3 Indian Concept of State and Administration

1.3.1 Vedic Concept

The Rg Veda describes two principle terms, such as sabha or village assembly and samiti. It mentions that women attended the sabhā as members. The sabhā was both “people in conclave and the hall which was the venue of their meeting.”(Shama, Ram Sharan, 2005, p.105) The mention of women councilors demonstrates the age of the text, implying that the concept of men councilors occurred much later. Priests also attended. After that, the sabha was patriarchal and excluded women. The source has not given the exact period in which this had occurred.

*The Atharva Veda* mentioned that a king could not act without the sabha’s advice and council. Therefore, the sabha must speak righteously to advise the King.

1.3.2 Saptanga or Organic Theory

Kautiṣṭhya was the chaplain or pundit under Candragupta Maurya who was a post Vedic monarch of great fame. Candragupta Maurya had under him a council of ministers which resembled the cabinet of ministers of modern democratic states.

The rural administration was concerned with rural affairs and a district officer was elected to tend to road construction and
maintenance, land surveillance and work with rivers. Town administration officials collected revenue and maintained law and order, and it is mentioned that they had men who acted as police or secret agents.

For Kautiḷya the state was organic and composed of several aspects or elements. At the top of his list was the raja, or king. He was selected by popular mandate and approval. Below the king is prime minister, who serves as the advisor to the king. The Prime Minister should possess good sense and wisdom to guide the king. The third element is territory—land and resources. As, it is commonly understood, territory is basic to the state. It is the foundation thereof. When a king and his ministers have located a suitable territory, they proceed to establish a capital, complete with fortifications for national security. After the capital, the next element is treasury or wealth. Natural resources were wealth before man created gold coins, and many sources on Humanities mention resources as wealth before money.

**Minister** under Kautiḷya’s Organic Theory of State or Saptamga is more than compatible with the Jatakas of Gautama Buddha. He has given a broad range of duties including agriculture, welfare, economics and so on.

**Territory** is defined and redefined throughout the various periods. Initially it was called janapada (tribal settlement), latter it was redefined as rastarā and jana respectively. Rastarā means territory whereas
jana refers to population. But Kauti̯lya’s Arthasastra defines it as both. Kauti̯lya prescribes a village as 100 to 500 families. A sthaniya contains 800 villages.

Fortification is translated as durga, which refers to a fortress or castle. In the Book of Manu, it is defined as pura, a fortified capital. Kauti̯lya describes the construction of the fortress in a work titled Durgavidhana. The formal layout of the capital is in another, titled Durgavidesa. In many places in Asia, the term is added to the name, as in Singapore (originally Singa pura, the city of the lion).

Treasury or kosa, is the fifth element and herein it is emphasized that the treasures should be earned through righteous conduct. Obviously, it was most to refrain people doing wrong in the bad/hard times and to maintain the loyalty to the service of the army.

Danda means the army (sena). It also refers to punishment or coercive force. Kauti̯lya describes the soldiers as various types: hereditary, forest, mercenary, infantry, charioteer, mounted (on elephant back), and so on. The raja is the commander in chief.

Arthasastra mentions the primary officers of a king, who are today still practicing their duties in various countries. They are chaplain, deputy, premier, commander, minister, economic advisor and ambassador judge, counselor, and scholar (Skt., pandit.)

The chaplain is a pandit, familiar with the scripture, hard-working and attentive in all religious duties, have control over his senses, who subdues his anger, and whose anger even the king fears.
The deputy is the officer who distinguishes right and wrong action. The premier is the supervisor of all activity and the commander knows military techniques and maneuvers. Counselors know polity; the scholars (pundits) know the righteous conduct, and the judge is familiar with laws and customs. The minister determines the time and place for all actions. Economic advisor helps determine state expenditures.

The *Arthasastra* further describes in details the duty of each officer of the king and advises the king to check their competence and keep them subject to his will. Furthermore, he should make them equal in authority.

As I have mention above Maurya had under him a council of ministers, which resembled the cabinet of ministers of modern democratic states. A diagram of Maurya council is given below:
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Certainly, rural administration was concerned with rural affairs. A district official was elected to tend to read building and maintenance, land surveys and keeping of rivers amongst other duties. Town administration officials collected revenue and maintained law and order. There are the earliest record of police and secret agents employed for this work.

We learn from the account of Megasthenes (the well-known ambassador of Seleucus Nicator at the court of Candragupta Maurya) and from Kautiśa's Arthasastra that the bureaucratic organization of the Mauryas marked the last and the highest stage of development of a process. (Prasad, 1928; Ghoshal, 1962). At the head of the Mauryan bureaucracy stood the council of ministers called mantriparisad (or mahamatras in Ashoka’s inscriptions) who had the right of discussing the king’s orders, or of controlling the State. In the time of King Ashoka the Great, he inaugurated a further class of official called dharma-mahamatras or ministers of Righteousness, whose duty was to supervise the affairs of all religious bodies, and to ensure that the officials followed the Emperor’s new policy. (Basak, 1959)

The spiritual life of the court was cared for by the court chaplain (purohit), and many lesser Brahmans; and the whole lot of numerous astrologers, physicians, poets, painters, musicians, and learned men residing in the palace and they enjoyed the royal patronage.

Speaking of Candragupta Maurya’s administration, Megasthenes divided the officials into three classes called the district officials, the town officials and the officers in charge of the army. Kautiśa gave a
parallel division consisting of officials in charge of the rural administration (the *samagarta*, the *sannidgata*, and their staff), the town administration (the *nagaraka* and his assistants) and the army administration (the *senapati* and his subordinates).

The district officials were entrusted with the superintendence of the rivers and land surveys as well as inspection of the irrigation canals; they were also required to maintain the roads with great care.

The town officials were in charge of revenue collection and the preservation of law and order by means of police, secret agents and troops, which were stationed in the chief towns under a captain (*dandanayaka*) who might be the governor himself. The duties of the town officials also involved the prevention of disasters (famine, flood and plague).

The military branch of the administration was controlled by a number of superintendents, with a general (*senapati*) at the head of all military affairs (the admiralty, the transport and commissariat, and the army units of the infantry, cavalry, chariots and elephants respectively). Medieval armies often had numerous generals, with a great general (*mahasenapati*) in supreme command. The great general was always a very important person, and often a member of the royal family. He took orders directly from the king. Below the general were numerous captains (*nayaka, dandanayaka*) who had charge of the secret agents and troops which were stationed in the chief towns.
Interstate Relations

States frequently fought each with other. Kautiṅga prescribed domestic material benefit against conciliatory action such as diplomacy or diplomacy intended to increase material benefit of the conciliatory state. Traditionally, a state employed four means: (1) sama, or conciliation, (2) dana, or subsidy, (3) bheda, or dissension in the neighboring hostile state, and (4) danda (military aggression).

A.S. Altekar (2005, p.293-4) mentions that unprovoked aggression was not advised. Advisors to kings in those times warned that unrighteous wars brought disgrace to the ruler who declared it and existence in hell after death. In this text, Altekar refers to relations between the Kauravas and the Pandavas (Mahabharata) and the concessions from the latter. To facilitate a reduction of unpopular wars, philosophers advocated ‘balance of power’ throughout the territory. Balance of power is one aspect of interstate relations which has endured until today, in one form or another. Among theories tendered was the mandala theory.

Mandala Theory presupposed the subdivision of a territory—division of a large tract into smaller states, and a hegemonious leader. The theory describes the relations invested in and embodied in kings: King was iconoclast of state polity then. The five subordinate kings of this theory were:

1) ari (śatru) or enemy,
2) mitra or ally,
3) ari mitra (the ally of one’s enemy),
4) mitra mitra (the ally of one’s ally) and
5) ari mitra mitra (the ally of one’s enemy’s ally)
The principal and rearguard kings constitute the *mandala*. All monarchs were advised to watch the group closely to maintain peace and prosperity and occasionally state expansion through ‘judicious alliance.’

**Manu’s approach to State and Administration**

Manu’s description of the origin of the King bears strong resemblance to the topic of divine power of Kings, from the Veda. Manu’s *Dhammasastra* (the law book of Manu) states that when men were without a king and dispersed through fear in all directions, the Lord created a king for the protection of all of them, and that the essence of the *Dikpalas* (lords of the quarters) was used for his creation. This was merely a metaphorical description of the paramountcy of the monarch, designed to enforce from the subjects.

Concerning kingship, D.C. Sircar (1995, p.35) mentions that a prince of age eight years could ascend the throne. He explains later in *Some Aspects of Kingship II* that according to Indian law, one attained majority at age sixteen, not at twenty-one. One could ascend the throne even as minor. A third condition was that an average reign per person did not exceed thirty-two years.

Although a king had certain privileges, he was never permitted ‘unfettered right over the life and property of the people’. (R.C. Majumdar, 2007, p.95) *Manusmirti* declared that a partial or deceitful ruler would be destroyed by danda, itself the symbol of royal authority. In so far as danda meant military action, this declaration could infer revolt or what the French, centuries later, called *coup d’etat* (blow of state). Kings
were therefore both trained in morality and well-educated. Princes of deviant character had to forfeit their right to the throne.

Manu accepts a social structure in which priestly caste (i.e., that of Brahmanas) enjoys the highest statue and Sudras have to suffer lowest statue. This approach is reflected in Manu’s discussion of the duties of a king as well. Manu says that his kingly priest should be a learned Brahmana and the king should extend full trust in him. King was supposed to donate to him half portion of the wealth found anywhere. Manu criticizes the nations populated or ruled by Sudras.

We have seen that Manu advocates divine origin of state and also superiority of Brahmanas over other Varnas. Secondly Manu in general stands for monarchy as against democracy. Kautiśalya’s approach is similar to that of Manu in some respect but also different in some important respect. Kautiśalya, unlike Manu, is silent about the origin of the state. He neither talks about divine origin or about humanistic or contractual origin. Existence of Ksatriya varna and possibility of sovereign king is a given fact for him. Kautiśalya advocates monarchy in clearer words than Manu does. A king is supposed to use different fair and unfair means to protect his sovereignty and also to expand his territory. Secondly superiority of Brahmins, which is vividly advocated by Manu is accepted by Kautiśalya with some reservation. For instance royal priest was a Brahman and a king was supposed to follow him. But the king was also supposed to examine the royalty of the priest by using different means. Danda, that is the law of punishment was central in both the governing systems - those of Manu and Kautiśalya. In Buddhist governing system, on the other hand, dhamma (righteousness) was more
prominent rather than danda. With this brief comparison let us concentrate on Buddhist concept of state and statehood.

1.4 Buddhist Concept of State

One can say that some concept of dhamma is central to both Brahmanical and Buddhist governing system. Even in Brahmanical system danda is ultimately meant for the protection of dharma. But though dharma stands for some kind of order in both Brahmanism and Buddhism, in Brahmanism Dharma primarily stands for hierarchical social order- Varnasra madharma whereas in Buddhism dhamma, which is a verbal analogue of Dharma, stands for egalitarian moral order.

Being a rational and ethical philosophy, Buddhism holds that the state, as a synonym of government or nation, and the class system (Sanskrit, varna) are sanctioned by human expedience. William Theodore de Bary attests to this, further in his text, by explaining that the Raja had a social contract with his subjects. A.S. Altekar agreed to this in State and Government in Ancient India, that government according to Buddhism was a solely and wholly human institution, and contrary to the Vedic Hindu attitude that it has a ‘divine’ origin. A.L. Balsham affirms that from the existence of a first king, kingship was dependent upon social contract. Furthermore, as he explains, the king is a public servant who depends upon the needs and wishes and of his subjects.

While discussing socio-political approach of Buddhism, we need to emphasize righteousness to be the wisest choice for a leader. It protects both the monarch or leader and his subjects. Accordingly, a righteous monarch follows the proper course of judgment and avoids prejudice, fear
and malice or delusion. Furthermore, he should look upon his subjects as his sons and daughters. Third, he should be generous, speak well of others, conduct activities which only benefit the public and avoid partiality.

Evidence of a semi-democratic concept of state is given by Donald E. Smith (1966). Besides mentioning social equality (as theory) in Buddha’s life time, Smith noted that Buddhism contained anti-authoritarian sentiment and employed ‘madhyamarga’ or the middle path (moderation) to cause peaceful compromise in argument. In addition, the Sangha itself was analyzed as a democratic society. Members were admitted with due consideration and were allowed to debate with others or among themselves freely. Buddhism was also against private ownership of property and accepted the notion of public property, which has overtones of both pure democracy and socialism.

The Buddhists had their own legend of the origin of kingship, which involved no heavenly prototype, but looked back to a primitive social contract. The Buddhist text Digha Nikaya says that mankind was righteous at the beginning, but when sinfulness gradually crept into human society; it decided to appoint one man from among them to maintain order in return for a share of the product of their fields and herds. He was called “the Great Chosen One” (Mahasammata), and he received the title of raja because he pleased the people.

The story of the Mahasammata gives one of the world’s earliest versions of the widespread contractual theory of the state. It implies that the main purpose of government is to establish order and that the king, as
head of the government, is the first social servant, who is ultimately dependent on the suffrage of his subjects.

From the evidence of the Vedic texts, the Arthasastra of Kautiśalya, Manu’s Dharma-sastra, and the early Buddhist canonical texts, we may conclude that the king’s function was the protection not only of his kingdom against external aggression, but also of life, property and traditional custom against internal foes. The duty of protection involved developing irrigation, relieving famine, and generally supervising the economic life of the kingdom. The early Buddhist texts including Jatakas give us the examples of good kings who observed the ten royal virtues and the duties of the pious Buddhist layman.

For the Buddha, who seldom debated the role of the monarch, the raja had five qualities, beginning with a noble birth. A true king could not be born among commoners. Second was wealth, citing that it could stave off corruption. Provided that the Raja was sensible enough, wealth could be used for social development. The third was a strong army for national security. The next quality is a wise minister. Herein, Buddha agreed with Kautiśalya but places the minister’s importance later. The last quality of the raja coincides with Kautiśalya too: Kautiśalya emphasized alliance (mitra) and Buddha emphasized a good reputation. They agreed because, essentially, a good reputation precedes the person and may go abroad before the body of the person. In so doing, it creates respect and strong alliance.
1.4.1 Ideal Statehood in Buddhism

According to the Buddha’s fourth sermon, Vasakara, the chaplain to Ajātaśatru, had been sent to enquire to the health and welfare of the Buddha and to seek council regarding a tentative campaign against the Vajjins. The Vajjins were both a united tribe and disciples of the Buddha. He taught them unity, sensibility and righteousness as a result of which they would prosper. He told Vasakara that so long as the Vajjins held public assemblies frequently, met and acted united, followed and respected the dharma, obeyed their elders and established practices and obtained women fairly, they would not be destroyed.

This in fact is the wise practice of a united and democratic nation. The Vajjins were not labeled as “democratic” because democracy was invented by the Greeks many years after the Buddha’s enlightenment. But their actions as prescribed are fair and sensible and could only lead to good results. Elsewhere in this sermon, Buddha spoke on righteousness that when a king was righteous, his subjects would be righteous.

If we think of a state in which the members like Vajjins are following the teachings strictly, and the King and the subjects are equally righteous, and everyone prospers rather than declines, then we are looking at what Buddha conceived as an ideal state. It is a state which can go forward in to the future based upon a proper present and arising from an equally suitable past (Paticca sammupada) and proceeding with propriety and caution. Its subjects are united in all endeavors, speak in one voice and are not divided on any issue.

It is rational to foresee only prosperity and happiness for any one who acts thus, whether an individual, a group (society) or a nation. The
objective of Buddha’s discussion of the Vajjins with Venerable Ananda and Vasakara, who came respectfully to seek advice, may be to outline by proxy the characteristics of an ideal state. However, the republic was ultimately defeated because Ajātaśatru acted according to Buddha Gautama’s council and created dissent among them. Thus, even thousand years before the quotation, it was proven that “united we stand, divided we fall.”