CHAPTER – III

ARTHASAstra ON POLITICAL CONDITION
OF THE STATE AND INSTITUTION OF KINGSHIP

The discovery of Arthasastra was an epoch making event in Indian History of Political Literature where the great writer Kautilya was considered as the first and foremost earlier writer of this. It embraced economical aspect as well as political principles and laid emphasis on the need for sanctions against social disorder. So truly we can say, Arthasastra regulates the Social and Political situation of the State as well as the people who have lived there in. Like Ramayana and Mahabharata, Arthasastra gives us an exact idea about the development of the Ancient Indian Polity. Scholars like Manu, Yagyavalkya have also contributed to the development of Political Literature. So the theory of Political Science has been discussed by various writers on Social and Political condition of the State in Ancient India. The Smrtis of Manu and Yajnavalkya deal with an account of the duties and responsibility of the King, the functions of the officials, civil and criminal laws, and the principles of foreign policy. But their account is not as comprehensive as that of Arthasastra of Kautilya. Here we are going to discuss about the political condition of the State which has been narrated by Kautilya in his Text Arthasastra.

1. Monarchy:

The Indian Sociologists have since early days denounced the state of anarchy. Since very ancient times, we can say, from the Vedic age the
institution of Kingship came to be regarded highly by the Indian people. If we go through the Puranic age, we can find the nature of King and his position was most essential for the State. Between a Kingless State, and the State one, which is badly governed by a King, The Indian mind preferred the second one. In _Bhagavatapurana_ it is described that, the Sage (_Rishis_) placed the undeserving Vena on the throne only on account of the fear of anarchy. That is why the Sage chose to place such a bad King like Vena on the throne. A kingless State in that time meant a chaotic condition of administration, which was supposed to lead to the ruin of the whole nation. An orderly rule by the Institution of a Kingship had come to stay as the only efficacious form of Government capable of protection of the society as well as State and its all round progress, establishment of peace and its march toward culture and civilization. This was only possible under the rule of law backed by the strong arm of the ruler to punish the offenders. Our tradition says that, when the _Kshatriya_ class was created as a strong arm of the nation, the Kingship came to be evolved as the symbol of power. In this case Manu explained in his text _Manusmriti_ “When all the people were frightened by anarchy and chaos that prevailed and when they began to disintegrate and flee away, the Almighty raised a King. For that King, the representative of the divine, the protector of the people, the Almighty produced a sceptre which was at once a weapon of power and a symbol of Law and Justice”. So the King and institution of Kingship have become the fulcrum of the stability and safety of the society as much as of its peace and prosperity. The goodness and nobility of the institution of Kingship depends upon the King’s administration and his Justice. So _Arthasastra_ says:-
The path of happiness is in the observance of the Law, which meant the performance of one’s duties. Adherence to the path of duty is only possible under better economic conditions. It is easy to understand how only under a stable and strong Government the economic condition of the society can be what is desired. By this way only stable and strong government can be possible. Therefore the King and the Institution of Kingship both are responsible for a stable Government. There is a famous saying in the ChandogyaUpanisada in which, King Asvapati describes his own Kingdom and his subject as – In my Kingdom there is no thief; there is no coward, nor a miser; there is no drunkard; nor is there one who has not taken the vow of worship of the ‘fire’; there is no idiots in my Kingdom, nor men of lose character, where could therefore be women without moral?

न मे स्तेनो जनपदेन कदयों न मधफः |
नानाहितापिनिवधान् न स्वैरी स्वैरिङी कुलस्थिति |
(ChandogyaUpanisads 5-11)

So a Kingdom should be like this where it should be free from vice and misery.

Lastly, we can say that, it was the concept of Indian Law-givers like Manu, and Kautilya that, the King must look for his personal happiness in the happiness of his subject; their welfare tended to his good, there was nothing personal and exclusive to the King; his identification with his subjects must be so complete that their good and bad must be considered by
him as his personal good or bad, only a King who is modest with learning, who is ever dedicated to the procurement of the pleasures and satisfaction of his subjects, deserves to enjoy the Lordship of the earth³.

**King and Administration:-**

The scheme of Administration, as discussed by Kautilya in *Arthasastra*, is so wide and extensive. In his scheme, the King (राजा) possesses the prominent place and he is the central figure. The King is the higher authority and everything should be conducted in his name only. Since the personal administration of a large and vast empire was beyond the capacity of one man or Individual, Kautilya prescribed a well-regulated machinery and a vast organised bureaucracy based on a hierarchy of agents of different grades. By the help of the agent of different grades, the system of administration is to be built up. According to Kautilya the important administrative bodies may be divided into four parts⁴ such as:-

i) The Central Executive Machinery.

ii) The Consultative Body or *Mantriparisada* and the Secretariat.

iii) The Bureaucracy and the Department of Central Government.

iv) Provincial and the Local Government.

i) The first category of Administration is the Central Executive Machinery which consisted of the King and his advisers and the Department Heads or Chief Officials. Twenty members were included in it. They are:-
1. **Mantrin** – The Minister, who have better knowledge about *Veda*, *Purana*, and he must be native and favorite of the people. *Mantrin* has been translated as controller also.

2. **Purohita** – He has not mere an ordinary priest to administer spiritual and religious needs of the King but he has also to perform the same for him. The King was to regard him as preceptor and to venerate him as a son of his father.

3. **Senapati** – Kautilya preferred him as a man of royal blood for this post. He was the important official of the state and he excercised administrative control over the army.

4. **Yuvaraja** – The hair-apparent or the crown-prince was closely associated with administrative work.

5. **Dauvarika** – He is the keeper of royal gate and through him the applications are reached to the King.

6. **Antarvamsika** – The leader of harem. He was the in charge of royal harem.

7. **Prasastri** – He had important military functions. His main duty is to administer punishment and preserve peace in the royal camp.

8. **Samaharta** – The collector general of the revenue. He also collects the revenue and maintains peace. Police officers and spies were under his jurisdiction.

9. **Samnidhata** – Receiver general or chamberlain. He receives all dues. He is the in charge of store house, prison house and armouries etc.

10. **Pradesta** – He conducted both the executive and judicial functions. He has to supervise the work of spy, collecting *Bali*, administer criminal justice and inflict punishment.
11. **Nayaka** – Leader of the force – He was a military official. He occupied the frontal position.

12. **Paura** – He was the superintendent of the capital city.

13. **Vyavaharika** – He was the City Judge.

14. **Karmantika** – He was the superintendent of manufacturers.

15. **Dandapala** – He was military-cum-police official.

16. **Durgapala** – He was the Governor of the fort.

17. **Antapala** – He was the Governor of the frontier.

18. **Atavikas** – He was the controller and chief of the forest.

19. **Karagaradhikarin** – Overseers of prisons.

20. **Dravyasamcayakarta** – Steward.

All they were collectively carry on the administrative activities. Their number is also varying from time to time and sometimes multiplied to suit the need of the time. All authority flowed from the monarch or King who delegated powers to a number of larger officials under whom were working small officers. In anytime, all of them were answerable to the King.

ii) The second part of the administration of the Government is the consultative body or **Mantriparisada**. The King has to have advisers to help him to rule; he cannot carry on the work of administering the State unaided. It is humanly impossible, for a single individual, however strong and intelligent, to regulate and guide the entire social organisation in a proper manner. So it is clear that, to govern a State without guidance and cooperation of honest and loyal ministers to the King, is an impossible task. Already it has been mentioned that, **Mantriparisada** should be composed of ministers, selected from well-tried families, well-versed in sciences, heroic
skill in the use of arms, descended from noble families, possessed of enthusiasm, dignity and endurance, pure in character, affable, firm in loyal devotion etc. The appointment of these officials is depends upon the King’s voluntary business and thus a matter of pure expediency. The King does not actually delegate authority; he rather seeks to lession his burden but not his responsibility. Final decisions always depend upon him.

So in this connection Kautilya says – “In critical movement, the King shall summon his ministers individually and collectively and deliberate with them. He shall either act up to the decision of the majority or to that which appears to bring success. The King always presided over the Mantriparisada. It was only a consultative body without powers of initiating measures. The head of this Parisada is known as Prime Minister. The position of the Prime Minister entirely depends upon the sweet will of the King. He was also the joint head of the Mantrins (Cabinet), the Amatyas or (the chief executive officers). These council of ministers were to be constituted of an inner and outer body. The inner body was concerned with deliberation and policy making and the outer-body was charged with carrying these decisions into action.

According to Prof. Radhakrishna choudhary the major duties of the Mantriparisada may be categorised as follows –

1) Commencement of the work not begun.
2) Completion of the work begun.
3) Improvement of the accomplished work.
4) Proper execution of the order passed.
5) General supervision of the working of the administrative machinery.

Except these the *Mantriparisada*, also aided and advised the King on all important matters of the state. The State business was formally discussed in the council. Every act and venture ought to be proceeded by proper deliberation. The King should not do anything without deliberation. In the council, the majority opinion in all matters was accepted as final. The *Mantriparisada* was associated with all important functions of the State.

iii) The all engrossing bureaucracy was highly complex machinery. In order to preserve the tranquility in state, all officers had to be paid in commensurate with their ability, the hazardous nature of the work and service rendered to the King. The main aim and object of the Organisation of Bureaucracy was only responsible for the success of the administrative Department. According to Kautilya, the young men of responsible family, wisdom and purity were to be recruited for the Government Service. Only persons of highest virtue were appointed as ministers. These were several grades of *Amatyas*, the highest of these were *Mantrinah*. Various department of administration were functioning under them. These are the following administrative departments, which has been clearly maintained by *Arthasastra*.

1. Department of Revenue collection.
2. Department of receipts into the treasures.
3. Department of Audit.
4. Department for the issue of Royal writs.
5. Department for the keeping of royal treasury.
6. Department of Mines.
7. Department of base metals.
8. Department of exploiting ocean mines.
9. Department of Salt.
10. Department of Coin
11. Department of Jewelry control.
12. Department of Gold Mining.
13. Department for the upkeep of Agriculture and forest.
14. Department for the control of supply of commodities.
15. Department for receiving raw vegetable and forest products.
16. Department of weapons and implements of war.
17. Department for regulating weights and measures.
18. Department for the regulation and measurement of mines.
19. Department for the collection of tax.
20. Department for supervision of weaving.
21. Department of Agriculture and royal farms.
22. Department for the regulation of wine shops.
23. Department for regulating the slaughter house.
24. Department for the regulation of courtesans and allied trades.
25. Department for regulating royal ferries.
26. Department of port towns.
27. Department of royal cows.
29. Department of royal elephants.
30. Department of royal chariots.
31. Department of infantry.
32. Department of passport.
33. Department of pastures and uninhabited meadows.
34. Department of waste land.
35. Department for regulating guilds.
36. Department for regulating shops and prices.
37. Department of Mint.

These are the thirty-seven departments, which were the part of administration governed by King as well as well as his assistants.

iv) In Ancient Age, particularly during the time of Kautilya the state or empire had become too extensive to be ruled by one Central Executive body. It was not possible to have direct contact or dealings with the distance provinces. For the betterment of administrative functions, the state was divided into a number of provinces, and they were constituted as separate units under the Princes of royal blood or Governors. Naturally the Kautilyan scheme of administration was Janapada or province which normally consisted of 800 villages with hundred to five hundred families. The provincial defences were well organised and frontier guards protected the approaches to the province. The viceroys were recruited from the prince of royal blood. They were the heads of the provinces. The viceroys had council of ministers and he also appointed ministers or Mahamatyas for purposes of inspection of Judicial administration. Alongside the vicereoyalties, there were governorships and the governors were known as Rajjuka. The governor was also sometimes called as a Rastriya, Rastrapala, or Rastramukhya and Isvara. The Viceroy enjoyed high and wide powers. They had to maintain law and order in their respective areas and protect the state from external
enemies. He had to supervise revenue collection and to take steps for public utility like construction of Dams, arrangement of irrigation facility etc. Except these the local Government like rural and urban administrations was also functioning under the control of King indirectly. Each part of administration of the state was strongly linked with the King.

**Principle of Dandaniti related to King:-**

The great seer Manu\(^9\) says – “All are controlled by the fear of punishment; it is hard to find a man who is intrinsically good by self volition. In fact all the people surrender before the strong. Not only men, but also the Gods, the demons, the celestial beings, birds, beasts and the reptiles, all without exception, remain within their bounds only on account of the fear of punishment. Where the strong arm of the ruler is alert and watchful, there never arises any doubt or hesitation about the duties and obligations in the minds of the subjects. But it is of course necessary that the arm that rules must also be thoughtful and wise to guide the people on the proper path.” The scholar like Yaska\(^10\) also explain the word ‘Danda’ in Nirukta in both the ways viz., “Punishment which prevents a man from committing crimes and sins as well as which maintains him on the path of morality and order.”

In Indian Science of Administration of a State or a Kingdom, this interpretation of the word is emphasised. Danda or punishment according to Indian Political science means administration and Dandaniti means administration by Law or Justice. Indian political science admits punishment justified by Law and logic as adequate principle and policy of statecraft. This rule of lawful punishment is upheld by the power of the state; and the power resided in the institution of Kingship. This institution
of Kingship was evolved from the class of warriors named as Kṣatriyas. This Kṣatriya Varna is the second constituent part of the Indian society. So here it need not necessary to describe again about the Kṣatriya Varna because already it has maintained in previous chapter\textsuperscript{12}.

Kautilya, a Political stateman strongly believed – "No Danda, No State". According to him, Law was a human creation, a creation of society and of thinkers. The growth of law and justice was closely connected with the prevailing form of social and political organisations. Kautilya enjoyed upon the Kings to be always watchful against Maladministration and oppression of the people by the state. Kautilya’s conception of Kingship was a dynamic principle, a principle of external activism. His dynamic principle demanded the culturalisation of man through education and in this sense, he created new avenues. Danda or punishment was the fountain head of politics and all the works were carried through it. In Mauryan policy, we find that the common laws of the land had a religion as well as legal sanction and it represented the highest power of the State to which even the King and his ministers must bow. So it is clear that, the birth of Danda from Law was its merging into law and these are but the two stages of sovereignty. When Law is its cause, Danda is dejure, but it is defacto when Law is its effects. Their relation is reversible. Authority issues from law and law issues from authority. So in this connection Kautilya says —The King also issued writs and he also clarify that the Law was the embodiment of all order. The King was regarded as the counterpart of Varuna, the moral judge par excellence\textsuperscript{13}.

While stating the general provisions for the settlement of disputes, Kautilya\textsuperscript{14} speaks of four legs or limbs of Law (Catuspadah) Dharma,
Vyavahara, Caritra and Rajasasana and says that each later one supersedes the former one or ones. So according to Surendranath Mital\textsuperscript{15} the Laws made by the King are to be considered as the most important, and further, that thereby he is authorised to make law superseding even Dharma, Vyavahara and Caritra. After dealing with Dandaniti and advocating proper use of Danda Kautilya again says that, “the people of four Varna-s and Asrama-s, maintained by the Danda of the King and attached to their own duties and occupation, keep to their respective paths\textsuperscript{16}.

There were eighteen titles under the Civil Law and the Criminal Law included theft, murder, burglary, forcible entry, poisoning, coining, injury to property, criminal negligence of duty, violation of caste rules, fraud and sedition which comes under the principle of Dandaniti\textsuperscript{17}. At the time of Kautilya, Dandaniti was the wielding of Danda, which alone could procure safety and securing of life. Danda was dependent on discipline. The object of Dandaniti was to ensure the life of a philosopher for the exaltation of mankind. By the help of the Department of Law and Justice, the King controlled the judicial machinery and the administration of justice carried on by the help of Amatyas and the Dharmasthas.

Finally we can say that the main aim behind the exercise of Danda was to arrest the anarchical condition and ensure smooth working of the administration. That is why “No Danda, No state” was the favourite maxim of Kautilya. In other words, Danda was the symbol of sovereignty. It was the duty of the King to consolidate the position of the State. The King regarded as the symbol of people’s progress, the Central pivot of the whole superstructure.
Six Fold Policy of the State as well as the King:-

Kautilya’s *Arthasastra*, which is a perfect culmination of all the good and bad things of the Aryan policy and political philosophy, has also enumerated exhaustively in different ways of striking at and crushing the enemy. The power of the state, which could use these two types of warfare, was necessarily required to be well aquainted in the science of politics and diplomacy. If we would go through the ancient text, we can easily find out that, ‘Diplomacy’ had a special term in Sanskrit that is ‘Nyaya’. The King was expected to know every detail of Labyrinth of Diplomacy. In this context our Ancient scholar says that – “नयकः पृथिवीं जयति”. It is clear that, “one who is skilled in diplomacy will be able to win the whole world”.

So the diplomacy in Ancient days was divided into 6 aspects and it was technically known as “Sadgunyam”. This sixfold policy is an important adjunct of the Kautilyan diplomacy. Kautilya has built up a system of thought upon it. It is laid down that the invading monarch should set out for conquest when the enemy is slack and when his own state is in a condition of prosperity. These six different facets of the art of diplomacy were made effective and fruitful by the famous four expedients of statecraft\(^\text{18}\) such as *Sama* (Conciliation), *Dana* (Gift), *Bheda* (Dissension), and *Danda* (Coercion). By using all of them simultaneously, it is such a diplomatic method that a King should bring other kings under his control.

The Six expedients are *Sandhi* (Peace), *Vigraha* (war or diplomatic conquest), *Asana* (maintaining a post against an enemy), *Yana* (preparedness for attack), *Samsraya* (friendship), *Dvaidhibhava* (double dealing or
duplicity). These six facets of diplomacy were universally known in those ancient times and are still recognised as good methods through which the interests of a state are guarded or advanced. Kautilya says that, the circle of the states is the source of sixfold policy, whoever is inferior to another shall make peace within him; whoever is superior in power shall wage war; whoever is indifferent shall observe neutrality; whoever is possessed of necessary means shall march against his enemy; whoever is devoid of necessary strength to defend himself shall seek the protection of another; whoever thinks that help is necessary to workout an end shall make peace with one and wage war with another.

Here it will be discussed about the sixfold policy one by one briefly:-

1) **Sandhi:-**

This is the first aspect, which is very simple to understand. A state when faced with a more powerful adversary must try to negotiate a peaceful pact to survive. It never pays to oppose the mighty. Therefore it is advised that a small State should survive in alliances with the large or mightier State. Kautilya says the alliances may be temporary (Chalasandhi) or permanent (Stavarasandhi). The alliances were also further categorised according to the substance and term of concession, whether it was a contribution of gold, or a surrender of a piece of Land. **Sandhi** or the treaty system is the frank procedure of diplomacy and Kautilya discusses various kinds of treaties under this heading in first chapter of 7th Book of *Arthasastra*, which are not needed to discussion.
2) Vigrahā-

The second phase is ‘Vigraha’, which meant a conflict with either a stronger or a weaker enemy. The conflict might have been caused over a woman, over a slice of land, over some dishonour of the nation or an account of harbouring and helping the enemy and many more reasons. Kautilya\textsuperscript{22} attaches more values to a diplomatic struggle that to an armed contest, and is only a means to an end i.e., to avoid regular welfare. When a nation had to face another, Kautilya advised, as far as could be possible the root of discontent should be resolved by diplomacy. Resort to weapons should be the last remedy to solve the conflict.

3) Asana:-

The term Asana has been translated in a number of ways suggesting neutrality, or holding a post against an enemy. So Asana is ‘neutrality’ in Modern terminology. This diplomatic move was of course considered practicable only for a strong state. It was generally believed that a weak nation had always to side with the strong nation, as it had no chance of survival between two fighting mights. By Asana, Kautilya envisaged a condition of armed neutrality. A careful study of the working of the Mandala system reveals a number of intermediary relationships. Madhyama and Udasina correspond to neutral kings. Both of them occupied interior zones apart from diplomatic zones\textsuperscript{23}. 
4) Yana:-

*Yana* is the third facet of diplomacy, which simply means that taking into consideration all the points the fighting forces should be marched to the battle field. A King should march only when he is confident that he would be able to destroy his enemies work. The diplomatic utility of *Yana* has been clearly discussed by Kautilya. If the conqueror finds his enemy is set by troubles, his subject disaffected and disunited, his Kingdom ravaged by pestilence and other ills, then he may attack. He should lead an expedition against the enemy in the front after making peace with the rear enemy²⁴.

5) Samsraya:-

*Samsraya* is a device resorted to by diplomats of ancient time as well as of modern days in trying to save one's own state behind the cover of some other stronger state. In this device there was always the risk that the stronger nation which gave cover and protection was likely to swallow itself the smaller ones. So any *Samsraya* or alliance with a great power may be tolerated as stop gap. On account of the fear and consequent gravity of strategic setback, permanent arrangements stand condemned. This alliance may vary according to time and situation. An alliance must be formed or entered in such a case when the King has complete confidence and whose friendship is sincere and genuine²⁵.

6) Dvaidhibhava:-

The Sixth and the last trick of diplomat was the well-known practice of duplicity or double dealing adopted since ancient age. It was not possible
for state of moderate strength to fight more than one enemy at a time. In such an eventually the diplomats kept all other friends silent or guessing by adopting an equivocal attitude until the enemy with whom the state was at war was vanquished. The King who is sued for peace and also the King who offer peace should both consider the motive with which the proposal of peace is made, and adopt the course of action which on consideration seems to be productive of good results.

These are the sixfold policy, which has been discussed in Arthasastra. So Kautilya says, A King should be fully accomplished with this sixfold policy, and by which he can come out victorious. The King who does not follow these six guna-s fails in his aims. By following these principles, he becomes a good ruler of his people as well as successful in his foreign relations and he goes on gaining glory and prosperity and satisfaction of his people.

On a closer study of the institution of Kingship we can find out many more revealing facts. Our Ancestors were fully conscious of the fact that the institution of Kingship was only man made, and that was dependent upon the choice, and will of the people who select their kings. The Hindu institution of Kingship at all times was answerable to the spiritual leadership of the society as well as to the common masses in it. The office of the Kingship was conditional and was determined by the agreement between the King, the spiritual leadership and the common people. In other word we can say that the institution of Kingship was in one sense a joint and co-operative responsibility and was assigned an important function in the life of the state as well as people. The Kingship was tantamount to a trust vested with
interests and cares of the defence of the land, safeguarding the subjects from exploitation and maintaining a happy and harmonious concord between the four classes of the society. The institution of Kingship was never beyond the pale of law and was always considered to be punishable for every violation of the tacit agreement between the King and his subjects. Truly we can say that it was the Kingship which exercised sovereign power.
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