CHAPTER III

THE CENTRAL THEME

Indispensability of the use of force in Arthaśāstra and The Prince:

We shall now discuss the Dandaniti which played a vital role in monarchical administration of ancient India. It was particularly for this dandaniti or the law of punishment that some scholars observed that Kautilya was another Machiavelli, that his standard of morality was depraved and both Kautilya and Machiavelli were champions of monstrous punishments. But this would be only a prejudiced, one-sided and wholly untenable estimate. Both Kautilya and Machiavelli, as can be seen from their works, had invariably a common-sense point of view and offered alternative punishments also, often in the nature of fines. We should not forget that in spite of differences between the Florentine and his Indian counterpart both the Arthaśāstra and The Prince are now regarded as the crown of all earlier Indian and Italian experiments in the exposition of political theory.

N.C. Bandopadhyaya in his Kautilya, a Critical and Historical Study, points out that the Arthaśāstra was written "to procure peace at home and prestige abroad". To Ganapati Sastri (in The Arthaśāstra of Kautilya) the chief aim of the
book was "the protection of one's own kingdom first and, when that is ensured, enterprise for the acquisition of enemies' territories". He further states that the Arthasastra is "a method of government by which a king should rule for the welfare of his millions of subjects, cautious and dexterous in preventing treachery, watching over the conduct of subjects and officials." Similarly, Machiavelli's particular aim was to discover an order in political activity itself, not in some external standard or cause. He examined politics in a detached manner, analyzing the ways in which power can be acquired and maintained. That Machiavelli lived in a Florence whose very life was finance and commerce may also help to explain his attitude, which had some of the characteristics of a business calculation of profit and loss. Machiavelli was essentially concerned with ascertaining the conditions of political success and this he sought to do by determining what kinds of acts have proved beneficial and what kinds detrimental to the political actors who performed them. In The Prince and the Discourses, written between 1513 and 1521, Machiavelli demonstrated the soundness of certain political precepts by using a kind of calculus, by citing numerous examples from history of both 'positive' and 'negative' cases and ultimately, like Kautilya, for the protection of the State he emphasized the law of punishment.

To both the great authors the main object of government was to preserve what had been acquired. By comparison
with Kautilya, let us quote Butler ("Hudibras"):

"Nick Machiavel had ne'er a trick,
Though he gave his name to our old Nick."

Attempts may be made now to know the origin of this
dandaniti which the king used as a means of securing his person
and crown as well as for ensuring public safety. The condition of the society in the political
level in ancient India cannot be expected to have been much
different from that existing in other countries during the same
period and this, in Hobbesian notion, was in the state of
nature subject to a qualification, however, that the society
had come of age in the field of intellectualism but had been
leading a life of political instability.

The efficacy of the dandaniti in administering the
land was fully realized in the days of Mahābhārata. Later
dandaniti as' conceived in Mahābhārata authors who discussed it at length differed
in their views on the nature and scope of
dandaniti but never questioned the place of
danda in State-affairs. The question as to whether the king
was the creator of the age or the age manifested itself as a
mighty historical force behind the creation of the king was
decided by Bhismṛ, the celebrated teacher and warrior-hero of.

King as creator of the age the Mahābhārata. He plainly says that the
king was the creator of the age.¹ We find
the Atharva Vēda echoing the same conviction:
Himself being prosperous (bhûto), he does put strength into the beings (bhûteshu); he became the chief lord of the beings (bhûtanem). Thus, with whatever lustre one may try to adorn the Vedic age by saying that it was an age of elective principle the facts as gleaned from the ancient literature corroborate the view that the king was himself the creator of the age. In other words, it was the king who put strength into his subjects who expected material prosperity from him. The king was expected to be firm like mountain and Indra and always mighty under whom his people could feel themselves secure.

In the Mahabharata, the origin of dandaniti is ascribed to Brahma who is said to have composed the niti in one lac chapters to be abridged by Siva into ten thousand chapters. Dandaniti in the new form was further abridged by Indra who put it into five thousand chapters. The work then fell from the hands of the gods into the hands of the two celebrated teachers — one looking after the cause of the Devas and the other, of the Asuras — viz., Brihaspati and Sukra who further abridged it to three and one thousand chapters respectively to enable the people to comprehend it. Kautilya started his work with salutation to these two great teachers. However, the title, Dandaniti, was retained by Sukra only while Brihaspati gave the name of Arthasastra to his book. Dandaniti which was the law of punishment as also the science of government occupied such a conspicuous position in...
the eyes of the ancient teachers that they divided the ages into four viz., Satya, Tretā, Dvāpara and Kali — each shining over the immediate next by one quarter of purity; in other words, by one quarter of peace and prosperity measured on the basis of the extent of the dandaniti which the king applied against his subjects. When the king acts wholly in accordance with the spirit of dandaniti, the golden age (Satya Yuga) arises and when he acts upto a quarter only he paves the way for the appearance of the Kali (dark) yuga. The Tretā and Dvāpara epoch lie in between. Manu who was primarily concerned with the social codes and conduct and only incidentally dealt with political matters was no less eloquent on the usefulness of the danda and held the opinion that the ultimate sanction behind the State was force. In the absence of the dandaniti the law of the jungle prevails. "It is the danda which rules over all subjects; it is danda which protects them when all else are sleeping, danda keeps awake; law is nothing but danda itself." By saying that danda keeps awake Manu invests it with a personality and in fact declares that it is danda who is the real king, the real leader and the real protector. Danda may then be well understood as the coercive force which was solidly used by a sober administrator and the frightening character of which was successfully imprinted in the minds of the subject people.

Kautilya, who was well acquainted with the Atharva Veda showed great respect to his Atharvan predecessors. But to what
extent he was influenced by the precepts of the Atharva Veda is conjecturable. To his credit it must be said that he did not treat dandaniti in a narrow sense. That sceptre on which the well-being and progress of the science of ‘Anvikshiki’, the triple vedas and vāttā depend is known as danda (punishment). In other words, danda creates an environment in the society in which the study of philosophy, attainment of the highest knowledge and economic pursuits are rendered easy. Also, “It (dandaniti) is a means to make acquisitions, to keep them secure, to improve them, and to distribute among the deserved the profits of improvement. It is on this science of government that the course of the progress of the world depends.”

This wish to acquire more was not the pious wish on the part of a Kautilyan king only. It was ‘admittedly a very natural and common thing’ for a Machiavellian prince also.

Dandaniti in Arthasastra:

Thus Kautilya who upheld the traditional dandaniti interpreted it here as science of government but in the very preceding passage he said “that which treats of danda is the law of punishment or science of government.” Here he understood danda: law of punishment of dandaniti in the sense of law of punishment as well and thus it is seen that the law of punishment and the science of government were interchangeable terms. All through, he tried to establish that by the rightful
use of the *danda* alone the State could be made secure and that the promotion of the three sciences viz., *Avikshakī*, the triple *Vedas* and *Vārtta* could be made possible. Thus he made it clear that it was the *danda* which stood foremost in the business of the State. He further assured that it was the *danda* which assured the safety and security of the king's life also. There is a parallel passage in the *Śānti Parvan* where it was stated that "it does not behove a *Kshatriya* (evidently the king) to remain without coercive power for, neither he nor his subjects then can enjoy prosperity". The entire social well-being was thus dependent upon the *danda* and hence it becomes amply clear that *dandaniti* did not involve the wielding of physical force only but regulated in addition the principles of a social, economic and political existence also.

If seen from a different angle, Kautilya seems to have been a believer in what Hobbes would call the state of nature. He had firm conviction that without *danda*, order could not be established in the society. The people would not follow the rightful path if the king (*svāmi*) tried to rule them without his sceptre. Not only the social well-being and the economic prosperity but even *dharma*, however developed, perish if *dandaniti* becomes lifeless. Thus alongwith the *svāmi* in the list of the elements of the State, *danda* also occupies the first position. tacitly. The only qualification Kautilya desires his king should have is that while awarding punishment he should be learned enough
to know when and to what extent he may extend his sceptre. In reality, however, the author of the *Arthasastra* gives Carte Blanche in the hands of the king, to maintain law and order. Kautilya expects that his king will protect the weak against the strong — in fact, if the king has to remain careful of any section of the society it is the section constituted by the stronger ones — and thus it is understood that the author of the *Arthasastra* believes that if the king severely punishes the strong he will be endeared to the hearts of the bulk of the population because in a monarchical society the weaker sections always suffer as the stronger ones are prone to oppress them. This is just what Machiavelli also believes.

It is then not without reason that Kautilya saw the dandaniti as the end of the Sciences. The other co-occupant of the last chapter on the end of sciences, vārttā, is only dependent on dandaniti. Thus says Kautilya, 'the king can hold under the control both his and his enemy's party only with the assistance of the army and treasury obtained solely through vārttā which, in its turn, depends on the Rod. Vārttā, commercial pursuits, brings in money and other valuable goods to the royal treasury and the army which sustains the king's power can be maintained only when the king is in possession of a sound treasury. Thus Danda which is specifically mentioned as occupying the sixth position in the seven element theory of the State and perceivable in the person...
of Kauṭilya's king\textsuperscript{31} is sometimes bracketted with Kosa\textsuperscript{32}. These two, in combination, can alone sustain the coercive power of the king. The army through which the coercive power was exercised and which functioned both as a police force as well as guards against danger from outside the border became a State-organ and acted as a means to the achievements of particular kinds. In absence of the coercive power the law of jungle prevails and though not specific and eloquent like Kauṭilya Manu also felt the necessity of the army in dandaniti\textsuperscript{33}.

It is readily understood from the above discussion that whatever lofty motives such as social welfare and economic prosperity were in the mind of the author of the Arthaśāstra the policy (i.e. dandaniti) could not escape from becoming harsh particularly in a monarchical land. Moreover, Kauṭilya wrote in an age when the political condition of the country was in a state of fluidity and when the innumerable small kingdoms and republics were merging into one single large empire under the Mauryas. As such, there was little scope for the king to abstain from becoming too dependent on the army and this was more seriously true in relation to the territories newly acquired. Kauṭilya's dandaniti was the culmination of the older nitis and it corresponded to the seizure of more centralized and despotic power by the monarch.\textsuperscript{34} The appearance of the Buddha not only offered a shattering blow to the pre-eminence of the Brāhmīns but also synchronised with the emergence of the Kshatriyas — Buddha.
himself being a Kshatriya — as the most powerful section of the society. The unlimited despotic power thus seized by the Kshatriya monarch could be sustained only through a serious utilization of the danda though it might not necessarily involve severe punishment except when occasion so demanded.

The view that the supremacy of the Kshatriyas was firmly established is manifested in Kautilya's list of the elements of the State also where the name of the priest was dropped. The priests, probably, by reason of their knowledge, occupied the ranks of the amatyas and thus followed the king in the 'State-elements'. But the Kshatriya king was not bound to accept the advice of his ministers though, however, he consulted them in complicated matters. In times of emergency, the king was desired by Kautilya to consult all the ministers and abide by their suggestions. But this was evidently to avert the anger of the people in case failure attended the measures adopted by the king and in no way proves the importance of the ministers or the priests. In fact, it was a brilliant example of Kautilya's deceitful state-craft where the king could escape the wrath of his subjects by making the majority of the nobility — who, in some way or the other, were the guardians of the people — responsible for failure in grave situations.
Place of cruelty in Machiavellian politics

It is seen in the above discussion that danda constitutes the sustaining force of Kautilya's government. Let us now examine what does Machiavelli say in this connection? In fact, we shall find astonishing similarities. Machiavelli has no objection to a king's becoming too faithful to his words but facts and realities have compelled him to hold the view that great achievements can be made by those only who know to play with their words. In fact, those princes who showed little respects for their words and knew how to trick men with cunning became successful while those who were too rigid to follow the honest principles failed utterly. There are two ways, says Machiavelli, to get into success: by law and by force. Though the first is proper to men and the second to beasts yet men cannot always act rationally i.e., in the manner in which he should act but follows the 'laws of the beasts'. Hence it is necessary for a prince to understand both—when to make use of the rational and when of the brutal way. This was wonderfully taught to princes by ancient writers.

Like Kautilya, Machiavelli also expects that his prince will be wise and prudent enough to realise whether it will be better to abide by the words given or, to disregard the pledges. However, he never holds that a prince should be bereft of having the outward good appearance. Men are impressed by
appearances and results. A prudent prince should, therefore, have lips replete with deceitful utterances showing that he is merciful, faithful, humane, upright and religious — the last one being the most important — but he will have the least occasion to use them for, men generally judge "by the eye rather than by the hand". In other words, everybody sees but few understand and as very few come in close touch with the prince in comparison to the large number who see him from a distance the latter will remain satisfied if the prince appears before them as good. Machiavelli put this view from the examples of contemporary rulers. For example, Ferdinand of Aragon had never preached anything but fidelity and good faith, and yet had he exercised either the one or the other he would have lost his reputation or his state many a time.

It is with such intelligence as mentioned above that the prince should, in Machiavelli's view, deal with his people. Like Machiavelli, Kautilya did not openly speak that the king should be so crafty. But he was well aware of the utility of playing false games. His overwhelming dependence on the espionage leads us to believe that he differed very little from his Italian counterpart in his estimate of the human character. Man's action is justified by the achievements he makes and not by the manner in which he makes these achievements.

It is not objectionable that a prince should have a
desire to have a reputation for compassion but he should be

Question of Cruelty careful enough to see that he is not making
Cruelty a bad use of desire to have a reputation for compassion but he should be

Ceasar Borgia, for example, was considered cruel, yet that cruelty reduced
Romagna, unified it, and restored order and obedience. In the
final analysis it will appear that Ceasar Borgia should be con-
sidered more merciful — as he became able to establish law and
order in the unified Romagna — than the proud Florentine people
who, to escape being called cruel, allowed Pistoria to be devas-
tated. We find a similar view in the Arthas\textit{\textasciitilde}stra when Kautilya
says that what pleases the King's subjects, not his ownself,
should be considered as good. This speaks in a round-about way
that the Kautilyan King is at liberty to take measures which,
though may appear as evil at first sight, if ensure the people's
welfare should be considered as good. Machiavelli opines that
so long a prince can maintain law and order and unity in his
principality and keep his subjects loyal he has nothing to worry
even if he has to pursue a cruel policy. In fact, a new prince
cannot avoid to have the ill-reputation for cruelty because
there are abundant dangers in a newly won State. He may have
no other means but to adopt cruel measures when he is to secure
and maintain the newly won State in the teeth of the will of a
supposedly hostile people. His condition is, as Machiavelli
points out:

88

\textit{\textasciitilde}stra when Kautilya
say,
against my will, my fate,
A throne unsettled, and an infant state,
Bid me defend my realms with all my pow'rs,
And guard with these severities my shores. 50

The successful Italian princes of the fifteenth century had all risen from low position by dint of sheer merit and strewdness. Machiavelli was concerned with the true picture of what actually happens and the precepts he left in his political philosophy were derived "from the way in which men had behaved and did behave". 51 The age cautioned all, who were willing to establish their supremacy, against following the practices of the earlier ages, i.e., against indulging into endless barbarities. Barbarity was permitted but unto a limit only. It should not incite the public opinion to go against the ruler. 52 As long as the whole community will not dare to revolt against the prince, he is permitted to adopt cruel policy even if it involves executions for, "executions ordered by a prince only affects individuals". 53 Like Kautilya's king who pursues the dandaniti to ensure the safety, prosperity and increase in the size of his dominion, Machiavelli's prince believes that politics deals with the preservation of dominion and increase of political power and it is useless speaking that the policy pursued to get the desired results involves a cruel policy. 54 However, from this does not follow the logical conclusion that the prince should consistently follow a cruel policy in regard to his subjects. Rather he should allow his behaviour to be tempered.
Sheldon Wolin points out that Machiavelli believed in a permanent "economy of violence" — the need for a consistent reserve of force always in the background to keep things going in such a way that the virtues admired by him can be protected and allowed to flower.

Now a question arises, as Machiavelli says: whether it is better to be loved than feared or the reverse. Machiavelli argues that since both cannot be expected in the person of one it is better to be feared than loved because man are by nature greedy, liars and deceivers and are prone to desert the prince in times of his peril but swarm like bees when he is in his good days. In political world, Machiavelli opines, there is no room for moral values such as love, fellow-feeling as a social creature and men are as quick to break the bond of love as quickly they are formed particularly, if they feel that breach of the bond will pay. On the other hand, if the bond of attachment between the prince and his subjects is one governed by fear instead of love, people generally will not act contrary to the expectations of their ruler for fear of meeting punishment. There is only one single condition which the prince must observe in his 'cruel policy'. It is that he must see that he is not hated by his people.

Does Machiavelli not resemble Kautilya who also says that "whoever imposes severe punishment becomes repulsive to the people" while he "who awards mild punishment" — resembling
Machiavelli's that prince who wants to be loved than feared — "becomes contemptible". In fact we see that Machiavelli has echoed Kautilya in almost the same words. "The prince's behaviour should be tempered with humanity" can well be compared with Kautilya's "whoever imposes punishment (danda) as deserved becomes respectable". Both then believed in the efficacy of stern policies in statecraft subject to the condition, however, that the prince is not hated by the whole community for that.

The monarch may avert earning the hatred of his people if he does not put his hand on the property of his subjects. This question of private property injures the people's sentiment and jeopardises the prince's security.

Machiavelli astutely realises this and emphasises on safeguarding the 'right to property' of the subject-people. Kautilya also is not silent on the point though it may seem that he is not as eloquent as Machiavelli in this regard. In fact, he enjoins a conquering king to distribute the gains obtained among the deserving people. Ch. IV of Bk. I of the Arthasastra shows clearly that Kautilya honoured the right to private property. None of the authors however, saw the right to property of the subject people as a fundamental right. Neither the age nor the monarchical rule as conceived by them permitted Kautilya and Machiavelli to think of fundamental rights even in the remotest sense of the term though it is known that Machiavelli held in high esteem the
kingdom of France and her parliament while Kautilya appreciated the corporations.

The hymns of the earlier literature, particularly of Atharva Veda, cited in the preceding pages, are no longer to be found or expected in the new Arthasastra. That age had long ago passed away when the people would assemble before the king ratifying his seizure of the throne and praying for bestowal of blessings and use of energy in ameliorating their condition.

The new age in which Kautilya lived synchronised with the appearance of the omnipotent monarch who no longer required the ratification of his acts by his subjects and could depend on his own strength.

This change in the circumstances was manifested in other spheres as well. The super-dominating personality of the king now was felt not only in the political life of the State but in her economic life also. The king showed his interest in all fields pertaining to economic activities, and he left no stone unturned in his endeavour to augment the State-income. The State was not a laissez-faire State and it actively participated in agriculture, mining activities, forestry and even ran industries. Thus Kautilya wanted to see a sound State-exchequer though, at the same time he showed due honour to the right to property of the subjects while Machiavelli upheld the sanctity and inviolability of the property-right of the multitude purely from a selfish angle;
otherwise, he does not differ from Kautilya.

The right to property is bracketed in Machiavelli with the honour of the women of the citizens. Machiavelli's sole concern was the safety and security of the king's person and his State and it was this obsession that prompted Machiavelli to advise the king to honour private property and the women. These are the two things, Machiavelli astutely realises, about which men are very sensitive and will not hesitate to take the law in their own hands if encroachment comes from any quarter. However, he observes that if the majority of the people remains pleased with the king he has little to think about the few ambitious men whom he can curb in many ways and with ease.

A prince has only two things to fear: the rebellion of his subjects and the dangers arising from external threat. The latter can be tackled by the prince if he is well-armed and has good allies but when there is no disturbance from outside the border the prince's chief fear is from the subjects who may indulge in secret conspiracies and, if they do really indulge in, the prince's everything would be at stake for, one who has been deserted by the populace has least chance of maintaining his State and authority. The strength of the Machiavellian State depends particularly on the patriotism of the people and a ruler who impairs the people's liberty by depriving them from owning private property is sure to throw himself into danger.
other hand, the ruler who gives his people the most complete security guarantees his popularity. It is to ensure the continuity of his rule that a prince should refrain from confiscating private property and molestation of women.

Restraint of the organs of sense in the Arthasastra and Machiavelli on this point:

There is a radical difference in the opinion of Machiavelli and Kautilya as to the qualities and the character a monarch should have. Machiavelli does not expect that his prince will have all the good qualities for which men are esteemed. Particularly, a new prince, being in precarious circumstances, in order to maintain the states, "is often forced to act contrary to fidelity, friendship, humanity and religion." Machiavelli will not say however, that the prince should diverge from the good if he can avoid doing so but he knows it full well that in a corrupt society where the "necessary virtues have decayed" there is no possibility of restoring good days except through absolute monarchy which will be successful only if it uses despotic power. Therefore, it is unnecessary, in Machiavelli's opinion, to speak that the prince must possesses all the good qualities though it is essential for him to appear to have them.

Kautilya's king, on the other hand, though he sees through the spies and "establishes safety and security by being ever active" that is, plainly speaking, his king being as shrewd
and as vigilant as the prince of Machiavelli, must have good education including the practical knowledge of how to restrain the organs of sense if he is to be a revered king. To Machiavelli, corruption can be fought by corruption only. But Kautilya does not appear here to believe in this process. He believes rather that a king who is well educated can only act according to the needs of situation. He does not believe that a king who has not built a sound character by proper and serious education will be able to pursue a course that requires the restraint of the organs of sense. A king who has not learnt, under discipline, to abandon lust, anger, greed, vanity (māṇa), haughtiness (mada) and overjoy (harsha), hardly avoid these things in practical life. Mere appearance to have the qualities will not do though it does with Machiavelli's prince. The king must, in reality, possess these because strict observance of these organs of sense can alone ensure the rigidity of the king's character.

However, though, Kautilya and Machiavelli differ in the character of their princes they do not at all differ in their ultimate goal. What calamity may befall a king who tries to make a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇ maiden is illustrated in the Arthasastra by the example of Bhojarāja. Several other kings who were led by these 'six enemies' all perished with their kingdoms and relations though many of them possessed vast empire. There is such astonishing similarity between the opinions of the authors that at times it may seem that Machiavelli
simply quoting Kautilya in regard to private property and
women! Thus Machiavelli wrote:

"It makes him (the Prince) hated above all things —
to be rapacious and to be a violator of the property and women
of his subjects, from both of which he must abstain." 76

While Kautilya wrote: (with his organs of sense under
control) he (the king) shall keep away from hurting the women
and property of others." 77 What a strange similarity? Indeed,
great men think alike.

The King's duties in the Arthasastra:

In ancient India the duties of the king toward his
subject constituted a vital part of the king's business. No king
could expect to lead a life of 'go as you like'. The king, even
though he was the creator of the age, was to act according to
the precepts contained in the specifically written science of
government or he might also follow the tradition. In the period
when the Brāhmīns had hold over the king they had tried to bring
him under the purview of 'dharma' by saying that the king was not
above the law. 78 Dharma presumably played a sort of constitu-
tional check upon the king during the period of Brāhmīn supremacy
but, the question was that if the king tried to dominate over
the champions of dharma instead of the champions of dharma
dominating over the king then who could punish the king if he
transgressed the law. This led a second school to opine that the king was adandya or above punishment. The king holding the reins of government and having the support of a fighting force composed by men of his own caste viz., the Kshatryyas, had little to worry if he violated the law. Indeed, it may be said that the emergence of the caste-system on the basis of occupation and its taking a solid form from the endeavour of the Brahmins, eventually worked against their own interest and largely contributed for the decline of their power who thereafter leaving the affairs of the State in the hands of the Kshatryya — the other superior caste, confined themselves, to study alms-begging and acting as priests in ceremonies. The Brahmins became a purely religious class while the Kshatryyas were entrusted with discharging the political duties. Thus a king violating the law made by the Brahmins was beyond their power as regards awarding punishment and hence the Brahmins had to console themselves with the poisonless forecast that a faulty king would be punished by God. In fact, according to the ancient texts, the first ruler was created by Brahma who ordered that the king should be regarded as the supreme head in all vital matters of the State.

However, it would be wrong to suppose on the basis of above discussion that the king acted as an unbridled despot. The king had such scopes no doubt but, he had a strong background.
moulded by proper education which would not generally tempt him to pursue such a harsh course as is generally adopted by unbridled despots. Kautilya armed his monarch with unlimited power but did not wish that he would use that power arbitrarily. However, a king who has not a rigid character can hardly be expected to act as a benevolent patriarch. Hence Kautilya advocates that the prince should be given proper education in order to build his physique and improve his intellect. The study of the prince is included by Kautilya in the list of the prince's duties: These enable him (the prince) to become a better man while the public duties of the king have a direct bearing on his relations with the people. The duties are heavy and numerous and hence it follows that a king who has not undergone a proper disciplinary course will find it extremely difficult to stand the pressure of the hard work that would require him to remain engaged for almost the whole of the day.

Kautilya advises the king that he should never cause the petitioners wait at the door once they have assembled during the scheduled hours nor should he entrust his officers to look into the grievances of the people particularly when they seek the monarch's attention. Further, he will never put off but shall hear all urgent cells at once because delay in such matters may make them impossible to accomplish. If there is a religion it is the readiness on the part of the king to action; if there is any sacrifice its performance lies in the satisfactory discharge of duties.
It is not difficult to discover in the duties stated by Kautilya that the king had to depend much on his secret agents and that the night particularly concerned him—which shows that a king should always remain apprehensive of conspiracy brewing in the dark—and hence he consulted the commander-in-chief every evening. Hence it is for the safety of his person and realm that the king must feel that "in the welfare of the people lies his welfare" and accordingly act. If he fails to remain ever active and to do duties pertaining to the welfare of his subjects "his present acquisitions and acquisition to come will perish". A disaffected people rise against the king along with his enemy and "the conclusion of Kautilya is that no king should ever generate poverty, acquisitive greediness and disaffection among the people".

Kautilya's concern over the duties of the king is visible in the other chapters of the work also. The King must adopt measures that will ensure public welfare in various ways.

Social welfare and protection of people in Arth,

These have been discussed by Kautilya in Book IV named Kantaka-śodhana (eradication of thorns or anti-social elements). The king must provide protection to the public against fraudulent artisans and merchants and give State relief against providential calamities e.g., fire, flood, epidemic, famine etc. He is also to see to the following: protection of the public from the acts of evil doers living by secret and foul ways.
detection and punishment of the criminals; examination of the cases of sudden death; questioning and torture for extorting confessions from the suspects; protection of the people from the oppression of government servants and punishment under penal laws for certain types of crimes.

Thus Kautilya's king would not only pay personal attention to the prayers of his people — though we are not quite certain whether he did it because he believed in the social welfare of the people or because he wanted to secure his self interest — but also protect them from being oppressed. The second one certainly involved the administering of law and one will be astonished to see that Kautilya spoke in such words in connection with agreement with the artisans that contain the essential elements of a valid contract of modern times. The protection of the subjects necessarily involved the punishment of the wicked and herein lay, according to one writer, the success of ancient India's remaining almost immune from crime like theft as punishment was prompt and severe. Public welfare occupied such an important place in the affairs of the king that in case of famine he would not hesitate to force the rich to 'vomit their surplus' and distribute the same among the innumerable poor.

Kautilya advises the king to protect families from adultery and ensure public health. To maintain the health of the society the king would inflict punishment upon the adulterers.
and the punishment would be commensurate with the seriousness of the crime committed including even death. Further, Kautilya was very orthodox about the caste-system. In no case, would he allow people of one caste to infiltrate into another and instructed the king to see that the people "consisting of four castes and four orders of religious life" devotedly adhered to their respective duties and occupation.

Curiosity prompts us to examine whether Kautilya's duties of the King were actually performed by the king for whose use the Arthasastra was supportedly written. Megasthenes, who had little scope of knowing the Indian legal codes, and who saw the king a few times in the court said that the "king may not sleep during the day time ... He remains in court for the whole day, without allowing the business to be interrupted, even though the hour arrives when he must need attend to his person — that is, when he is to be rubbed with cylinders of wood. He continues hearing cases while the friction, which is performed by four attendants, is still proceeding". This statement agrees well with that of Kautilya which also informs us that the king had to remain for the most part of the day in the court. The Mauryan king's untiring energy in the prompt discharge of his duties made possible the rise of the first magnificent empire on the ruins of the Nandas though Chandragupta Maurya was a usurper only in the beginning.
Machiavelli on his prince's duty toward the subjects.

In contrast to Kautilya, Machiavelli was not greatly anxious for the welfare of the people. It is not that Machiavelli disregarded the importance of the people in his political philosophy nor can it be said that he was not concerned about the welfare of the people on the ground that the people enjoyed little importance in a monarchical State. Machiavelli, on the other hand, was fully aware of the fact that the strength of a State indeed depended on the strength of the people inhabiting the State. Furthermore, as one of the Florentines who were accustomed to enjoying the rights and privileges of citizens and as one who wrote the Discourses in which he showed his sympathy for the republics it was not possible for him to deny the rights of the people against their ruler. But as he was speaking for the new prince who would just come to establish his hold over the land it was not possible for Machiavelli to dwell at length on the point.

Unlike Kautilya, Machiavelli was not concerned with an established king and as such he could not treat politics in all its aspects as was done by his Indian counterpart. Yet, Machiavelli's attitude toward the duties his prince was to perform for his subjects, which are incidental in his writing, can be perceived. Apparently, his attitude towards the subjects is one...
of a negative impression. He dealt with them not from the angle of theirs but from that of their ruler's interest. This is because, as has already been stated, he wrote for a prince and a dominion both of which were in the very initial stage i.e., when they were yet in their formative stage and did not strike any firm root. The book was a discussion of princedoms, with special emphasis on new ones — the result of recent conquest, the products of change and themselves liable to change — and on how to render them stable through the exercise of special qualities by the prince himself, by his choice of agents and his use of a national army.

However, Machiavelli opines that the prince must work for the satisfaction of the people particularly if he comes to power with their aid and it is wise for the prince to depend upon his people instead of the nobles who play the role of king-makers. These nobles resembled to a large extent ratnins of very ancient India but had no counterpart in Kautilya's day when all the high officials of the State were only the servants of the king who no longer held power of king-making. However, in ch. IV of Bk I, Kautilya clearly cautions the king against the powerful in the society and advises him to stand by the side of the common people so that they can resist the strong.

Machiavelli does not specifically mention what steps the prince should take to satisfy his subjects but evidently advises him — to adopt such measures as would gratify the
people and at the same time consolidate his position. The important point to be noted here is that both are to be achieved simultaneously. The extent to which the prince is dependent on his people is rendered clear when he advises the prince to try to win over them even if they had opposed his coming to power and even if he came to power by the favour of the nobles. He must remember that he is always to live with the same people. He can easily win over such a people only if he does take them under protection. The demand of the people is not too much; they only want that they should not be oppressed and this the prince can guarantee by curbing the powers of the nobles and controlling his personal lust. A king who conducts with his people in a cordial and friendly manner quickly turns foes into allies and if he fails to do that "he has no security in adversity." 

To Machiavelli, the continuity of the rule of the monarch stands foremost. The King should explore ways to guarantee this continuity even at the risk of losing the obedience of all surrounding him. It is quickly realized that while Machiavelli does not fail to count the people as one of important weight he is at the same time eloquent on the point that the prince must aim at the preservation and security of his dominion and if in this task he has the fear to lose the support of the people he must disregard it. Machiavelli, as he openly admits, will not waste time on describing how the prince should govern.
his subjects because his predecessors have already discussed on the subject. In this he probably censures the views of Aristotle — who was obsessed by the ideas of an ideal State — inasmuch as he says that "many have pictured republics and principalities which in fact have never been known or seen".

Machiavelli wrote on real-politik. He realized that a prince was destined to undo his fortune if he was required to be virtuous in all of his activities and plainly said that it was not at all possible for a prince to pursue a virtuous course simply because in that case he would have to "run a great hazard among so many of a contrary principle". Machiavelli would not disagree with others in the opinion that a prince would be praised if he possessed all the generally accepted good qualities. But he believed that it was hardly possible that a prince would possess all the good qualities and even if he possessed them it would not be possible for him to exhibit them always. Hence the successful ruler must know, if he wants to maintain his rule, how not to be virtuous and act according to the exigencies of the situation. He should not be led by imaginary notions and must know the truth that end justifies the means. Policy, seemingly bad and though may not be viewed with good eyes by others, may ultimately lead to the well-being of the State. Hence, if occasion so demands, the prince is at liberty to adopt course that may disregard the people's welfare.
Similarity in their views:

From the above discussion it is apparent that Machiavelli did not follow a track similar to that followed by Kautilya in connection with the duties of a monarch. Yet, some points of similarities with Kautilya are discernible even in the incidental references of Machiavelli. There is no standard to judge the activities of a Machiavellian ruler except by the success of his measures and such a "ruler is not only outside the law, but if law enacts morals, he is outside morality as well". This prerogative of the Machiavellian prince may be compared with that of the ancient Indian king who was adandya with which Kautilya agrees generally. But the most important point in which they agree is that a king cannot live amidst a hostile people and must act in such a way that will save him from earning the people's displeasure. Thus when Machiavelli says:

"It is to be added (also) that a prince can never secure himself against a hostile people, because of their being too many; and, further that, above all things it is necessary that a prince should retain the affection of his people, otherwise in any crisis, he has no remedy" we hear an echo of what Kautilya says in this connection:

"... When a king makes himself inaccessible to his people ... he may be sure to engender confusion in business, and to cause thereby public disaffection, and himself a prey to his enemies".
Resort to tyranny in Arthasāstra:

A king who does not act in accordance with the desires or, better say, the "general will" (in Rousseau's sense) of his subjects is blamed by the latter. But how can a king fulfill the expectations of his subjects? Is he bound to act according to the wishes of his people or is free to pursue a course that will guarantee his own interest? Let us examine the views of Kautilya and Machiavelli separately on the subject.

Kautilya gave the third and fourth position to the people in his 'Saptanga theory' of the State. The people of the countryside were the inhabitants of the Janapada while those dwelling in the fortified cities (Durga) probably held the rank of citizens. The king topping the list was obviously in a position to dominate over the other elements. The word स्वामी occurring in the 'Saptanga theory' has been differently interpreted by scholars. Jayaswal seems to have understood by the term, 'master' but, of the criminals and not of the innocent subjects. He has further advocated depending upon the Jataka story that in contemporary India the people were their own masters. This argument can be accepted only in a qualified sense. The Hindu Upanishadic as well as the Buddhist philosophies taught the people that they could work for their individual salvation and for that matter had no need to depend upon the State or the monarch. It is in this sense that the people were their masters themselves. The word स्वामी instead of the word...
raja or raja was first used by Kautilya who evidently knew the difference in the meaning of the words. The former occurring in the Buddhist Jatakas did not occur in the Arthasastra simply because there was a change in the meaning of the term meanwhile. Svāmi was used by Kautilya in fact to mean a sovereign king who was to look after the interests of the people of his realm. He not only enjoyed sovereign power but had the ability to "enrich even the poor" and make the "miserable elements of his sovereignty" happy and prosperous. If the fortune of the king was in peril, all the six other elements were to be doomed. The fortune and misfortune of the people depended upon the king. Ordinarily, the king was not to be one awarding punishment only; he had a double role: to inflict punishment upon the criminals, and, to work for the welfare of the people.

Once it is known that the king enjoyed sovereign power, our interest falls upon knowing whether he could use tyrannical methods against his subjects in case he felt the need. Kautilya presupposes the existence of a loyal people in a monarchical land. The important characteristics of Kautilya's sovereign State are that its people must be pure (suci) and loyal to the king. Consequently, as long as the people do not slip from the right track and remain loyal the king has nothing to do against them. The king will however, commit a serious mistake if he thinks that the people will always pledge their loyalty towards him for,
"when the law of punishment is kept in abeyance, it gives rise to disorder. The king should, therefore, never fail from keeping his vigilant eyes upon the subjects for, this alone can "ascertain the purity of character of the king's subjects. Thus it is the duty of the king to ensure by punishment loyalty of his people. In fact, the vigilant eyes of the monarch in the Arthashastra were so unfailing that he could detect treasons and the seditious persons and could punish them secretly through spies who eradicated the anti-king elements with fire, weapons and even poison. Adoption of such steps on the part of the Kautilyan king on a vigorous scale could create a political atmosphere similar to that prevailing in Machiavelli's Italy. In other words the Kautilyan King has unlimited power theoretically. Whether he will follow a tyrannical course or not however, depends upon the circumstances.

Machiavelli on the use of tyrannical methods:

Machiavelli is more eloquent than Kautilya on this subject. He has been described as an upholder of tyranny. However, such criticisms have been all made without any reference to the conditions of contemporary Italy in which Machiavelli lived. Machiavelli was a stern realist and he drew all of his materials from the occurrences of his day. He writes that there is a wide gulf between men should live and the way in which they actually live. He was not advocating for a utopian principality or
a republic which are possible, in his opinion, only in dream and a ruler who, in his activities, fails to choose between what is possible to accomplish and what people generally aspire for by being led by the spirit of idealism is destined to bring in his own destruction. In fact, the experience is such that a prince who always acts according to the generally accepted good laws often meets ruin and it is because of this fact that Machiavelli advises his prince to learn how not to be virtuous and use this quality in emergency conditions.

Machiavelli has earned severe criticism from numerous writers who blame him for having discovered and unfolded before the eyes of the tyrants the vicious track (to be discussed in more detail in Ch.V).

It is as if the tyrants did not know their way and Machiavelli came forward with the 'holy book' to assist them in their ambitious pursuits. It is as if "he was the Tempter, the Evil Principle, the Discoverer of ambition and revenge, the original inventor of perjury, and that before the publication of his fatal Prince, there had never been a hypocrite, a tyrant or a traitor, a Stimulated virtue or a convenient crime." The fact is wholly different however. Being in the fullest sense the child of his times Machiavelli was more influenced than any other political philosopher by the spirit of the environment. The Prince is, indeed, a book written borrowing materials from the activities of successful tyrants, e.g. Francesco Sforza,
Alexander VI, Caesar Borgia and Ferdinand of Aragon. Machiavelli also dwelt at length on the constitutional principality and even on the republics. However, their resurrection were a complete impossibility which he did not fail to realise. The tyrannical method in the efforts of seizing the throne started well before Machiavelli in the thirteenth century and became the most spectacular aspect of Italian politics during the days of Machiavelli.

As has been stated already, it was the age of the despots, nay, of the new despots who often came to power by dint of 'talent and audacity' and who had no other means save cruelty and fraud to secure themselves. Living amidst conspiracies the new prince must have known how to safeguard his interests. A prince who is "fickle, frivolous, effiminate, cowardly and irresolute is despised" by his subjects. He must, therefore, create an atmosphere in which no one "ever dreamt of trying to deceive or trick him". By nature corrupt, men always try to seize upon others' difficulties and thereby knowingly or unknowingly drag the political life of the State into what Kautilya would call masyayāya. A brave, strong-willed prince can only save the State from falling in such a state of anarchy. Interestingly, 'to be feared or to be loved' is not so important in reference to the people but is important for the ultimate security of the king and the kingdom. George Bull's observation in his introduction to The Prince may also be mentioned here.
Machiavelli's autocrat must not be thought of as an irresponsible tyrant. He continually stresses that the prince must build his State on the goodwill of the people; he is to be no oriental despot, but must respect his subjects' susceptibilities, being ready for cruelty only because, in the long run, it is often kinder to be cruel than weak.

The prince was to combine in him the character of a lion and a fox to deal with those wretched creatures who did not abide by the established norms and in this he resembles Kautilya who also enjoins his king destroy the anti-monarch elements. Further, while Kautilya emphasizes that the king must adopt measures that "would ascertain the purity of character of the king's subjects" Machiavelli opines that "a wise prince must devise way by which his citizens are always and in all circumstances dependent on him and on his authority; and then they will always be faithful to him". In other words, both Kautilya and Machiavelli agree that a monarch cannot rule without a loyal people and that to keep the people in the right track they must pursue courses that may be harsh and tyrannical in appearance. They read about and knew the human psychology which made them believe men are always prone to seize and earn more for them. It is the selfish nature of the people that compels the monarch to remain apprehensive of their evil designs and forces him to take steps to undo their enterprises. Like Kautilya, Machiavelli also believes more in the powers of the monarch than in his glory.
We shall now examine the nature of the authority and obligations of the Kautilyan king toward his subjects. Despite Kautilya’s insistence that the king must endeavour to improve the people’s lot it is not undiscoverable in his work that a king who imposes unjust taxes has the chance of escaping the people’s wrath by means of spies. A spy was instructed to raise before public question regarding the good qualities of the king to test its mind. His apparent motive was to impair the king’s prestige before the people for, he seems to have denounced the king for levying heavy fines and taxes. Of course, it is true that Kautilya admits that the king has the right of raising fund when “he is in great financial trouble and needs money.” But who was to decide as to the necessity of raising the fund? Evidently the king. As such if a king could establish the point that he really needed money nothing could check him from realising his end. That a king had no bar to becoming unscrupulous in exacting money was tacitly admitted by Kautilya when he enjoined the king to replenish the royal treasury by forcible demand from the well-to-do subjects who were in position of making payments. Hence when the first spy uttered against the king probably he referred to the real state of things. But the manner in which he was silenced by a second spy has been rightly interpreted by Ghoshal as pointing to the red authority and power of the king. Citing the example of Vaivasvata Manu, Kautilya said that the king owed his origin to the people who first elected him to
protect them from the state of anarchy. If it was an election then what happened to the election principle after Manu is not known as Kautalya did not mention any other king following him but suddenly mentioned that the king would inflict punishment upon the subjects if they failed to pay taxes.

The king united in his person the images of both 'Indra' and 'Yama'. The reference to Vaivasvata Manu gives an idea of how the king came to play the role of Indra (the God of protection), but as to the gradual growth of the king's power culminating in his playing in the role of Yama (the God of death), Kautalya is reticent. However, this reveals that the Kautilyan king had unlimited authority over his subjects and there was theoretically no scope for the subjects to despise the king. Kautulya's reference to "ra.1a ra.1yam" meaning "the king is the State" also deserves being mentioned in this connection.

The king who assumed the role of the protector had naturally certain obligations to fulfil toward his subjects. The ancient Indian king could never ignore this moral side of his responsibilities. The extent up to which the king was under moral obligation toward his subjects is amply manifested in his duty that in case of theft of private property he would find out the thief and restore the stolen goods to the real owner and that in case of failure he would "make the loss good from his treasury". The king was under another obligation also and that has been already stated. It involved the prevention of
adultery in the families of the poor who, in all ages, are tempted to resort to all sorts of crimes. Thus the king who had supreme authority over his people was under moral obligation to work not only for the maintenance of law and order but also to guarantee the social health. The fulfilment of these obligations alone could ensure the security and prosperity of the people in whose well-being rested the scope of their being loyal to their king.

**Authority and obligation of the prince in the opinion of Machiavelli:**

*The only way to establish any kind of order (there) is to found a monarchical government; for, where the body of the people is thoroughly corrupt that the laws are powerless for restraint it becomes necessary to establish some superior power which with a royal hand, and with full and absolute powers, may put a curb upon the excessive ambition and corruption of the powerful.*

The above quotation shows clearly what was Machiavelli's anxiety and what he felt necessary as solution. He sincerely felt that no other form except monarchy with full and absolute powers could only set things right in Italy. He had great sympathy for republications but now he was convinced that it could no longer be effective in Italy for, she had lost the strong civic life which alone could render a republican form of government successful.
Furthermore, Machiavelli lived in an age "when the Italian despot and the absolute monarch were in full tide of their success and when much of what men may call prosperity was flourishing under their sway". "Let the prince, then look to the maintenance of the state; the means will always be deemed honourable and will receive general approbation".  

Machiavelli specifically declares: "Where the safety of one's country is at stake there must be no consideration of Safety of the State: what is just or unjust, merciful or Prime importance cruel, glorious or shameful; on the contrary everything must be disregarded save that course which will save her life and maintain her independence". It thus appears that even the lives of the subjects lie at the mercy of the prince in times of danger. The absolute monarch visualized by Machiavelli is neither politically nor morally bound to his subjects for, the State is a 'fait accompli' in his imagination and a prince wins it either by his own arms or with those of others or either by fortune or by prowess or through lucky astuteness. The principedom is thus seized by the prince mainly through his own efforts and as such he has extraordinary authority over his subjects.

Moreover, Machiavelli's prince treats man as a political animal only and as such all his activities were bound to be Though under no obligation Machiavelli's prince also tries to satisfy the people. politically motivated. However, though not under obligation, Machiavelli's prince, if he is
wise and is in possession of a well-organized State must not
antagonise the nobles and should satisfy the people and make
them content. "This is one of the most important tasks a prince
must undertake."

An Assessment:

From the above discussion it appears that the central
theme of both Kautilya and Machiavelli is that the king must.
resort to the use of force if he wants to carry on his rule
successfully. The nature of the subject people, in all countries,
is the same and it is their selfish mentality which compels their
ruler to keep a vigilant eye over them. Machiavelli observes:

"human beings are always ungrateful, fickle, liars and deceivers,
they shun danger and are greedy for profit; while you treat them
well, they are yours ... but when you are in danger they turn
against you." They deserve punishment as such. Kautilya also
holds no better opinion. The king must employ secret agents who,
by their secret activities, will generate fear in the minds of
the people for, the latter will not know who are spies and hence
will not utter such things by which they may incur the wrath of
the monarch. The aim of the monarch of both Kautilya and Machi-
avelli is thus to strike terror in the hearts of disloyal elements
and if he deems it necessary he may even assassinate them. Both
seem to believe that terror only ensures loyalty and that fear
of the governing power is the basis of any good government.
What a striking similarity, we thus see, in their theories of the king's powers! Machiavelli was indeed anticipated by Kautilya in realpolitik. Yet he has not been given due recognition. It is a great misfortune for him that he has not been included in the study of political science. If it was so, his fate would have been different.
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