STATE ORGANISATIONS

Machiavelli on Nature and Forms of Government

In the present work, though we are mainly concerned with The Prince we cannot always afford to overlook the author's analysis in his other works particularly, the Discourses and The Art of War. What has been left in The Prince as a theme has been elaborated in the Discourses on many occasions and as such it becomes necessary to look into the Discourses for supporting elements when we are in difficulty with The Prince. In the words of J.R. Hale, "The Prince without the Discourses is like Hamlet without the prince of Denmark".

Truly speaking, The Prince expresses no theory of government. It cannot, however, be denied that the first reading of the book invariably leads one to believe that not only the monarchical form but the worst of it viz., the despotic rule, was the one Machiavelli preferred most. However, as has been said already, Machiavelli's interest in this respect may not be properly judged from his views as contained in The Prince only.

Seemingly, Machiavelli's classification of governments resembles the Aristotelean system with whose work he is supposed to have been acquainted. Aristotle's forms of government were based upon the sovereignty which rested in one, few, or the whole people thereby being respectively known as the Royalty, Aristocracy and
Polity in the pure form and as Tyranny, Oligarchy and Democracy in their corrupt form and these are all discernible in Machiavelli. But Machiavelli could not agree with the purest forms of government discussed by Aristotle for, they represented the ideal forms in the most abstract sense. Aristotle has made the classification on the basis of two criteria the first being the number of those in whom the sovereign power is vested while the second concerns the end to which the conduct of the government is directed. He has thus distinguished between the pure and the corrupt forms of government. In other words, he admits that difference exists between what is desired and what is generally the usual state of things. Aristotle's perfect government in any of the three forms mentioned above is possible only with the perfection of all the members composing the government. But what is generally seen is that the governing body instead of working for self-perfection works in a way that promotes their own interest instead of promoting the interest of all the citizens and assumes the corrupt form. It works as if to vindicate the saying of Lord Acton: power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Machiavelli, a stern realist, accepts the Aristotelian forms of government only superficially and never reposes his trust in what is ideal. His concern was with what was really happening around him and he would rather treat the governmental forms in the manner they existed rather than in the manner in which they.
should exist. However, this should not be construed to mean

No upholder of corrupt government that Machiavelli was basically an upholser of the corrupt forms of
government. "For all its dogmatic force there is a tentative, apologetic note in *The Prince*. This is what I would do, Machia-
velli seems to be saying, and this is why it would be allowable
for me to do it". ¹

Princes, Machiavelli writes, must use cruelty and fraud to secure themselves but cruelty is used well only when it is employed once for all and when one's safety depends on it and then it "is not per-
sisted in". The realization of the actual state of things in combination with the aspiration for good government has led
Machiavelli to think that the mixed form of government is the best one.² For, in this form, there is a scope for "check and balance" — the monarch's power would be balanced by the senate and that of the Senate by the people. Machiavelli however, did not spend much time on the various aspects of the mixed forms of government and rather concentrated his attention on the character-
ristics and relative advantages of the principalities and the republics — the two forms that existed in contemporary Italy.
In regard to the aristocratic government he is wholly uncompromising. It is much better, in Machiavelli's opinion, to have a popular form of government than an aristocratic one for, while the latter works for enhancement of the individuals' power the
former is concerned with the maintenance of peace and order. He considers the aristocracy as a great impediment to the establishment of free government. Not to speak of its transformation into a republican one, even the monarchical form cannot emerge if not through the destruction of the aristocrats. In fact, he had the least faith in the efficiency of the nobles and this made him opine that in the constitutional principality it was better for the prince to depend upon the people than on the nobles about whose integrity he could not remain very certain.

To the credit of Machiavelli it should be said that while he had a very low opinion about the individual's character he had a reverse idea about the popular government. Individually, each man is subject to corrupting tendencies or corrupt practices but when united they have the better chance of not going the wrong way; at least, in comparison to a single ruler their chance is less. In fact, he believes that the people, as a whole, is wiser than the prince and the ingratitude of the republic is not greater than that of the prince. Thus it is seen that Machiavelli had a very high hope on the popular form of institutions. This throws us into confusion because in The Prince he upholds the monarchical rule. The confusion however, vanishes when it is understood that just like the purest forms of government of Aristotle Machiavelli's consideration of the republican government is in connection with an ideal form only and like the corrupt forms of Aristotle into which all the forms eventually transform Machiavelli's acceptance of the monarchical form is to find a way-out...
He realized that different forms of institutions worked pretty well at different times and in different places depending upon the circumstances but in the prevailing condition his problem was to find out a government that would save Italy and it was under the pressure of this agony that he came to the conclusion that the monarchical form was the best one.\(^7\) If the foreign invasions constituted the first cause for his reposing trust in the prince\(^8\) the second cause could be discovered in his hatred of the nobility who lived idly on the proceeds of their wealth without giving any useful service and were "everywhere enemies of all civil government". These nobles were so powerful that "the only way to establish any kind of order there is to found a monarchical government ... which with a royal hand and with full and absolute power may put a curb upon the excessive ambition and corruption of the powerful".\(^9\)

In the days of his exile Machiavelli's only agony was over the miserable condition into which Italy sank. Previous knowledge gathered as a diplomat, now combined with the success of the Italian 'new princes', the fate of Savonarola and the success of the national monarchs in the neighbouring countries led him to create the masterpiece dealing with the monarchical form only.

Kantillys on Nature and Forms of Government:

Unlike Machiavelli who upheld the monarchical form of government in The Prince and the republican form in the Discourses,
Kautinya does not exhibit any such ambiguity. Machiavelli, it seems, when he wrote _The Prince_ scrupulously detached himself from the bond he had toward the republican form. The converse may also be taken as true. The only safe point that may be adduced in support of his becoming a monarchist is that his obsession to liberate Italy from the barbarians found expression in _The Prince_ and not in the _Discourse_. Otherwise, it would have been very difficult to decide as to what was his real colour — a monarchist or a republican?

Kautinya however, saw the republican State the signs of permanent existence\(^*\) for, in his view, such a State has the least possibility of being subject to anarchy. It seems from this that he was an admirer of the theory of the majority ruling over a State for, as he said, such a rule was invincible in its character. Kautinya was so obsessed by the superior nature of a republican government that he would not advise his _vijigisu_ (conqueror) king to destroy the republics, in case they were friendly to him.\(^*\) Their destruction would become necessary only if they dared to show an unfriendly attitude to the attempts of the _vijigisu_ king who was extending his hands for mutual cooperation.\(^*\)

In the perspective of his being an admirer of the republics arises a question in our mind regarding the real cause for his being an upholder of monarchical State? The
reason seems to be that Kautilya who spent his boyhood and youth in Taxila\textsuperscript{13} — this place being situated in the north western frontier of India — saw in the days before the invasion of Alexander a large number of republics which were not only properly ruled but also were of such invincible nature that Alexander could overrun them only after experiencing the stoutest most resistance. Kautilya still living in that region with his disciple Chandragupta Maurya — the latter is said to have met Alexander according to Plutarch\textsuperscript{14} — saw with eyes full of wonder and admiration the valour and chivalry with which the republics opposed the sweeping invader. It will not be then wrong to suppose that Kautilya, as a follower of real-politik would naturally opine against destroying the powerful republics and oligarchies and enjoin the vijigśu to try to win their friendship.\textsuperscript{15}

But whatever sympathy Kautilya had for the States other than monarchical he was a realist in the true sense of the word. He could not afford to ignore the undeniable fact that Alexander's sweeping victory against the small kingdoms and republics of north west India was rendered easy by the failure of the sovereigns of the locality to put up a united resistance. In fact, instead of forming a united front against the foreign invader they were rather involved in such mutual jealousies\textsuperscript{16} that, some of them, forgetting the dangerous consequences of...
foreign domination even joined hands with the conqueror and fought against the native princes and warriors. It is in this perspective that Kautilya, despite his fascination for the rule of the majority, advocated for a monarchical State that would subdue by force or by friendship all the adjoining kingdoms and republics and would ultimately pave the way towards the establishment of a large empire. Kautilya must have definitely observed with special care and attention the political trend from the time of Bimbisāra down to his own time. This period witnessed the rise and consolidation of the Magadhān empire before the superior power of which all the republics, oligarchies and smaller kingdoms gave way. This process had to be continued to found an empire embracing as large tract of land as possible for, this alone could ensure the safety and security of India from the foreign inroads and internal dissension. The contemporary political atmosphere made it amply clear to Kautilya that the lustrous days of the large republics or corporations (e.g., of the Lichchhavis) were over and that there was no hope of converting the whole of India into one single republican State though for smaller tract of land republican form could yet be the answer.

It is said that the credit of offering a comprehensive, theory of the State in India should go to Kautilya who enumerated the seven elements of the State which is generally known as the Concept of State: Saptangā theory. These seven elements Keutilya and Machiavelli put in a definite order and these are svamī, amāra, jānapada, durgā, kosa, danda and mitra. The theory
however, does not corroborate the actual state of things according to Romila Thapar. She points out how in Magadha, though a small area and where the requisites of a common language, common customer, and a common historical tradition, were present, the idea of the state was absent. She further says that if it is insisted that the *Arthasastra* demonstrates Mauryan ideas on the State, then, "the work fails on this count, when tested on the basis of two fundamental prerequisites. In the text, the loyalty of the subject is to the individual king and not to the state. Thus the state as an entity above the government, symbolized in the king, does not exist. Secondly, the work does not consider the possibility of various systems in the light of attempting to discover which is best suited to that particular state, for instance, monarchy, oligarchy, republicanism, etc., but rather is concerned only with describing how best the king, as the motive power of the government, can function."22

However, the above view of Romila Thapar is only partially correct. Were not the ingredients of a State present in the Mauryan kingdom. Indeed, the elements of even the modern theory of State such as sovereignty, government, territory, population (the presence of which are sufficient to establish the de facto status of a modern State) and recognition by other States (to establish the de jure status) are discernible in *Svāmi, smātyā, janapada* and *mitra* of the Saptāṅga theory. The other three elements, viz. *durga, kosa* and *danda* were parts of sovereignty only. Care should
be taken here to distinguish between the "national State" and the "territorial State". The former cannot be expected to be seen in the Mauryan empire for, nationalism was a contribution of developed political consciousness. However, the author is correct when she says that the king symbolized the State.

Kauṭilya's statement, rājā rajyam = iti prakṛti samkhepah, meaning "the king is the State", proves this. And, the reasons why Kauṭilya did not discuss the other forms of government except the monarchical have been already discussed.

If Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra embodied the Indian conception of the state, Machiavelli's The Prince embodied that of the European although, however, in The Prince, he dealt with the prince and not with the state. In the words of J.R. Hale, "This was not the only book he wrote, but because it is short, shocking and brilliantly written, it is the only one most people read. This is one of the reasons why Machiavelli has become one of the most misunderstood of writers on the State." The conception of the state is examined at considerable length in the Discourses, and not in The Prince. H.C. Dowdall maintains that it is, in effect, by inventing the word 'State' that Machiavelli founded modern political science.

We should remember that Kauṭilya did not live in an age of rationalism like Locke and Rousseau. Rather, he lived in an India when no writer could afford to ignore the influence of dharma - the religion. Yet, how scrupulously Kauṭilya could
abstain from depending too much on the dharma in political matters! Whatever of religion is found in the Arthasastra is in context of the importance of the priestly class. But that too is curiously absent in the brilliant portions of his work. This is no little credit for a man who himself was a member of the priestly class and as a minister who had every opportunity of speaking for the indispensability of the priest in the elements of a theoretical State. But he did not do that. It is here that he distinguishes himself from the other ancient writers and earns our admiration. The exclusion of the priest from the organs of the State was a serious departure from reality and is to be considered as Kautilya's distinct service to the cause of political theory.

These seven elements of the State were regarded as the limbs of the body politic by Kautilya. Each limb, though itself might look unimportant, was an indispensable organ of the body politic for, its function could not be efficiently discharged by any other. The Government can function properly only if all the seven limbs of the body politic become mutually integrated and co-operate with each other.

Unlike Aristotle and like Machiavelli Kautilya was not concerned with origin of the State. The Greek philosopher who

Similarity with Machiavelli had a wide knowledge of the contemporary city-states in his land could dwell on the origin of the State and in this effort the model of the
city-state surreptitiously worked in his mind. However, in spite of the greatness of Aristotle there is no doubt that Kautilya surpassed the Greek in the field of providing a pragmatic definition of the State. Saletore has remarked that it is better that Kautilya discussed the essential elements of the State and gave secondary importance only to the theory of its origin. In fact, Kautilya's endeavour to trace the origin of the State was limited to the misdeeds of the Nandas and he left it there without further comment. 28

Machiavelli's 'State' a work of Art?

In the case of Machiavelli, scholars like Jakob Burckhardt, Friedrich Meinecke, C.J. Friedrich, and Charles Singleton point out that he has a developed conception of the state as a work of art. In the words of Joseph Kraft the great men who have founded or maintain human associations are conceived as analogous to artists whose aim is beauty, and whose essential qualification is understanding of their material — they are moulders of men, as sculptors are moulders of marble or clay. In this sense, Machiavelli's conception of States leaves the realm of ethics, and approaches that of aesthetics. Singleton maintains that Machiavelli's greatest contribution consists in his view of political action as a form of what Aristotle called 'making' — the goal of which is a non-moral artefact an object of beauty or the external to man (in this case a particular arrangement of human affairs and idea of State) — and not of
'doing' (where Aristotle and Aquinas had placed it), the goal of which is internal and moral — not the creation of an object, but a particular kind — the right way — of living or being.

Question of Welfare-State

In the Discourses Machiavelli says, "I believe the greatest good to be done and the most pleasing to God is that which one does to one's native city." To Machiavelli, a State and a people are governed in a different way from an individual and his main concern is not individual good but common good what makes his native city great. The Christian thinkers, the theorists of welfare state prefer a state in which citizens enjoy a wide degree of individual freedom, in which government is neither centralized nor omnipotent, in which citizens are prosperous even though the public treasury is poor. But Machiavelli finds no merit in such loose political textures because then the state cannot last. Machiavelli prefers republican rule in which the interests of the rulers donot conflict with those of the ruled.

The Mauryan empire indicates the triumph of monarchy as a political system over tribal republics or Samghas and this is demonstrated in the entire conception of the Arthasastra itself. Like Machiavelli, Kautilya also emphasizes on the control of the central authority and it was because of this increased power of the King that the Mauryan centralized monarchy.
became, in the words of Romila Thapar, "a paternal despotism". The edicts of Asoka found its main inspiration from the Arthasastra, where speaking of a king's duties Kautilya writes: "In the happiness of his subjects lies his happiness, in their welfare his welfare; whatever pleases himself he shall not consider as good but whatever pleases his subjects he shall consider as good." Infact, the idea of the king treating his subjects as his children was fairly current in ancient Indian political thought and Asvaghosa in his Buddhacarita (II.36) repeats the same sentiment.

These are the limitations of the concept of welfare state of both Machiavelli and Kautilya. However, Kautilya clearly required the king to provide for the maintenance of childless women, and old infirm, and diseased persons, who have no natural guardians to protect them.

Executive in the Arthasastra, their appointment and qualifications:

A king, however energetic he may be, cannot singly discharge the duties pertaining to the well-being of the State or work for its preservation even in the narrowest sense. Absolute power in the hands of a monarch does not mean wielding of that power by the hands of a single person. The king holds the sovereign power but exercises authority over the people through subordinate officials who are his own creation. Kautilya
opines that sovereignty (rajatva) is not possible without assistance and hence the king must employ ministers and hear their opinion. He expresses this view in the words "a single wheel can never move". The king who has been made well disciplined through proper education by teachers and who has learnt to restrain his organs of sense should know moreover that education is only an essential but not the sole qualification for kingship. He should constantly engage himself in the study of science also and acquire wisdom in practical politics by keeping company with the aged — who being senior in age to him possess the practical knowledge — so that in case he is in troubles to take a decision he shall have not only the scope of being guided by his own knowledge but can also consult those who have the experience of similar occasions. Lastly the king must look at the pros and cons of his steps and take in these matters the aid of his spies. To be specific, appointment of officials including councillors and ministers is indispensable if the king wants to run the administration smoothly. However, the minister who was far more important than the spies and took active part in their selection was also subject to being previously tested by the spies and this proves beyond doubt that the king had a private circle of spies who were enjoined by their lord to look into and certify the characters of the responsible men whom he would later employ for discharging important functions. This sort of activities on the part of the spies (Satri) evidently corresponds to the investigation generally made in
modern age by the police and men of intelligence branch in respect of a person who is to be appointed to a certain important office.

The Arthasāstra describes a highly centralized bureaucratic system of government which agrees well with the account given by Megasthenes. Kauṭilya is, however, more accurate and minute in the details. The council of ministers (which will be dealt with in more detail in the next section) evidently stood at the head of the Mauryan bureaucracy next to the king and was known by the name of pārīsa in the days of Asoka. Chandragupta Maurya had showed enormous interest both in the Civil and military branches of the government which is corroborated by Megasthenes and is perceived in the Arthasāstra also. Further, with the conspicuous development of capital cities and forts under him it became incumbent upon the Mauryan Emperor — in the organisation of the Government of whom is discerned the work of a master mind — to give special attention to the administration of the cities by separating it from the administration of countryside. Thus Megasthenes' classification of the magistrates into three classes who look after the administration of the cities (city-officials being called Astynomoi by Megasthenes), of the districts (agronomoi) and, of the military department, has a parallel in the Arthasāstra for, Kauṭilya also mentions the same three classes.
of officials viz., the Nagarakas and their assistants i.e., those who looked after the town administration; Samāharta, Samīdhamata and their staff — those who were in charge of rural administration and, the Senapati and his subordinates — those attending to the business of the military department.

Kautilya gives a long list of eighteen officials who were known as the eighteen tirthas of mahāmātras. The Dharmamahāmātra of Asoka, of course, is not found in the Arthasāstra. The only point deserves being noted in the context of our study is that almost all the officials of the Kautilyan State (except the Priest) were connected, in one way or the other, either with the collection of revenues or with the maintenance of law and order. This reveals that Kautilya was concerned with the real rather than the ideal aspects of administration.

Executives in Machiavelli, their appointment and qualifications:

In contrast to Kautilya who is so eloquent on the formation and description of the council Machiavelli does not exhibit any special interest in the matter. Machiavelli's genius was encumbered in this direction by the weight of the emergency condition. It is well said that he was interested in the pathology of the States. This comment is particularly true of The Prince in which Machiavelli found little scope for dwelling on the details of the administration which he did in the Discourses — the book being in the nature of "an enquiry into the genesis and maintenance of States". The miserable
plight into which Italy was thrown and the surrounding occurrences convinced Machiavelli that Italy could not be saved unless and until an omnipotent monarch came forward to stand as a saviour. In short, Machiavelli could not think of the State without thinking of the prince and his over-emphasis over the prince as the undeniable and indispensable ingredient of the State has led many to believe that "the new prince he created personified the state".

However, it will be an act of folly on our part to imagine that Machiavelli really overlooked the importance of a good administration. Like Kautilya's king, his 'tyrant' could not expect to rule without the aid and assistance of assistants who might be ministers, councillors or advisers. Scholars have noticed and emphasised on Machiavelli's anxiety for a strong prince and a strong militia. But they have missed this point of extraordinary importance in a Machiavellian study that his prince needs advisers as well. The Prince deals with prince, principality and the army which is in Machiavelli's view, the mainstay of the prince's power but in Ch. XXII and Ch. XXIII, Machiavelli abundantly manifests his conviction that a 'wise prince' should rely on his advisers if he really intends to achieve success. It is, as if, Machiavelli was echoing the words of Kautilya who said "sovereignty is possible only with assistance. A single wheel can never move. Hence he (the king) shall employ ministers and hear their opinion". By sovereignty,
Machiavelli probably believed in nothing but in the virtù of the prince which, in the Florentine's sense, denied all the rights of the people that were antagonistic to the scope of the free exercise of the prince's authority. Yet he did not fail to realise that assistants were indispensable for the sound discharge of the prince's functions.

It is presumable that Machiavelli who apparently counted on the virtù of the new prince and not on his blood would also rely on the merit of the minister or adviser and not on his blood or parentage. Interestingly, however, Machiavelli opines that genuine virtù counts in difficult times only and in normal times people generally adhere to men who are of superior blood or have enormous wealth. If Machiavelli did not deal with the point elaborately, yet, such an opinion, on his part, suggests that at normal times his choice would rather fall on the men of noble birth which is just the case with Kautilya. If Machiavelli could discuss the prince's responsibility with respect to his dominion after the latter had established his authority he would probably have left us with the details of the administrative machinery. Unfortunately, it is not so. For the same reasons, Machiavelli's prince was only remotely concerned with the social and economic aspects of the State administration. Yet, the major officials of Kautilya's administration are not alien in Machiavelli's distant thought. If his prince realised that he could not run the administration without effective assistance of the ministers...
it is only logical to say that he also could not think of sustaining the State without other officials too who, in any age, are indispensable for a bureaucratic organization. There are incidental references in the 'Little Castle' which emphasize that the prince must levy taxes (e.g., in ch. 26) and we can well presume that Machiavelli did not think that the collection could be done without the assistance of tax-collections.

Next, though seemingly deaf to the requirements of the people Machiavelli was also not oblivious of the fact that the prince would not be able to sustain his State if he failed to give his people good laws. He saw the usefulness of good laws in 'parliamentary France', yet, in _The Prince_, he ventured to believe that good laws could be given only if good arms were available at hand.

He states that one of the (two) main corner stones of the State is good law and that where there are good arms, good laws inevitably follow. From this we can presume that like Kautilya he was thinking of giving justice (i.e., judiciary) to the people. But in the prevailing state of things in Italy he could not hope that people would abide by good laws unless they were forced to conform under the threat of arms. Even the priest of Kautilya's system is not missing in Machiavelli's imagination if it is kept in mind that in the final analysis of Kautilya's system the priest is not found to have any hold over the temporal affairs of the realm. Machiavelli candidly tells us that religion
can be used if the prince feels that it will pay. Hence
maintaining a deceitful relationship with the priest is not
likely to be absent in Machiavelli's contemplation — the
priest obviously fulfilling the desires of the prince. The
inclusion of the priest — the association with whom was just
to impress the people as regards the "genuine religiousness"
of the ruling prince — was to be in keeping with the prince's
attempts to deceive the people because "men in general judge by
their eyes" and hence it was a statesman-like step and nothing
more.

Kautilya and Machiavelli on ministers and councillors:

Thus the major officials of Kautilya's State-machinery
can be visualized in the little treatise of Machiavelli. The
spectacular similarity between Kautilya and Machiavelli however,
is in the context of the employment of ministers and councillors,
As has been pointed out already, both were aware of this essen­
tial element of administration. Competence and loyalty are the
two qualities which must be possessed by the ministers of both.50
The attribute of a 'good minister' is, in the opinion of both,
his sense of loyalty. A king or a prince who does not depend
on the advice of the ministers only invites calamitous conse­
quences and all his steps are destined to
end in failure.51 Kautilya insists that
the king must see through the medium of aged persons who evidently
not only include the tutors among them, but ministers as well.
It is interesting to note that while both insisted on the need of
ministers and councillors and advised the king to seek their advice. They warned the king against being led by the advice of one single minister. Both of them opines that the final decision rests with the monarch. The monarch will consult with the ministers but has the liberty to act according to his own will. A king who can form his own judgment is considered by both Kautilya and Machiavelli as the best king. In case of emergency only Kautilya advises the king to rely on the advice of the majority of the ministers. Another remarkable similarity between Kautilya and Machiavelli in this respect is that both of them advised the king to show honour and give wealth to the ministers to such an extent that they require no more. Such persons would then solicit nothing but the king's admiration and sympathy only.

Choice of ministers speaks of the ability of the prince:

In the Arthasastra, the ministers form the second element of the saptânga theory of the State. In other words, they occupy a position second to none but the king himself. The ministers are thus supposed to play a very important role in state affairs and are authorised to assume even the kingly office in case of the demise of the king in the enemy's land. It is thus very important that the monarch who will employ ministers should make the appointments very carefully as the success or failure of the monarch will depend largely upon the
advisers' ability. In fact, the choice of the ministers spoke on the ability of the monarch himself because the monarch who was not himself wise could not be expected to employ wise ministers. The proper selection of the ministers was further important because they were the very people who, by their wise counsel, in a way, tempered the otherwise autocratic character of the monarch.

It was not the priestly-class as Smith has supposed but, the ministers — who however, perhaps included Brāhmins in their ranks, owing to the latter's noble birth and wisdom but not on the ground of their being natural spiritual guides — who acted in a manner corresponding to the system of 'check and balance' of modern age. This is the case with Machiavelli also. Smith could have escaped being erred if he had carefully noticed that the priest in the employ of the monarch could be confined and even banished if the monarch deemed it necessary.

V.S. Agrawala attempts to make out a case on the constitutional status of ministers from references in the works of Pāṇini and Kautilya; but U.N. Ghoshal thinks that Agrawala's arguments are rather ingenious than convincing. Megasthenes states that the advisers to the king are selected from a particular caste, which he lists as the seventh caste (he obviously could not distinguish between "class" and "caste" — there were four "classes" only). Romila Thapar notes with surprise that although the Arthasastra goes into considerable detail
regarding the administration of the kingdom, yet nowhere is 
there any indication of how the officers were recruited. She 
believes that perhaps the personal choice of the king played 
the dominant part.

Naturally then, the king must be careful while selecting 
ministers and before appointment their fidelity, merit and qualifi-
cation should be properly tested. If the monarch is unsatis-
fied with a minister the latter is to be discharged forthwith.
Machiavelli also holds a similar opinion though in a round-about 
way. A person to whom offence has been given should not be given 
any administrative post of importance. When Kautilya says 
"the king may ask his ministers for their opinion, either indivi-
dually or collectively and ascertain their ability by judging 
over reasons they assign for their opinions" and Machiavelli emphasizes "he (the prince) 
should be a constant questioner, and he should listen patiently 
to the truth regarding what he has inquired about ..." and "should 
know how to correct or understand them" we only observe a striking 
similarity.

Kautilya on military organization:

Both Kautilya and Machiavelli specially concerned 
themselves with the military department. The causes which forced 
them to deal with the subject with the utmost importance were 
similar in certain respects while they differ also in certain 
respects. Machiavelli saw time and again the devastations
caused in Italy by foreign hordes and of the miseries of Florence particularly, he had personal experience. He seriously thought over the matter, examined the causes of Italy's recurrent failures in the face of foreign invasion and finally came to the conclusion that the root of all evils was her degenerated military system. Kautilya also had similar knowledge of the weakness of the Indian fighting forces against foreign armies. Like the military organization of ancient Rome for which Machiavelli had special fascination Kautilya had similar conspicuous traditions in his land. In fact, in India the military system had never been neglected. Need of an able general led to the genesis of kingship in Vedic India. The Aryans were engaged in constant wars against the aboriginal 'black people' and in inter-tribal conflicts. The king was the head of the army in ancient India and he personally led it against the enemies. He was not like the modern Indian President in whom is vested all the powers of the army but who never participates in war-activities nor devises plans in such matters but acts only as a constitutional head that is, as one in whom these powers are only nominally vested. Strategy, tactics and all such things are left to the trained soldiers.

In medieval India, anyone who had ability and power of establishing his rule, could do so, no matter to which varna or caste he belonged. But in ancient India this tendency was severely censured. Kingship was solely for the Kshatriyas i.e.,
the fighting class of the society. The heroes of both the Indian epics the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, were Kshatriyas by birth and both these epics show the great seriousness with which the little princes of the king's family were taught the military sciences. In both the epics kingship was hereditary but yet, the theory was that supreme military prowess had to be shown by the ruling or heir-apparent prince or else his kingdom was at stake. Though the celebrated warrior-hero was their grandfather, an āchārya well versed in the theoretical and practical aspects of the military science was appointed for the education of the princes of the Mahābhārata.

The necessity of having large fighting forces was felt by the republics of ancient India also and this was manifested in their attempts to form invincible league. The invasion of Alexander made Kautilya firm in his stand that a strong central government would have to be established if India was to save herself from being molested in the hands of foreigners and that the turbulent little frontier kingdoms must have been brought under its effective control. This necessitated the maintenance of a large standing army under the strong central government. It is said that the Nanda king who was supplanted by Chandragupta Maurya had also great military prowess. But the discomfiture of his large force in the hands of Chandragupta Maurya and Kautilya leads us to believe that there must have been some foul games in the matter definitely. As such, Kautilya, the most renowned practical statesman of ancient India, with
the installation of his protege on the throne, would naturally proceed to guard the army against weakness and corruption. Thus came out the first detailed written treatise, for being passed on to posterity, containing the science of military studies as one of developed subjects. None before Kautilya dwelt on the subject so extensively; in fact, Kautilya's emphasis on the military activities of the king to which he spent a number of chapters is suggestive of the idea that his king came to power by military prowess; sustained it by military prowess and carved out further extensive dominion by the same military prowess.

The existence of a large standing army at the expense of the State is supported by Megasthenes and Arrian also the latter saying that the fighting class was next only to the class of husbandmen with regard to their number and that they were very liberally paid from the treasury and although they passed time merrily in times of peace were at the beck and call of the king who might at any moment call for their service. 70

The soldiers enjoying supreme freedom and giving themselves up to enjoyment must have created some anxiety for the civil branch of the administration. Hence Kautilya sought to break this homogeneity by opening the homogeneity in the army & elements of modern concept military department to members of the other castes also depending upon merit. 71

It is charming to observe that this step on the part of Kautilya
served the purposes which are the concerns of the military
department of a modern State also especially, if the latter
is large in size. This breaking of homogeneity guarantees
against threat from a regiment composed by men of a single
stock for a regiment of diverse people will pull in different
directions in case there is an evil design on the part of a
section of the regiment. Thus, by making provision for recruit-
ment of soldiers of merit from castes other than the Kshatriyas.
Kautilya proved his worth as an able spokesman of the military
affairs.

In his attempt to break the monopoly of the Kshatriya
caste in the army Kautilya can claim far greater credit than
what generally he is supposed to deserve. For, an idealist in him could have opined
that the army composed of the men of the Kshatriya caste was
the best if the soldiers happened to come from the families
which had a tradition of rendering service to the house of the
king (mulabala). But Kautilya was not an idealist only — which
great man often happens to be — he was a stern realist too.
That is why, although, a firm supporter of varnasrama dharma,
he did not maintain the strictness in his ideas on the military
organization. His greatness lies in the fact that with the
realisation of the real state of things he did not stick to
the fanciful ethics of the ideal or "best army" but showed the
courage to break the time-bound notion. On many an occasion he
manifested the emancipation of his mind from the tutelage of the traditional way of thinking of the age. In fact, he visualized the course of future political development in India. He realized that it would no longer remain a land of several principalities and republics but would merge into one single empire under a single monarch. The kingdoms and the republics so long they were small in size could depend upon the Kshatriyas for defence as well as for offensive purposes for, they were hereditarily accustomed to bearing arms. But with the enlargement of the empire the monarch came in touch with people other than the Kshatriyas such as the hardy wild tribes (śāvīḍal) who were widely known in military circles for their ferocity. These hardy tribesmen having their abode in the hill areas were obviously very useful in mountain wars and their inclusion in the army was a new thing in the concept of ancient Indian military science and Kautilya must be credited for adding this column to the standing establishment for, as we see, even today, the same practice is being continued that is, tribesmen are still mostly used in mountain and desert wars. It is no little curious to observe that while he had the highest esteem for a Kshatriya army what he emphasized went against his inner sympathy.

It should not be forgotten that Kautilya differentiated the wild tribes from the hired troops (brh tabala) and the Śreni (corporate body of troops) and hence it is well proved that they were not of the ranks of mercenaries. The superintendent
Infantry, the most important wing.

of the infantry must have possessed the detailed knowledge of the strength or weakness of the different categories of troops who would be employed in war-activities. Of the superintendents looking after the different branches of Chaturangabala, viz., infantry, cavalry, elephants and chariots, the superintendent of the infantry seems to have enjoyed the most conspicuous status, and this shows that the infantry occupied the most important position in the army. The superintendent of the infantry, in addition to his knowledge of the capability of his wing must have also known thoroughly the nature of fighting in low grounds, of open battle, of fraudulent attack, of fighting under the cover of entrenchment (Khanakavuddha) or from heights (Ākāsayuddha) and of fighting during day and night, besides the drill necessary for such warfare.

One of the most remarkable features of Kautilya's military organization is the surgical wing which was attached to the rear of the army in the battle-field. This was something like the modern army medical corps whose task was to look after the wounded. Its body was composed of doctors and nurses and it was equipped with surgical instruments, remedial oils, medicines and bandages etc.

Book IX of the Arthasastra deals with the expedition of a viśvāsru king who before undertaking an expedition must
carefully weigh his own strength and weakness and those of his enemy. The king must also take into consideration various other factors such as place and time for his march, recruitment of his forces, the consequences, the loss of men and money, profits and danger, the internal and external dangers that are likely to be encountered. Before starting on an expedition the king must, moreover, take precautionary measures against all kinds of internal political dangers for, he must know that the internal troubles are more serious than the external ones.77

Book Ten deals with matters relating to war. The king leading the expedition seems to be wholly responsible for guiding his army during its march through dangerous and difficult routes. But the most important topic of the Book is where Kauṭilya advocates for treacherous fight. If the viṣṇīṣu finds it difficult to overpower his enemy in a fair fight. In Ch. I of Bk. IX also, Kauṭilya stressed that "of the three acquirements, viz. enthusiasm, power and skill for intrigue he who possesses more of the quality mentioned later than the one mentioned first in the order of enumeration will be successful in overreaching others". So diplomatic and shrewd the king should be that he would banish the durga-mūkhya and other mūkhyas (chiefs) in collusion with them who would then take shelter in the enemy's kingdom and would operate from there as secret agents.78 Did not they constitute the...
fifth column of the present age? And Kautilya was repeatedly saying that internal dangers were more serious than the external ones.

Kautilya dwelt on the military organization very extensively though, for obvious reasons, all the details are not necessary for our present purpose. His intention was that the *vijigisa* should aim at conquering the whole of India stretching from the foot of the Himalayas in the north down to the sea in the south. He must have as such a strong network of spies and a strong army the latter being one of the essential elements of the state. He must also build strong forts of different types. As there shall always remain a potential state of war between the neighbouring kingdoms the *vijigisa* must always pursue an aggressive forward policy. He, however, should observe in that a well-thought principle viz., the *mandala* theory. The *mandala* consists of both enemies and friends on all sides of the *vijigisa* (front, rear and on the two flanks) the immediate neighbour being foe and the next to the enemy being friend. The attitude of the king portrayed the essence of a changing inter-state relation as the *vijigisa* was never to stop until the whole of India was conquered. Hence the kingdom of the immediate neighbour being swallowed in the ever-expanding dominion of the *vijigisa* the kingdom of the friend (i.e., enemy's enemy) which was situated beyond the now defunct kingdom of the previous foe was turned into the status...
of an enemy's kingdom. This process would continue until all the kingdoms were swallowed up in the empire of the viśigīsu. Thus in Kautilya's view friend and foe were merely relative terms depending on the location of their realms vis-a-vis viśigīsu's kingdom.²²

The most conspicuous feature of the military organisation of Kautilya was the attempt to form a village militia which together with the standing army and other types of recruits led to the formation of a somewhat national military organisation. Kautilya realized that though for new conquests the standing army, the mercenaries (who were perhaps not of an alien land but of the same kingdom, governed by the king himself but, participating in war as mercenaries) and other levies were indispensable, other sections of the people had also some role to play in the defence activities to make the kingdom invincible to the enemy. Thus he stressed that neighbouring villages were to help each other for defensive purposes during the period when the state undertook the task of colonization of waste lands.²³ It is furthermore important to observe that the villages were expected to provide for their own security and to find for them a "natural frontier."²⁴ Most of the people of such villages were śūdras and hence it is presumable that Kautilya's village militia undoubtedly accepted the service of the śūdras. Not only that, Kautilya accepted the service of even the Chandālas — one of the lowest strata of the society — in defence activities.²⁵ In another context
also Kautilya, rejecting the opinion of the older teachers, opined that the army of the vaishyas and Sudras was better than that of the Kshatriyas as the former could supply with more hands. What we see is that Kautilya, in contrast to the older teachers, brought not only the Vaishyas and the Sudras but even the outcastes within the pale of the military organization thereby giving it a national character. In the city and in expeditions the army of the superior castes were employed; in the villages the Sudras more than others, worked for their defence while in the forests the chandalas and in the frontier the wild tribes served. It is not true that "the soldier was born, not made" and that only a particular caste was permitted by law to participate in war activities. The whole nation comprising of men of all strata, according to Kautilya, should represent the military department. This provision for using all sections of the society in military activities must be regarded as the greatest contribution of Kautilya in the field of the development of military studies in ancient India.

**Machiavelli on war department**

Like Kautilya Machiavelli is also eloquent on the subject of military science. The Art of War written by him in 1521 is a classic in this respect. Kautilya who seems to have been in the thick of battles a few times had wide personal experience of battles—ordinary, great, fair as well as treacherous
and as such he was in a position to deal with the minutest details of the military organization. Consequently he filled in five to six Books of his treatise with the stuff of military topics. This was not possible for Machiavelli obviously because he had no such wide military experience nor was he the prime minister of a conquering monarch who was always intent upon making new conquests. Yet, both were writing for monarchical rule and were convinced that without military prowess the monarch could neither sustain his realm nor could make new additions.

Machiavelli was particularly concerned with the subject for, from the study of history as well as from the occurrences of his day he was convinced that the present deplorable state of Italy which had once formed a glorious empire, was because of her negligence over the army. Quite naturally, then, the militia or citizen army formed one of the cardinal aspects of his thought. It would be erroneous to say that Machiavelli had no personal experience at all of the military affairs. What is being said is that he had no such scope nor had the occasion to have such wide practical knowledge of the military science which his Indian counterpart possessed. While employed in the service of Florence one of the most important concerns of his department was related with war. To his dismay he found that the glorious republic had no army of its own. It used professionals and mercenaries who were neither moved by any feeling of patriotism nor belonged to the state and were
recruited from those waiting at the market for the lord who
would pay them the highest wages. These mercenaries fought
under the command of their own captains but were accompanied
by Florentine commissaries and it was in this scope that
Machiavelli found an opportunity during the rule of Soderini to
gain some practical knowledge of the military science. His
insight into the art of war being combined with the initiative
taken by him to reorganise the Florentine militia largely
contributed to the victory of Florence over Pisa.

The difference between Kautilya and Machiavelli is
that while the intention of the former was to help an enter­
prising monarch to expand his dominion the latter tried to show
Dif ference with
Kautilya
fighting by which they could liberate
their motherland by driving away the foreign masters. Further,
in The Art of War, Machiavelli was obsessed by a passionate
love for the glorious army of ancient Rome and this thing
particularly distinguishes him from Kautilya who seems to have
furnished ideas on the military organization wholly from his
originality because here he did not consult any previous teacher.
Machiavelli, in another sense also, differed from Kautilya. He
could not think of a large standing army supported by the State.
The ancient Roman armies, for which he has so great fascination,
were mere "pigmy armies" if compared with the armies of ancient
India. Maintenance of a large standing army, Machiavelli knew
well, would steadily tax the royal treasury of the small city-State and hence recommended for the disbanding of the army in times of peace. The soldiers of the Machiavellian prince's army would, then, when there was no war, go back to their previous individual profession but on their military service being demanded by the State they would come forward and find themselves in the warfield. It is, as if, then would pass their time merrily in a playground during a vacation that would change their taste and reanimate their vigour. 96

All the essential elements of the <i>Saptânga</i> theory of Kaûtîlya seem to be present in Machiavelli's concept of the State though the latter's views on the subject are not as systematic as Kaûtîlya's and require to be gathered from here and there. Thus Machiavelli almost echoes Kaûtîlya when he says that one cannot expect to get anything unless one is well-armed and has enough money to pay. 97 In the real world it is the money and army that count. Kaûtîlya is also very firm on the point: "It is by means of the treasury and the army ... that the king can hold under his control his and his enemy's party." 98 In another context Machiavelli says that one of the main foundation stones of every State, monarchical as well as republican, is good arms. 99 Just like Kaûtîlya, Machiavelli was aware of the various kinds of troops which the king might use against enemies. Thus Machiavelli's native force, mercenaries, auxiliaries and composite troops 100 can all be discovered in Kaûtîlya's <i>mâulas</i>, <i>bhrata</i>, <i>srênis</i>, troops belonging to a
friend (mitrabal) or to an enemy (amitrabal) (in which case the viśiṣṭa will be benefited indirectly because here the army of one of his enemies will destroy the forces of another enemy king through the secret manipulation of the viśiṣṭa and thereby will render the path clear for him) and wild tribes (ātavibaś).  

J.R. Hale wonders why Machiavelli should not be praised rather as a military expert instead of the constitutional or political theorist — the form in which he is viewed. His wonder owes its origin partly to the interest which Machiavelli showed in military affairs under Soderini but largely to the Florentine's preoccupation in the matter of military science which finally led to the writing of such a book as The Art of War. However, Hale's opinion is not convincing for, Machiavelli's dream was to see a resurrection of the strong Italian States and the grandeur which were once seen under the Republican Rome and the necessity of having a strong army was perceived only as a means to the achievement of that end. He would have no occasion to dwell on the subject if it was not for redeeming the glory of old Italy. He sincerely believed that the people of Italy could hold the barbarians outside her geographical frontiers only if the citizens could be persuaded to believe that they were all "involved in a struggle for common defence." Unlike Kautilya's India the free life of Machiavelli's native city granted liberty
to the citizens who enjoying the privileges were too prone to make abuse of them.\textsuperscript{104} and this forced Machiavelli — though by birth he was a believer in republicanism — to come to the conclusion that a strong State could be established only if the subjects bound them to an omnipotent prince. The absence of the strong ruler failed to restrain the city States from giving themselves up to pleasures, even sensual, and they were rapidly being demoralised by the other accompanying vices. The disunion and anarchy prevailing in the Italian States allured the leading but unscrupulous Italian powers to call, in their quarrels foreign assistance which forced Italy to remain virtually a prey to the covetousness of the foreign powers and finally led to the sack of Rome in 1527.\textsuperscript{105}

Machiavelli undertook the task of showing the way in which the military organisation of Italy should be reformed. It would be the wisest course for the princes and the republics of Italy to form military establishments of their own. So long they had done nothing of the kind. The only class of soldiers known to them was the mercenaries and the only thing that concerned the mercenaries was who would pay them the highest wages. A mercenary was just concerned with the highest wages and longest terms. Immediately on the expiry of his term he could take up an employment under a master against whom he had just fought and turn his arms against that who was his master a few days ago. Such a thing was quite natural because the mercenaries had neither any sympathy or love for those they
defended nor any hatred against those they fought. In such
circumstances an employer counting on their support could
hardly remain free from anxiety. The danger of depending upon
the mercenaries is illustrated by the case of Francesco Sforza
who entered the service of the Milanese and fought against their
enemies on their behalf but, finding an opportune moment, he
turned his arms against his employer and seized the throne from
the position of a mere military adventurer. In his attempt
to establish himself he hesitated at doing nothing that seemed
expedient to him though in the opinion of "sane persons" these
would be nothing but treacheries. Machiavelli was an admirer of the
achievements of Sforza and would allow such treacheries against foreigners.

But he was not blind to the dangers of employing
mercenaries. "Mercenaries and auxiliaries are useless and
dangerous ... princes have paid the penalty for them." If
the commander of the mercenary force is lacking in prowess he
will bring about the ruin of his employer in the very normal
way while if he is powerful enough he cannot be trusted at all
for, he will be always prone to seize the power. If it is
found that the commander even after successful completion of
the campaign does not turn against his employer this should be
attributed to the latter's good luck. Machiavelli's apprehension owed its origin to the realities and he was confirmed of the wicked nature of the human being. He vehemently
castigated those who chose to use auxiliaries i.e., those who were willing to accept assistance from powerful states. His repugnance to the use of auxiliaries sprang from two causes. First, such use of the auxiliary forces was mostly responsible for the miserable condition of Italy which brought down upon her vast predatory armies of the Emperor Charles V and Francis I, the king of France. Secondly, just like the mercenaries the auxiliarian also can turn against the monarch for whom they have come to fight. And the latter are more fatal than the mercenaries for, “they constitute a united army, wholly obedient to the orders of someone else; but mercenaries having conquered, need more time and opportunity to harm you, for, they are not a compact force and you have raised and paid them yourself. Mercenaries, moreover, are led by someone you appoint, and he cannot immediately assume sufficient authority to be able to do you harm. To sum up, cowardice is the danger with mercenaries and valour with auxiliaries.

Hence Machiavelli has opined that armed forces must be under the control of the prince who himself should assume personal command of his troops and that “mercenaries bring nothing but loss”. Wise princes even prefer to lose battles with their own forces for, they know that true victory can never be achieved with alien arms. Thus Machiavelli prefers native troops to mercenaries, mercenaries to auxiliaries and he resembles Kautilya in making the statement because the latter
Remarkable similarity also says that a standing army (maulabali) is better than a hired troops (including śrenis, vṛtabel and mitrabal) and the hired troops are better than the 'army of the enemy' (amitrabali) and wild tribes (atavibal). Just like Machiavelli's auxiliary force (which is fatal) Kautilya's wild tribes are anxious for plunder and in the absence of any scope for plunder and under troubles, they prove as dangerous as lurking snake.

Machiavelli does not make any more classification of the forces and says that except an army composed of subjects or citizens all other forces are either mercenaries and auxiliaries. And what they do once the war is over? "War makes thieves and peace hangs them. Because those who do not know how to live by any other occupation, do not find anybody who will support them in soldiering and do not have so much ability that they can join together to carry out an honourable villany, are forced by necessity to rob on the highway (and justice is forced to wipe them out)." Machiavelli's citizen army however, is not very different from Kautilya's standing army. The only difference is that in times of peace the soldiers must support themselves by pursuing other occupations. But just like Kautilya's standing army they are at the beck and call of the monarch who may, at any time, demand their services and which they must render without fail. The importance of this army, drawn from the citizenship of the state, has been recognised by later
generations of Italians. After the unification of Italy this was judged worthy of special mention on the monument erected to the memory of Machiavelli:

"To Nicholas Machiavelli

The Intrepid and Prophetic Precursor of National Unity,
The First Institutator and Master of Her Own
In place of Adventitious Armies,
United and Armed Holy Placed This Tablet,
On His Fourth Centenary, 3rd May, 1869."

More Similarities in the authors' views:

'A prince desirous of making conquests must know the art of war for, this is "the first way to win a State", says Machiavelli. Like Kautilya's well-trained king, Machiavelli's prince must be skilful in his application of the military science. Otherwise he will forfeit his fortune and will never be respected by his soldiers. Himself being acquainted with the military affairs Machiavelli, like Kautilya, spoke for the training of his militia and making them disciplined. These things should be done more in times of peace than during war for, it is the duty of the prince to keep his men always ready for any contingency. For, otherwise, due to lack of training they may not do good when they are actually on the battlefield. It is not like Kautilya's standing army yet, the prince, even in times of peace, must keep his men well-organised and trained.
Kauṭilya speaks for the construction of various types of forts depending upon the geographical nature of the locality.\footnote{121}

The monarch of both should know geography the point and stresses that the prince must learn practical geography.\footnote{124} "Such knowledge is useful in two ways: first, if he obtains a clear understanding of local geography he will have a better understanding of how to organize his defence; and in addition his knowledge of and acquaintance with local conditions will make it easy for him to grasp the features of any new locality with which he may need to familiarize himself ... The Prince who lacks this knowledge also lacks the first qualification of good commander".\footnote{125} Kauṭilya seems to be anxious about the army when it is on the move and this anxiety is discernible in his "encampment", "march of the army" and "operation of a siege".\footnote{126} Similarly, Machiavelli’s prince should be able enough to know "how to locate the enemy, where to take up quarters, how to lead his army on the march and draw it up for battles, and lay siege to a town to the best advantage".\footnote{127} What an astonishing similarity!

Not in The Prince but in The Art of War Machiavelli has elaborately discussed the organization of the army and a perusal of the work will leave an indelible impression on the mind of the reader that he had practical knowledge of the military science\footnote{128} though his practical knowledge was not as extensive as that of Kauṭilya who saw major battles fought not only during
the reign of Chandragupta Maurya but during his son's time too. Machiavelli had great admiration for the Swiss military system also and this together with the ancient Roman system supplied the fundamental stuff of his thesis. He dealt with topics such as recruitment, training, choosing site for encampment, arrangement of defence line, supplies, assaults, ambush, siege and capture of cities by deception, stratagem, tactics, secrecy and discipline in the minutest possible detail and this goes much beyond to prove that the author's mind was obsessed by a feeling of urgency of making a recast of the indigenous military system.

Allowing the differences in their minute details it can be safely said that both Kautilya and Machiavelli treated the army as the backbone of monarchical rule. Kautilya regarded the standing army composed of the men of Kshatriya caste as the best army for, the members of such an army were "ready to share in the weal or woe of the king" and would not play false with him. Similarly, Machiavelli believes that a citizen army is not an instrument of tyranny for, the citizens or subjects carrying arms legally "never do damage". Kautilya emphasized that the hereditary army was the best but at the same time opined that mercenaries could be utilized if the king deemed it expedient. But Machiavelli was against using the mercenaries of whose efficiency he was totally disillusioned. But notice is to be taken of one point. Kautilya's king was a vijigita who was
continuously expanding his dominion and hence he might feel the necessity of using bigger armies for the successful conclusion of his campaign. Otherwise, for mercenaries he had also no better fascination. The most interesting point on which the authors agree is that both were eager to give a national character to their army. Machiavelli who showed personal interest and busily engaged himself in the reorganization of the Florentine militia held the view that "the new militia ... was to be animated by a truly patriotic spirit" i.e., it should become a national militia. To speak honestly, Kautilya did not conceive the national character of the army in the sense Machiavelli conceived of it but he assigned a national character to his army by speaking for bringing within the organization men of all castes and races. Like Machiavelli's prince his king also did not lag behind in instilling zeal, ardour and patriotism in the minds of his soldiers. So, the slender difference in their manner of placing views does not carry much weight as the army of both would ultimately appear in the same colour.
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