



REVIEW OF RESEARCH

ISSN: 2249-894X

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF)

UGC APPROVED JOURNAL NO. 48514

VOLUME - 8 | ISSUE - 9 | JUNE - 2019



KAUTILYA'S THEORY OF STATE

Shivakumar Shivasharanappa¹ and Dr. I. S. Vidyasagar²

¹Research Scholar Department of Political Science Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi.

²Associate Professor of Political science Dr.Ambedkar College Kalaburagi.

ABSTRACT:

Political Thought is primarily concerned with the state and its functions. There are no historical records to tell us how and when men originally come to live under the state conditions or a political system. In the absence of historical evidence, political thinkers and writers have, however made various suggestions to explain how state originated.¹ There are differences of opinion among various political thinkers related the meaning, origin, function, objective elements of the state. Therefore, attempt has been made in his chapter to analyse Kautilya's concept of state. The word 'state' called *stato*, in Italian, 'etat' in French. 'Staat' in German and 'Estado' in Spanish. These all words give the same idea of state stability or status.²



KEYWORDS: Political Thought , historical evidence, political thinkers.

INTRODUCTION :

No Contemporary evidence is available to enlighten us on the origin of the state. The idea of the state as an organized society goes back to the Greek city states. Aristotle describes it as the nature growth of family and village state is a union of unlike persons to satisfy their needs. The theory is prior in nature. family being older in time. The Romans borrowed idea of state from the Greeks but applied it to a bigger geographic unit. The Roman term *status* 'Reipublical' means the state of public

concern. In its modern sense, the term is first used by Machiavelli during the 16th century as a general, term for a body politic. Hobbes, Lock and Bentham come to see the state as an artificial creation. This view given by the western thinkers.

In India many ancient works like Satapata, Brahman, Manusmriti and Mahabharat have dealt with problem of origin of the state. Most Institutions were regarded in ancient India as due to divine agency or inspiration and the state was no exception to this rule. In the Mahabharata show that the state was regarded as a divine institution. king's right to govern

was partly due to his divine creation and partly due to the agreement of the subjects to be governed by him in order to terminate the anarchy.³ The puranic literature says that varnas played a great role in the origin of the state. When the means of subsistence has been provided, people were divided into four varnas. Therefore, Brahma created the king who was also vested with *danda*, the rod of royal authority to punish the wicked and wrong. Therefore, in the Puranic view the state came into existence to check the mutual struggles among different varnas. Narda and Bribaspatishays

that when the golden age was destroyed, the law of jungle prevailed in society, and people began to feel insecurity and insafety about their property, family and Varnadharma. As a result Vyavahara, the state authority came into existence to safeguard property and maintain law and order in society.⁴

Kautilya Arthashastra is not a theoretical treatise on political science. It is not directly concerned with the question of the origin of the state. Kautilya's Arthashastra essentially a book on the art of administration gave only passing reference to the origin of the state. Kautilya refers to the problem of the origin of the state only incidentally during a discussion of spies among themselves. According to Kautilya the state originated when people got weary of the logic of the fish (matayanyaya) according to which bigger fish swallow the smaller ones. People themselves selected Manu as their King and one tenth of the merchandise and of the gold as his share. The state originated to fulfill the desire of the people to have a peaceful society. King took upon themselves the responsibility of maintaining the safety and security of their subjects. Kautilya does not propound any logical theory of the state its origin and ends, but he appears to believe in the social contract theory according to which the state came into existence after such a contract between the king and the people.⁵ He regarded the state a result of human nature and its needs and it was consequently natural and beneficial.

Thus Kautilya imagined the original state of nature to be one of total anarchy, where might is right prevailed. People agreed to pay taxes and to be ruled by one person in order that they may be able to enjoy security and well being. Kautilya believed that the state was an organism and not a mere mechanical institution. Kautilya was the first contractualist in India like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Rousseau were the modern contractualists of the west but Kautilya's social contract was government and less social because he was not interested in creating a theory on the origin of the state. His intention was to replace the misrule of Nanda Dynasty by Chandragupta who could make the strong and powerful state. Kautilya also believed in the divine origin theory.

DEFINITION OF STATE:

In the Ancient Political Thinking, Kautilya has first time defined the state in Arthashastra. According to Kautilya, an area cannot be a state unless there are not people and rulers to control that state. According to him state is an area which consists many cities. It not only produces things for living but also protects its people from danger and animals. Others things like fertile land, food, wood, jungles for elephants, pastures for animals are also available there. For water it depends not only on rain but it has many sources of water. For trade there are a lot of goods. There live decent and high character people. There live wise owners and faithful servants. Kautilya has given a detailed definition. According to Kautilya, a state consists of different cities, people, different sects of people, military, treasury and tax-system.

Arthashastra has been mentioned there that Artha is the subsistence or livelihood of men, in other words it means the earth inhabited by men. Arthashastra is thus the science which shows how to acquire and preserve that earth that is to prescribe means for securing and preserving power over the earth. Thus, this sastra is composed as a guide to acquire and secure this and the other world.⁶ The definition of state given by Kautilya is identical with the modern definition of state. Modern thinkers like Garner defines state as 'community of persons, more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite proportion of territory, independent or nearly so, of external control and possessing and organizing government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience.'⁷ According to MacIver State as 'a' the state is an association which acting through law as promulgated by government endowed to this end with coercive power maintains within a community territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order.⁸

Kautilya used the word 'Raja' which according to Spellman, corresponds to the English word 'State'. The state is defined for the first time in the Arthashastra of Kautilya as consisting of seven elements a definition which become an axiom in the later sources.⁹ According to Kautilya the state and kingship were based on popular good will. The king was their leader as well as head of the state and government. In the Vedas, the state was considered to be a source of peace, law and order, security and justice. In the state the king are responsible for maintain peace and order to encourage, moral, religious

and material progress and provide a sense of security to his subjects. In Kautilya Arthashastra king was the head of the state. King were vested executive, legislative, Judicial and financial powers. In Kautilya eyes, the state and king are indispensable: the later is such an essential part of society.

The Origin of Kingship :

Kautilya regarded state as an essentially human, not a divine, institution. This was in keeping with the early vedic view which looked at monarch essentially as a human being, rather than a divine person.

The theoretical aspect of the State did not fall within the philosophical domain of Kautilya, as he was not a political theorist. Yet, his stray reflections on the origin of State to help us have a better understanding of his concept of state in its totality. And, the almost casual mention of these ideas in his Arthashastra is hardly surprising, as these ideas had already gained currency during the Mauriyan period.

Kautilya was disturbed to find that people had to suffer the anarchy of Matsyanyaya, the proverbial 'judicial' tendency of the large fish to swallow the smaller ones. He thought that it was primarily to get rid of this hobbesian kind of a situation which led people select Manu, the Vaivasvata, as their first king.

While selecting their king, the subjects expected him not only to ensure their "safety and security" and 'punish' people with anarchic tendencies, but also to "maintain individual and social order". For this purpose, they empowered him to collect property taxes or royal dues equivalent to "one-sixty of the grain grown and one-tenth of merchandise". The king was also authorized to act atonce, as Indra and Yama acted, while dispensing rewards and punishment. And acting as such he could never be despised". The prevailing view was that if a subject disregarded the king, he would have to undergo not only political but also divine punishment.

Thus, to Kautilya, the king derived his authority to rule from those who selected him for this office and paid him property tax or royal dues to enable him to fulfill the duties and functions assigned to him. As such, Kautilya's king commanded instant devotion and loyalty of his subjects.

The Organic State : The Saptanga Theory :

Kautilya builds up his theory of the state as an organic entity on the basis of seven elements, which he describes in his Arthashastra as Saptanga. The seven elements, despite being enumerated separately, stand in the closest possible relation to one another and are in themselves "mutually serviceable". Together, they constitute the state as an organism, "like a chariot, composed of seven parts fitted and subservient to one another". Though Kautilya likens the state to Chariot, he conceives it essentially as a living, not a dead, organism in which the Swami (the king) is the spirit that regulates and guides the remaining constituents of the body-politic. This harmony is essential not only to their own existence, but also to that of the whole which they constitute together further, according to Kautilya, of these seven elements, each subsequent elements inferior to the preceding ones. "Thus, the Swami or the King (first prakriti or element) becomes superior to the remaining six elements".¹⁰ His righteousness and other qualities would result in the righteousness and prosperity of other elements, whereas his vices would multiply the troubles and calamities of the other elements. In this connection, it is to be noted that while Manu argues that various elements could gain importance on different occasions, the Mahabharata considers all the elements as supplementary to one another.

"To an extent, the organic theory of State finds elaboration in the Ancient Greek Political Philosophy. For instance, while comparing the state with the human body. Plato had argued that just as a cut in the finger causes pain in the body, similarly injury of one organ creates problems for the other organs of the body-politic. Aristotle was of the view that no organ and no individual has any value, if not considered in totality. For instance, an arm is meaningless without the body. The Greek philosophers wanted to avert the causes which endangered the unity and solidarity of the city-states, whereas Kautilya aimed at comprehensiveness of Anvikshaki, Trayi, Vaarta and Dandaniti".¹¹

Seven Angas, Prakritis, or elements were enumerated and elucidated by Kautilya for describing “the nature of the State” in its totality. As laid down in the first chapter of Arthashastra’s Sixth Book, entitled Mandala Yonih, these are :

1. The Swami, the sovereign King
2. The Mantrin, the ministers
3. The Janapada, the people and the territory
4. The Durga, the fortification
5. The Kosha, the treasury
6. The Sena or the Dando, the army
7. The Mitra, the allies.¹²

All these elements establish the nature of state. the seven characteristics that emerge from these seven elements are :

1. Unity, uniformity and solidarity, of the state;
2. Stable and systematic administration;
3. Definite territory, able to protect and support both the king and the subjects;
4. Planned system of security and defence;
5. System of just and proportionate taxation;
6. Strong and powerful state
7. Freedom from alien mle.

Through these elements, Kautilya is able to depict the various facets of the state of his conception, inclusion of Mitra (ally), Kosha (treasury) and Sena (army) as a separate elements in the formation of State may not be acceptable today, but it had a marked relevance in an age when the theory of separation of powers was not predominant and when the state meant nothing but the sole embodiment of the highest executive authority, subject only to the supremacy of laws. As a matter of fact, in incorporating all these elements as constituents of his body-politic. Kautilya is only according recognition to all the agencies which contribute to the “moral and political existence of a community”.

Moreover, by including Mitra (ally) as a constituent element of the state. Kautilya has succeeded in presenting the state “not as a thing in itself, but as one entity among and in relation to many” in the international sphere. He recognises not only its sovereign character but also its interdependence. His policy has, therefore been rightly described by M.V. Krishna Rao as “pluralistically dominated monism”.

The seven elements of the state outlined by Kautilya may be discussed as follows:

1. Swami (The Sovereign King):

Subscribing to monarchy as the ideal form of state, Kautilya has accorded to the king “the highest place in the body-politic”.¹³ The Swami is the chief executive head of the state and is, thus “the consummation of all other elements”. He is not merely a feudatory chieftain, but a variable sovereign owing allegiance to none. The word Swami is derived from the word swayam which refers to self determining. The Swami, therefore becomes a living and animate embodiment, which is subjected to be ruled by none, does not follow any external mlings and is liable only to self imposed restrictions. He is thus, the symbol of legal and political authority and power. Distinguished from Raja or Rajan, Swami has the reflection of political superior or sovereign.¹⁴

Kautilya gives a comprehensive list of four broad categories of qualities which constitute the ideals of a Swami :

- a) Qualities of an inviting nature (AbhigamikaGuna): which induces the people to approach him, i.e., the qualities of high birth, pious, consulting the aged persons, truthful not of divided nature, grateful having lofty ideals, powerful to control the neighbouring kings, of firm mind, having a large assembly and having a propensity of for discipline and restraint.

- b) Qualities of intellect and institution (PrajyanaGuna): devotedness, hearing, reception, retention, discriminate vision, critical analysis, penetration into the regions of metaphysics.
- c) Qualities of enthusiasm (UtsahaGuna) : Prowess, non-endurance, quickness and dexterity.
- d) Qualities of self restraintGild spirit, eloquence, self pride, keenness of mind, energetic, powerful trained in the arts, free from vice, capable of giving rewards and penal sanctions, having foresight, ready to avail opportunities, capable of taking advantage of the enemy's weak-points, free from lust, anger, covetousness, obstinacy, fickleness and back-biting habits and adhering to the customs as interpreted by the aged persons.

This categorisation of qualities supplements the usual notion of kingship being characterized by coercion and subordination of people. The king was, thus, not be a despot, exercising power through sheer military force, but was to rule his subjects through affection. Accordingly, the duties and functions that he is called upon to perform are of two types: 1) Protective and 2) Promotive.

The Protective Functions :

In so far as the protective functions that Kautilya expects the Swami to perform, the following are of vital nature:

1. Being the natural guardian and saviour (the parens patriae) of his people, his highest duty is to protect:
 - i) The life of his people specially the ones in distress, the widows, the women without children, the women with infants, the orphans, the sick and the indigent.
 - ii) Hermits, srotriyas and students.
 - iii) Property of the people.
2. To put down violence and maintain law and order.
3. To avert dangers and command the army.
4. To redress people grievances.
5. To punish the wrong doers.
6. To administer justice impartially and in accordance with the sacred law (Dharma), evidence (Vyavhara), history (Samstha) and enacted law (Raajasthasana)

The Promotive Functions :

On the other hand, his promotive functions include the following :

1. To promote the moral and material happiness and welfare of his people as in their happiness lies his happiness and in their welfare his welfare.
2. To enable them to pursue freely their independent effort in life.
3. To maintain unity and solidarity.
4. To reward virtue.
5. To promote agriculture, industry and arts.
6. To regulate the means of livelihood, especially of the labourers and artisans.
7. To encourage education and help students.¹⁵

In the exercise of these functions, Kautilya's king was all powerful. The limits of his authority were imposed by the social and religious customs of his state which have existed from times immemorial and with which he was required not to interface. Further, the king was not be a despot exercising power through sheer military force, instead he was to rule his subjects through affection. Kautilya puts great emphasis on the devotion and loyalty of the subjects. Accordingly he suggests that no king should ever generate poverty, acquisitive greediness and disaffection among the people. The qualities, requisite training and obligations of the king, as described by Kautilya, have definite similarities with Plato's Philosopher-King, and are equally relevant today as these were during Kautilya's time.

2. Amatya (The Minister) :

The second elements of Saptanga, in its broad sense, incorporates, modern government; its organs like executive and legislature; and administrative structure of minister, secretaries, administrators, heads of departments, councilors, bureaucrats, advisers etc. In its narrow sense, the term Amatya or Mantrin used for the minister of the highest grade N.C. Bandvopadhyaya points out that it is not clear whether there was one niantrin or more, though some passage of Arthashastra do contemplate the existence of more than one such minister.

Kautilya describes an elaborate system of recruitment of the Amatyas and other officials who were to be Dharmopashuddha (morally and ethically pure). Arthopashuddha (honest in financial matters), and Charitropashuddha (of good or pure character). The Amatyas were expected to be natural born citizens, persons of noble origin, free from all vices, men of infallible memory, friendly nature, wisdom, patience and endurance. Kautilya was of the view that these ministers who have three-fourth of these qualities be considered medium level minister, but those who are in possession only of half of these are in general inferior.

“The king was expected to appoint only wise men to these offices as they were to be his most trusted advisers. These ministers were not only to advise the king whenever their advice was sought, they were also to maintain the secrecy of their deliberations. In fact, administrative ability, knowledge of scriptures and higher character are the qualities essential for the ministers every where and in every age”.¹⁶

3. Janapdad (The people and the territory) :

The unique element of Saptanga is the symbol of state, which stands for a “territorial society”. Here ‘Jana’ denotes people and ‘Pada’ is the symbol of territory where these inhabitants permanently reside, D.R. Bhandarkar and R.S. Sharma are of the view that Kautilya’s Janapada includes not only territory but also population N.C. Bandyopadhyaya is also of the view that when Kautilya spoke of the Janapada, he spoke of his subjects settled in the kingdom. Modern Western definition includes these two elements as separate and exclusive elements, whereas Ancient India scholars considered these two as supplementary or complimentary to each other.

Unlike Plato and Aristotle, Kautilya did not suggest any specific size of territory or population. His emphasis was more on quality than quantity. In his order of things, the state occupied a definite territory, which was the chief physical basis of existence. Kautilya prescribed the following requisites of a propersous, Janapada in ‘terms of its territory’ :

1. Accommodate and support the people.
2. Defend the state against enemies.
3. Find occupation for the people.
4. Have manageable neighbours.
5. Be free from depredation of wild animals.
6. Provide pastures.
7. Have arable land, mines, forest.
8. Provide good internal communication, i.e., rivers, roads and out let to sea.
9. Produce varieties of merchandise
10. Be a repository of resources for the common good.¹⁷

Bhandarkar selects only three of these characteristics as major features of the ideal territory. He says that the “Janapada should be Shatru-Dveshi (hostile to the foe), ShakyaSamanta (powerful enough to control the neighbouring kings), and KarmashilaKarshah (inhabited by agriculturists capable of toiling and miling).

In so far as the population is concerned, Kautilya stressed the qualities or the character of the people. He wanted the people to be energetic and industrious. They should also be Bhakta Shuchi Manushya (people who are pure and devoted). They should not only have a patriotic spirit, but also have hatred for the enemies. Repeatedly, Kautilya emphasized that loyalty of the subjects is the

greatest of all assets that a king could possess. Kautilya further suggested that the subjects should not only have the tendency to pay their taxes, but also to undertake punishment for violating laws and orders. They should have respect for the rule of law and government commanding popular support. The people should present a sort of unity in diversity in as much as the state should have people of all castes, including men of the higher orders. It was only the people with such qualities who would be able to make the Kautilyan State not merely social and political, but also paternal.

4. Durga (Fortification) :

Kautilya regarded fortification as essential for the defence and protection of the state. He wanted the state to fortify the territories from all sides. He has described four types of fortification which include Audak (surrounded by water), Paarvat (built on the top of the hill), Dhaavana (built on barren or waste land), and Vana (surrounded by forests). In the first category are included those forts which are built on islands surrounded by streams of tanks and pools. In the second category are included the forts which are surrounded and overlaid by mountains rocks. In the third category come the forts built on barren or waste lands. Under the fourth category come the forts which are surrounded by forests, swamps and shrubs of these categories, the first two are used for the protection of the territory and the remaining two are used for the protection of the farmers (vanapala). These fortifications, thus would not only protect the people and the capital, but would also be suitable for fighting purposes, i.e., for both defensive and offensive purposes.¹⁸

Kautilya suggested that the fort should be constructed by the king and a place where it can be constructed with minimum labour, economically and easily. He should establish his capital at a central place, which should become a centre of protection of wealth.¹⁹

Although the forts and castles of the time of Kautilya today appear to be more of archeological importance, they are as significant today in the context of territorial aggressions and international conflicts, atomic bombs and missiles as they were in the times of Kautilya. Thus, Kautilya's advice and scheme of watching a nation's territory and protecting it from aggression is as relevant today as it was in his times.

5. Kosha (The treasury) :

The flourishing economy is essential for the existence of the state in all times and circumstances. That is probably why the philosophers of Ancient India looked at treasury as an essential element of the State. They wanted the treasury to be always full with stocks of gold, silver, diamonds and jewels, so that not only the routine affairs of the state are conducted properly, but the king is also able to protect the people from natural calamities like floods and famines. Though Kautilya wanted a prosperous treasury, he specifically directed the king to earn the wealth of nation only by legitimate and righteous means, and in no way by unfair and immoral means. Proper management of agriculture, trade and unfair and immoral means. Proper management of agriculture, trade and commerce also makes the treasury prosperous. It helps the king not only to make the people prosperous, but also to control and contain its enemies.

For the collection of revenues, Kautilya suggested the following legitimate sources :

1. Various forms of land tax.
2. Duty levied on the sale of commodities in the market.
3. Tax on imports and exports.
4. Road cess, canal cess, ferry dues, conveyance cess, tax on load, tax on markets and fee from passport.
5. Taxes received from artisans, fishermen etc.
6. Taxes levied on prostitutes, gambling houses, pubs and slaughter houses.
7. Income from prosperities and monopolies belonging to the King.
8. Forced labour.
9. Fines through law courts.
10. Accidental income.

11. Interest on loan advances to the people.
12. Miscellaneous taxes.²⁰

“Kautilya emphasised that taxes must never be imposed suddenly and in extreme excess over previous payments. Watchful of disturbances, Kautilya resorts to the analogy of fruits. He says, “Just as fruits are gathered from a garden as often as they become ripe, so revenue shall be collected as often as becomes ripe. Collection of revenue or of fruits, when unripe, shall never be carried on lest their sources may be injured, causing immense trouble”. Kautilya points out that the people might migrate to a more favourable country, if troubled by unjust extortion.²¹

Recommending deviation from legitimate means in emergencies, Kautilya acknowledged that the people could be expected to pay extra and higher taxes. Kautilya lists a number of methods by which the king can obtain extra funds. The king could have recourse to trickery and assassination. He recommended that the king should explain the necessity to the people, but if this does not bring in the required revenue, he may sell honours or positions, or if the danger is very great, take away the wealth of corporations or heretics and temples. He may export funds from all sinful people as the sinful rich are the most rewarding.

Thus, collection of additional revenue in the wake of acute crisis, but in normal times, their proper legitimate collection, in proportion to tax paying capacity of citizens, is also the criterion of taxation of modern welfare governments as was prescribed by Kautilya.

6. Danda (The army or the force) :

Like other philosophers of Ancient India, Kautilya also accepted a strong and hereditary Kshatriya army, as the most important requisite of the state. He insisted on the hereditary army, as it would not only be skilled, well contended and obedient to the king's will, but also be free from duplicity. Such an army would serve both the defensive and offensive purposes of the king. It would not only protect the people, but also keep the enemy away.

As far as possible, soldiers should be drawn from the traditionally noble Kshatriya families, so that they remain loyal and are satisfied with the grants given to them by the state and are habitual of bearing losses in property and person. Hence, it was obvious for Kautilya to pay great attention to the maintenance and organization of the army. For instance, in Arthashastra we find him mentioning as many as half a dozen heads of departments namely :

- a. The Aayudhaagaaraadhyaksha (incharge of the armoury)
- b. The Naavadhyaksha (incharge of the naval forces)
- c. The Ashvaadhyaksha (incharge of cavalry)
- d. The Hastyaadhyaksha (incharge of the elephants)
- e. The Rathaadhyaksha (incharge of the chariots)
- f. The Pattiadhyaksha (incharge of the infantry)²²

R.S. Sharma has added to these six divisions of Kautilya, the other two additional categories of forced labour and hired soldiers and pictured the army as AashtaangaBala.

Kautilya has also categorised the nature of the army as follows :

Maul Bala (hereditary army), BhritBala (paid army), Shreni Bala (territorial army), MitraBala (army of allies), AmitraBala (army of enemies), and AtviBala (tribal army). Kautilya was of the view that the chief of the army should be amply familiar with the abilities and inabilities of all these forces. He should be familiar with all types of warfare, i.e., PrakashYudha (regular declared warfare), KutaYudha (warfare of treachery and intrigue), and TushnimYudha (chemical warfare). Furthermore, joyalty, knowledge of kshatravidyaa (science of weaponry), experience, devotion, preparedness for sacrifice etc. were some of the qualities expected in the soldiers. Such awareness of the qualities and qualification on the part of the army chief and other soldiers are relevant even today.

7. Mitra (The allies) :

Having realized that 'political isolation means death', Kautilya proceeded to consider the Mitra or the ally as a vital factor. Infact, it is the quality and quantity of the state's allies that determines its position in the political world.

Kautilya recognises two kinds of allies, namely Sahaja (or natural) and Kritrima (or required). The Sahaja or natural ally is the one whose friendship is derived from the 'times of King's father and grandfather and who is situated close to the territory of the immediately neighbouring enemy. On the other hand, the Kritrima or the acquired ally is the one whose friendship is specially resorted to for the protection of wealth and life. For instance, Hitler required the friendship of USSR at the out break of Second World War through a non-aggression pact and terminated it in 1941 according to his own choice.

"Kautilya however, preferred an ally who is traditional, permanent, disciplined and enthusiastic and from whom the possibility of opposition or rebellion is minimum. He should help in times of need and when ever the state is in danger. Instead of observing neutrality, he should exemplify himself as his defender and protector. Ally, thus should be in possession of six requisite qualities; such as hereditary, permanent, manageable, supporter, eager to co-operate and strong enough with Prabhu Shakti (instutional), Mantra Shakti (intellectual) and Utsaaha Shakti (enthusiastical) strength. Kautilya was of the view that the prudent king must strengthen himself by the force of powerful allies, with whose active co-operation, he would be able to put down foreign, enemies, save and enrich his kingdom and preserve the political equilibrium".²³

Kautilya, thus furnishes us with full and complete definition of the state. The modern constituents of the state, such as sovereignty, government, territory and population are covered respectively by the elements of Swami, Amatya and Janapda in the Saptang theory of the state. In modern times, unless a state receives recognition of other States, its de jure status is not established. This element in the modern. States may be compared to Mitra (ally). Though in the modern definition of the state there is no place for any and taxation, these are covered by the concept of sovereign power which exercises the function of coercion and tax collection.

A remarkable similarity between the Kautilyan and the Marxist conceptions of the state has also been traced with reference to their view of the class character and the need of Danda and Kosha. R.S. Sharma concludes his analysis with his observation that "Kautilya's Saptang theory not only bears resemblance to the modern definition of the state, but contains certain elements typical of the state expounded, by Angels".

However, a reference to the problem of the concept of sovereignty is immensely important, in Ancient India, there were sovereign states in the sense that the holders of the political office of kingship could generally make their 'will' prevail by resort to 'force'. Various scholars have only been denying the conceptual equivalent in Sanskrit of the notion of state sovereignty, and not the historical existence of actual powerful sovereign kingdoms.

Kautilya's concept of state is however vividly reflected in his description of angas or elements of the state. He did not specifically define the term 'state', as he was essentially, a man of action (a councillor) and not a theorist. His concern for and emphasis on the internal and external security of state was to save humanity from a sort of Hobbesian state of nature, a state of war, marked by Matsyanyaya (the strong, like the big fish, tyrannizing and devouring the weaker and smaller ones).

Further-more, it has to be pointed out that on the one hand, Kautilya constructs the categories which make the ideal, in each of the seven constituents; on the other hand, the eighth book of Arthashastra examines the vices and calamities of each of the sevenfold factors. It analysis the troubles of the king and his kingdom (like gambling, drunkenness, greed, anger etc), the aggregate of the troubles of men (being untrained, greedy, over ambitious), the groups of molestators (if most inhabitants indulge in armed conflicts), the group of obstructionists (the majority of inhabitants being agricultural labourers) the group of the troubles of the treasury (arising out of man made and natural calamities) the group of troubles of the army (because of loyal soldiers resentment on account of non payment of salaries and wives influence on solders) and lastly, the group of troubles of a friend (who

could be influenced or bribed and could turn neutral at times of crisis). Kautilya was of the view that if a fault in one element affects other elements, then it should be considered disastrous and has to be rectified.

Here, it is important to note that Kautilya provided for a mechanism to prevent the king from becoming self centered and autocratic dictator by keeping him under the control of sacred and social traditions, ethical norms aimed at peace and prosperity of his people. The sovereign of Kautilya is bound by the ethical norms of Anvikshaki, Trayi, Vaarta and Dandaniti, which he can not change or alter arbitrarily. The happiness and prosperity of the king consists in the happiness and prosperity of his subjects. By accepting Praja Dharma as Raaja Dharma, the king of Kautilya is accepted and adored as pare Jspatriar.

CONCLUSION:

In short, Kautilya, thus, represents the legacy of Ancient Indian Political Tradition in the enumeration of the seven elements of the state. And in its present day interpretation he presents himself as a theorist who combined the unique and basic features of both the Western Liberal as well as the Marxist theories of the nature of state. The Saptang theory is a vivid manifestation of Kautilya's deeper understanding of not only the political nature of man, but also the functioning of his political institutions, especially the state. It would not be an exaggeration to call this theory the indigenous (Indian) version of the nature of state.

NOTES AND REFERENCES:

1. T. S. Narula, Principles of Political Science. AskajanakPublisher. New Delhi 1984. PP.52-53.
2. Madan G. Gandhi, Political Theory and Thought, Pragati Publication, New Delhi 2007, PP.51-52.
3. A.S. Altekar. State and Government in Ancient India. MotilalBanarsidass. Delhi 1958, PP.28-29.
4. S. Vijayaraghavan, Political Thought. Sterling Publishers Private Limited. New Delhi 1981, PP.10-11.
5. N. Jayapalan. Indian Administration, Atlantic Publisher, 2001. P-10
6. Vishwanath Prasad Varma, Hindu Political Thought and its Metaphysical Foundations, MotilalBanarsidass. Delhi 1952, P-68.
7. Madan G. Gandhi, Political Theory and Thought, Pragati Publication. New Delhi 2007. P-52
8. Ibid. P-52.
9. Dusmanta Kumar Mohanty, Indian Political Tradition: From Manu To Ambedker, Anmol Publications, Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi 1997.P.40.
10. Dusmanta Kumar Mohanty, Indian Political Tradition: From Manu to Ambedker, Anmol Publications, Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi 1997 P-40.
11. S.A. Palekar : Indian Political thought current publication Agra-2016, P-8.
12. Dusmanta Kumar Mohanty, Indian Political Tradition: From Manu to Ambedker, Anmol Publications. Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi 1997,PP.40-41.
13. R. P. Kangle, The Kautilya Arthashastra, MotilalBanarsidass Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi 1963,P-129
14. N. Jayapalan, Indian Administration, Vol-I, Atlantic Publisher, 2001. P-5.
15. Ritu Kohli, Kautilya's Political Theory, Deep & Deep Publication, New Delhi, 1995.P-23.
16. Dusmanta Kumar Mohanty, Indian Political Tradition: From Manu to Ambedker, Anmol Publications, Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi 1997.P-41
17. R. Shamasastri. Kautilya's Arthashastra, G. H. Rama Rao Pub., Mysore 1967,P-13.
18. B. A. Saletor, Ancient Indian Political Thought and Institutions, Asa Publishing, New Delhi 1963,P-320.
19. R. S. Sharma Aspects of Political Idea and Institution in Ancient India, MotilalBanarsidass, Delhi 1958, P-33.
20. S.D. Gajrani. Modern Indian Political Thought, Modan Publishing House Punjabi University Patiala, 2015,P-39.
21. Madan G. Gandhi, Political Theory and Thought, Pragati Publication, New Delhi 2007, P-304.

22. SurinderKaurDhaliwal, Indian Political Thought Publication Bureau Punjabi University Patiala, 1990,P-27.
23. MadanG. Gandhi, Political Theory and Thought, PragatiPublicition, New Delhi 2007, P-307.



Shivakumar Shivasharanappa
Research Scholar Department of Political Science Gulbarga University,
Kalaburagi.