

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 6 | Issue 2

2023

© 2023 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to submission@ijlmh.com.

An Analysis and Review on the Principles of Governance and Administration Ideas of Kautilya, Abul Fazal Ibn Mubarak, and Gandhi

S. RAM SIVANU¹

ABSTRACT

The principles of governance and politics were studied as a separate discipline right from early ancient eras in Greek and other ancient civilizations. Indian civilization which is one of the oldest civilizations also saw this emergence of political science as a discipline. In our theoretical way of political administration these theories largely starts with the diplomatic ideas of Kautilya who is also known as Chanakya and Vishnugupta who was the prime minister of Magadha under Mauryan Emperor Chandragupta Maurya. Ideas of Chanakya were greatly seen as diplomatic strategies involving foreign relations, war strategies and political administration. In the advent of medieval era, India saw a range of invasions starting from the invasion of the Mahmud of Ghazni to Muhammad of Ghor and the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate and later the establishment of the Mughal Empire. I would like to emphasize on the medieval ideas of Abul Fazal Allami. He was a historian largely known for writing the official biography of Mughal Emperor Akbar and recording the details of the administrative system of Akbar. In modern era of ideas, I would like to present the views of Mahatma Gandhi, the father of the nation India. His views were different from the two former scholars, because the former was a strategist and the latter was a historian. But, here Gandhi's idea on Governance and Politics were more like a philosophical idealistic version which he proposed for India's future and was unfortunately not implemented. Finally, I would like to present a comparative view of all these three philosophical views and their criticisms.

Keywords: *Amatyasampat, Sovereignty, Divine concept, Marxism, Sarvodaya.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Political administration and Governance is considered as one of the key elements of the study of Polity. These two components make the study of political science more interesting. Political science is also a science. This can be seen in various instances. Similar to a science where there

¹ Author is a student at VIT School of Law, Chennai, India.

are various scientists, here in political science we have various theoreticians starting from ancient scholar like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Kautilya to modern theoreticians like the social contract theoreticians such as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, then theoreticians like Marx and post modern theoreticians like Isaiah Berlin, Karl Popper etc., Our country India, also has various theoreticians who contributed towards this subject arena like Kautilya from the ancient era of Mauryas, Abul Fazl ibn Mubarak from the Mughal Empire and Mahatma Gandhi from the modern Colonial era. I would like to explain the theories of political governance and administration of all these three people. I would like to explain their theories with the help of Arthashastra, the monumental work by Kautilya who is also known Vishnugupta or Chanakya, Ain – I – Akbari by Abul Fazl ibn Mubarak and various works of Gandhi, which he wrote during his active political life and life during Indian Freedom Struggle and other articles. This paper includes history combined with politics science, like the historical viewpoint of people who lived at that point of time during various eras. Also, I would like to take the reader into the minds of these three people namely Chanakya, Fazl and Gandhi and connect their theories with that of various other western scholars like Plato, Thomas Hobbes and Karl Heinrich Marx and their ideologies. Also, I would like to connect some components of their theories with modern day perspective of political administration and governance. I hope that this paper will be able to cover all these aspects and make the reader fully understand the concept of politics of Indian subcontinent through various ages.

II. CHANAKYA'S VERSION OF AN IDEAL KING AND EMPIRE

Indian soil has seen the rise and fall of numerous civilizations and empires. The Mauryan Empire can be considered one such most acclaimed great empire. Mauryan Empire can be also remarked as the first empire which united almost the whole of present Indian Territory starting from the present day Kashmir, Punjab covering the parts of North Eastern India to the southern part of modern Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. This empire had its beginnings when Chandragupta Maurya defeated King Dhanananda of Nanda dynasty, with the help of his mentor Chanakya (375 BCE – 285 BCE) who is also known as Kautilya and Vishnugupta. Chanakya was considered intelligent and his real intention behind making Chandragupta the king was to have his revenge by avenging his insult by Dhanananda earlier. Chanakya served as the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Magadha and used to order Chandragupta what to do and what not to. His major work is considered as Arthashastra written about 277 BCE, in which he established his own thoughts on principles of governance, politics, economics, foreign relations, war strategies, establishment of various departments of superintends and their administrative powers. Chanakya pictuarized a well developed administrative system, similar

to present day systems.

So, I would like to start with Chanakya's basic level of discussions. Chanakya first makes clear about the qualities and duties of a king. He gives certain qualities or qualifications to become a king and gives enormous power to the king at the same time says that the power must be used only for the welfare of the people. The welfare of the state under the ideal king can be better understood by this quote "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"². He expresses regarding various other qualities of kings like the king should be always vigil and alert, he should know when to enter a war and when go for a peace accord, and his duty to protect the individuals or citizens of the state. Next, he enunciates the concept of appointment of ministers and other officials. Chanakya on the qualities of a minister says "satisfactory in all respects; for a man's ability is inferred from his capacity shown in work. And in accordance in difference in the working capacity"³ as the qualification for a minister and for priests and councilors or other officers he says "possessed of foresight, wise, of strong memory, bold, eloquent, skillful, intelligent, possessed of enthusiasm, dignity, and endurance, pure in character, affable, firm in loyal devotion, endowed with excellent conduct, strength, health and bravery, free from procrastination and fickle mindedness, affectionate, and free from such qualities as excite hatred and enmity--these are the qualifications of an amátyasampat"⁴.

The greatest achievement of Kautilya is that he made sure that justice is served always to people who avail it. The popular saying "Justice delayed is Justice denied", was interpreted by Kautilya even 2300 years ago and he says that never ever a king should make a person wait for justice who is waiting for the same by ringing the justice bell at the gates of the palace. He further adds that the king must give justice without any delay to the aggrieved. The most surprising thing is even though modern critics argue that Kautilya supported the strict enforcement of Varna system but, there is a verse from Part – I Chapter X of Arthashastra which says "The king shall dismiss a priest who, when ordered, refuses to teach the Vedás to an outcaste person or to officiate in a sacrificial performance (apparently) undertaken by an outcaste person (ayájya)." This shows that even the concept of equality in a different form but, similar to our existing model was developed by Kautilya himself.

Also, he regard that along with the times of being kind and welfare if needed the king and his

² Kautilya, (translated in English by B. Shamasastri), Page 52, Chapter XXIX, Kautilya's Arthashastra.

³ Kautilya, (translated in English by B. Shamasastri), Page 19, Chapter VIII, Kautilya's Arthashastra.

⁴ Kautilya, (translated in English by B. Shamasastri), Page 20, Chapter IX, Kautilya's Arthashastra.

administration should also become ruthless in order to prevent rebellions and anarchy against the king and the state⁵. This model also may look similar to the version of Plato's ideal philosopher king where he says that the king should have all the necessary qualities and be kind and ruthless at the same time. Also, Chanakya says so because according to him first comes the safety of the state and its people before anything. So, Chanakya believed that for the sake of this safety, some of the individual rights should be sacrificed. This version is also similar to the version of Leviathan proposed by Thomas Hobbes in his 1651 book Leviathan.

On the part of administration, Chanakya proposes the establishment of various departments which he calls as superintends. Those superintends are superintendent of treasury, , the superintendent of gold, the superintendent of store-house, the superintendent of commerce, the superintendent of forest produce, the superintendent of the armoury, the superintendent of weights and measures, measurement of space and time, the superintendent of tolls, the superintendent of weaving, the superintendent of agriculture, the superintendent of liquor, the superintendent of slaughter-house, the superintendent of prostitutes, the superintendent of ships, the superintendent of cows, the superintendent of horses, the superintendent of elephants, the superintendent of chariots, the superintendent of infantry, the duty of the commander-in-chief , the superintendent of passports, the superintendent of pasture lands, the duty of revenue collectors, spies in the guise of householders, merchants, and ascetics and city superintend.⁶ Chanakya also proposes for the punishment of civil servants as he believes that bureaucratic corruptions may well happen in a complex system. So, he advises for spying on ministers and officials for finding out malpractices or embezzlements of treasury funds if any.

Further, he says all the plans and strategies and the motion to take decision of bureaucratic crimes will be framed by the Prime Minister of the State and the king has to follow those ideas. This also may be seen as a similarity between the present system of Indian democracy and Constitutional Monarchy around the world where, Prime Minister and the cabinet frames the strategies and the President or the monarch becomes just a ceremonial signing authority also vice – versa in the concept of Chief Minister and Governor in Indian politics and governance system. Chanakya made this as he was the prime minister at that point of time and he gave Chandragupta guidance on war strategy and diplomatic foreign policy decisions.

Thus, the ideas of Kautilya are relatable still now in the world political arena and his ideas were considered to be the basic postulates of the study of polity. Even though his ideas were similar

⁵ SS. Ali, Page : 376, Kautilya and the Concept of good governance, Vol. 67, No. 2 (APR. - JUNE, 2006).

⁶ Kautilya, (translated in English by B. Shamasastri), Page 4, Kautilya's Arthashastra.

to the versions of Greek philosophers like Plato, who was his contemporary, this India versions was more focused on the Indian roots of this system. The inclusion of welfare dynamics and even modern day red tape and corruption shows us the genius of Kautilya's ability to foresee the future dynamics of World Politics.

III. ABUL – FAZAL IBN MUBARAK'S "BADSHAHAT"

Abul – Fazal ibn Mubarak also known as Abdl Fadl Allami (14 January, 1551 – 22 August, 1602) was a historian who lived during the rule of Mughal Emperor Jalaluddin Muhammad Akbar. He was entrusted by Emperor Akbar to write his official biography "Akbarnama". When writing so, Fazal also felt a need to justify the acts of the monarch, because for him Akbar was the ideal monarch.

So, he wrote a second book *Ain – I – Akbari*, which detailed the administration of the Mughal Empire and the political thoughts which existed in the 16th century. In order to portray the political governance of a state, he invokes the concept of "Badshahat". According to him, the term Padshahat (Badshahat) meant 'an established owner' where Pad stands for stability and shah stands for owner. Padshah therefore, means powerful, established owner who cannot be eliminated by anyone.⁷ Abul Fazal also similar to Chanakya says that the monarch should have both kindness towards people and ruthlessness toward injustice. Abul Fazal insists on a strict monarchy in order to defeat the anarchy and rebels, which is also similar to the version of Kautilya.

Abul Fazal says that the emperor or Badshah was the supreme authority over law making, law enforcement and judiciary. The theories of Badshahat did'nt evolve as a sole one but, it was developed by mixing together various ideas like that of Indian, Iranian, Arabic, Mongol, Turkish and Islam. He mentions that "Badshahat is the light derived from God which has been sent by God himself. God throws his kindness on Badshah; who works as the agent of god".. By saying so he reinstates the theory of divinity in the state machinery and portrays king as a divine entity.

Sovereignty rests with the emperor or Badshah as the emperor is a representative of the God himself. This concept can be seen from the very beginning in every ancient civilization. Even Greek Scholars and Romans believed the same. In the 17th century Travancore kingdom in Kerala, India, its ruler Anizham Tirunal Marthanda Varma conducted "Trippadidanam" through which he transferred the territories and treasury gained by him in various wars to Sree Padmanabhaswamy Temple at Thiruvananthapuram and adopted the title of

⁷ Dr. Swasti Rao and Manohar Parrikar, *Abul Fazal : Monarchial Authority and popular well – being*, Page 192, Unit – 11, IGNOU text

“Padmanabhadasa”. This tradition continues even today where the titular monarchs still adopts the Padmanabhadasa title. This is because they believed in the concept of divine connection.

Fazal, believes that the sovereignty must rest with the holy representative of God and not with people. Next, he distinguishes between just and unjust king. He says if a king discriminates the people on any means then he is unjust. There is a version that Mughals discriminated people on the basis of religion and the levying of Jizya tax is considered a valid proof for that statement. But, here Fazal speaks about the establishment of equality principle. I consider that Fazal thinks so because, his main intent was to justify the acts of Akbar and to justify Akbar’s abolishment of Jizya Tax, Fazal relies on Equality principle. On the notion of Just and Unjust king, Fazal himself says he who only "a just ruler (kargiya)" who is able "to convert, like a salt- bed, the impure into pure, the bad into good. The just ruler was characterized by tolerance, respect for reason and a fatherly love to all the subjects regardless of their religion or creed. Also, in context, of giving alms Fazal says that, “. . . .Many enjoy daily, monthly or yearly allowances, which they receive without being kept waiting. . . it would take up too much time to describe the presents made daily to beggars “There is a treasurer always in waiting at court and every beggar whom His Majesty sees, is sure to find relief”⁸. This statement shows the welfare state existed that too in the form systems similar to modern Public Distributive Systems.

In the administration part of Emperor Akbar similar to Chanakya, Fazal records the system of administration where the emperor is at the pinnacle of power, then the ministers and military chiefs, then the vassals who are under the Mughals i.e., various provincial governor and nawabs and the mansabdars. Akbar divided his empire into Subas, Sarkars and Mahalls. He appointed a chain of officers at various levels who were controlled by ministers at the centre. In this system, the religion of the officers could not interfere in their administrative work, so this system was also followed by his successors. Akbar wanted a sovereign rule so he gave importance to it. He systematized and centralized his administration⁹.

Another important thing in Akbar’s reign is the abolishment of employment on religious basis. For the first time in a foreign rule in India, equality were given to all people who are qualified regardless of their religion. Abul Fazal also, makes the society a patriarchal society, where the emperor is the father, queen is the mother, their relatives and ministers their family and the people as extended family. So, he says that the emperor must take care of the family as its head. This father concept can be viewed as a Patriarchal concept.

⁸ Abul Fazl Allami (translated by H. Blochmann) Page 266, Ain – I – Akbari.

⁹ Dr. Swasti Rao and Manohar Parrikar, Abul Fazal : Monarchical Authority and popular well – being, Page 197, Unit – 11, IGNOU text

He also goes on with his theory of welfare where king by feeling the people as his family must protect their well – being.

Akbar's administration goes like this

Central Government :

- Badshah
- DIWAN (Responsible for all income and expenditure and had control over Khalisa and jagir land).
- MIR BAKSHI Headed military department, nobility, information and intelligence agencies.
- MIR SAMAN In charge of imperial household and karkhanas.
- MIR MUNSHI In charge of Royal correspondence.
- SADR-US-SADR In charge of charitable and religious endowment.
- QAZI-UL-QUJAT Headed the judiciary department.
- MUHTASIBE censor of public morals.
- MUSHRIF-I-MUMALIK Accountant general.
- MUSHTAUF-I-MUMALIK Auditor general.
- DARGO-I-DAK-CHAUKI Officer in charge of imperial post equivalent to today's post master.
- MIR BARR Superintendent of forests.
- MIR-I-ARZ Officer in charge of petition.
- WAQIA-NAVIS News Reporters/writers.
- DIWAN-I-KHALISA In charge of crown lands.
- MIR-I-MAL In charge of privacy purse.
- MIR-I-TOZAK In charge of ceremonies.
- MIR-BAHRI In charge of ships on boats.
- MIR-MAUZIL In charge of Quarters.
- MIR ATISH OR Daroga-i- Topkhana Head of Artillery Khufia Navis Secret letter writers.

Provincial Governments :

- SIPAHSALAR The head executive (known as sipahsalar under Akbar and later known as Nizam or Subedar)
- DIWAN In charge of revenue department
- BAKSHI In charge of military department
- SADR In charge of judicial department

Sarkar Fauzdar/ District :

- Administrative head
- AMAL / AMALGUZAR Revenue collection
- KOTWAL Maintenance of law & order, trial of criminal cases and price regulations.
- PRAGNA :
- SHIQDAR Administrative head combined in himself the duties fauzadar & kotwal.
- AMIN, QANUNGO Revenue officials.

Village :

- MUQADDAM Headman
- PATWARI Accountant
- CHOWKIDAR Watchman¹⁰

Similar to present division powers almost 560 years ago, we had a complex system of administration under Akbar. Akbar's way of diplomacy is also seen as one of the most cleverest where, he used to fix a marriage alliance with every possible rough turners, believing one cannot revolt against one's own family.

In respect to society, Fazal classifies the society into four classes namely, The warriors, The learned men, Husbandmen and laborers and Artificers and merchants. This version is also similar to that of Plato's where he divided the society into three namely as kings and nobles who are gold hearted people, army men and other administrators who are silver hearted persons and finally the business class, merchants and normal people who are bronze hearted people.

This portrays the genius of Emperor Akbar who believed in secularity and welfare of people.

¹⁰ Asha Khatri, Central Administration of Akbar, Page 6 – 8, Dynamics Of Central Administration under Akbar and Mughal's military system.

Still the legacy of Akbar echoes at Fatehpur Sikri, the capital which he built.

IV. GANDHIAN PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, better known by his title “Mahatma” is regarded as the father of nation of India. His ideals were Satyagraha, Truth, Non – Violence and Sarvodaya. Gandhi explains the concept of Satyagraha as follows “Truth (*satya*) implies love, and firmness (*agraha*) engenders and therefore serves as a synonym for force. I thus began to call the Indian movement *Satyagraha*, that is to say, the Force which is born of Truth and Love or non-violence, and gave up the use of the phrase "passive resistance", in connection with it, so much so that even in English writing we often avoided it and used instead the word "*satyagraha*" itself or some other equivalent English phrase.”¹¹ Through Satyagraha he regarded Truth as the highest Supreme principle that an individual must hold in his life. The concept of Sarvodaya can be seen as a general economic theory which he proposed for an indigenous village based development. His ideas were largely established in his work “Constructive Programme : Its Meaning and Place”. In his own words, Gandhi says the following regarding the concept of Sarvodaya.

I determined to change my life in accordance with the ideals of the book." (Unto this Last by John Ruskin)

1. the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
2. a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.
3. a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the craftsman is the life worth living.

The first of these I knew. The second I had dimly realized. The third had never occurred to me. *Unto This Last* made it clear as daylight for me that the second and third were contained in the first. I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice.”¹²

So, basically, the book *Unto this Last* by John Ruskin made him to develop the idea of Sarvodaya. The verses given above shows us his outline for the idea of Sarvodaya.

The main idea of governance of Gandhi is that he insisted on the system of Grass root democracy where he insisted on providing villages “republic”. He insisted going on with decentralization

¹¹ M.K. Gandhi (translated in English Valji Govindji Desai), *Satyagraha in South Africa*, Page 107, Chapter 12 *Advent of Satyagraha*,

¹² M.K. Gandhi, *My Experiments with truth*, part IV, chapter xviii.

of power and providing villages that is the lowest units of the nation with sufficient power to fulfill their larger needs. Gandhi insists on establishment of only the cottage industries, which he says will produce all products necessary for the satisfaction of basic needs. He insists on fulfilling the basic needs only because he thinks all others are unnecessary. This is evident through his teachings on simplicity and living a simple life. He was against the modernization as he believed that it will lead to more discriminations among all.

His idea on abandoning the modern European ideas is understood by his following opinion “All should make it a point of honour to use only village articles whenever and wherever available. Given the demand there is no doubt that most of our wants can be supplied from our villages. When we have become village-minded, we will not want imitations of the West or machine-made products, but we will develop a true national taste in keeping with the vision of a new India in which pauperism, starvation and idleness will be unknown”¹³.

So, according to his idea in such a self – sustained village, if they are given autonomy by decentralization of power, then the village is going to be the most successful part of a governance. Implementation of such a grass root democratic system all over India will lead to a brighter path towards India’s development. He calls for equal opportunity for all where he wants communal harmony and no discrimination amongst the public on the basis religion, gender, caste, colour, race, etc., He calls for a complete removal or abolishment of untouchability which was in reality made a fundamental right by the way of enshrining this abolishment in Article 17 of Constitution of India.

On removal of discrimination he says “In such a happy state of things there would be no disgraceful cry at the stations such as “Hindu water” and “Muslim water” or “Hindu tea” and “Muslim tea”. There would be no separate rooms or pots for Hindus and non- Hindus in schools and colleges, no communal schools, colleges and hospitals. The beginning of such a revolution has to be made by Congressmen without any political motive behind the correct conduct. Political unity will be its natural fruit”¹⁴.

He also emphasizes on the concept of “National Language” where he says there should be a common language for the whole nation to show our unity by making the largest spoken language Hindi as the National Language. But, he says by theory since Hindustani remains as the official language of Congress, instead of spending time on learning English which is a foreign language, people can learn Hindustani so that it is used as the official language of the state. Meanwhile he

¹³ M.K. Gandhi, Constructive Program : Its meaning and place, Page 7

¹⁴ M.K. Gandhi, Constructive Program : Its meaning and place, Page 2

also emphasizes on the concept of protecting our own vernacular provincial mother language from the domination of English Language.

Thus, Gandhi posed an ideal society where everything is simple and self – sufficient to fulfill our basic needs and he did't support the notion of the modern development and as it may leave the weaker sections of the society. This led to a debate between his friend and disciple Jawaharlal Nehru, who later became Independent India's first Prime Minister. Nehru believed in the socialistic industrial model of development at a larger scale and focused on developing India from larger to micro level. Gandhi proposed the development to start from the grass root micro level and then to larger level, which was ultimately not taken into consideration by our policy makers. But, in the 73rd amendment of our Indian Constitution the inclusion of local self – government became the first stepping stone for the application of the Gandhian philosophy, but again we know that all systems has loopholes and this too has some which hindered the development and again centralization of the authority plays a crucial role in making this local governments a mere namesake third layer of governance in India, unlike the dream of Gandhi.

V. AN ANALYSIS OF THE THEORIES

First, we can notice that all these three theories were some way or the other related to the rulers of a state. Abul Fazl Allami, was a historian in the court of Akbar, whereas both Kautilya and Gandhi played a crucial role as a mentor like figure behind two rulers of Indian subcontinent at the dawn of a new era. The rulers were Chandragupta Maurya, who founded the Maurya Empire and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first premier or prime minister of independent India.

The first two theories of ancient and medieval period were kind of a theory which was applied in real sense and the last one was an idea that was not applied completely but, some of its basic elements were inculcated in the later stages of India's phase of development. The ideas of Kautilya show us how the thoughts of India were structured at the same time when thinkers like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle from Greece also worked on their theory. The concept of "Badshahat" extensively illustrated by Abul Fazl shows how Indian thoughts were modeled a century before the advent of social contract theorists like Thomas Hobbes who like Fazl also insists on the supreme power of the king.

The concept of making of welfare state and people's well being is similar in both the versions of Chanakya and Fazl, where the former mentions that the people's happiness is king's happiness and their sorrow is the king's sorrow. Fazl asks king to be in the role of father or head of a larger patriarchal family. I am mentioning here the nature of family as patriarchal family, because if king is going to be the head as father it implies that father is the head of the family

thus, making the structure patriarchal. When the king is the father and head of the large family that is the country, then automatically, people's sorrow is his sorrow and their happiness is their happiness. This shows the similarity between both these Ancient and medieval scholars.

Next, when we see the administrative system during these two periods, we can see that Chanakya gave importance on the division of departments under a centralized authority whereas, Fazl emphasizes on the decentralization and division of authority. This decentralization concept is very similar to the Gandhian philosophy as, Gandhi too insisted on the decentralization of power and the flowing of power from grass root level.

The Divine theory proposed by Fazl is very much almost the same as the Roman ideas of divine nature of state and even the ideas of Greek scholars who believed that the ruler is a representative of the almighty and the law pronounced by this representative is very much the law of the land. The idea of absolute supreme power of the ruler of Fazl is similar to that of Thomas Hobbes idea of Leviathan. Again, Kautilya says that we need a king because we need safety from external threats. Though not explicitly stated by Kautilya himself, his idea behind the welfare oriented, generous and at the same time as a strict disciplinarian and ruthless king is because of this safety. If the king is not going to be ruthless against the rebels, then they are going to create chaos. This idea is also similar to the same version of Hobbes who says if we are going to go against the state and try to depose them, then some chaos is going to be created which leads to the threat of the members of the state itself.

Next, Chanakya says that the high bureaucracy may well lead to red tapes and corruptions like embezzlement of funds. So, the king with the help of his prime minister who is his close confidant and with the aid of spy network should frequently check the other ministers and superintends.

Plato, the Greek philosopher divides the regimes into 5 which are Aristocracy, Timocracy, Oligarchy, Democracy and Tyranny. As we saw earlier, this philosopher divides the society into three in the structure of Aristocracy which is his best ideal form of government. In this division kings and nobles are gold hearted people (first place), army men and other administrators who silver hearted persons (second place) and finally the business class, merchants and normal people are bronze hearted people (third place). Akbar's division of society was also similar to this division of aristocracy of Plato. Here Plato adds that the first two divisions should not own any property, if owned they become corrupted. This is way similar to Chanakya's idea as this indirectly implies that the first two divisions of Plato is also is tended to corruption. So, the concept of corruption and embezzlement was forecasted by these two scholars even 2300 years

ago.

Gandhi's idea on indigenous economy and fulfillment of the only required needs which are necessary and basic is more similar to the Marxist ideology. I am not using the word Socialist ideologies because, Socialist model focuses on large scale development. Even Marxism focuses on this large scale development but, it focuses on most of the same goals as similar to the Gandhism. The goal of establishment of complete harmonious and equal society can be seen as an idea which is similar to Marxists. The Marxists too aim at the ultimate complete classless society with no discriminations of religion, colour, economic status, wealth etc., Gandhi also proposes the same because he says that this abolishment of all sorts of discrimination is the base for a developed society.

Again the Marxists view all those material except those needed for basic survival is an utopia and not necessary. This is the same thing that Gandhi too proposes through his idea of Sarvodaya and simplicity of living. Gandhi moreover also says that all professions do have same importance and wages for all should be fixed. This idea shows the concept of establishment of Communist State where Marx says the wages for all is same.

The non – belief in the concept of state can also be seen similar to both Gandhi and Marx. Gandhi says that state is a heartless machinery and there Gandhi says “The State represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul, but as the State is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence.”¹⁵ Marx also states that the existence of political state itself is a machinery which tends to create discrimination and other evils. According to the model of Marx, first he proposes a socialistic state under the dictatorship of proletariat or the working class. Then, after gaining sufficient control and making the people accustomed to the communist ideals, then the totalitarian form will be converted into a communist state, where the concept of state itself will be abolished and a complete equal society will be created. But, Gandhi had a difference from Marxist point of view where, Marx advocated for total violent form of struggle, whereas Gandhi, insisted on his ideals of Satyagraha and Ahimsa or non – violence. Even though the paths of Marx and Gandhi were different, their goals were the same.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have presented the views of the three scholars, starting from the ancient period to the modern period from the Indian subcontinent namely Chanakya from the Mauryan period,

¹⁵ M.K. Gandhi, Page 412, Modern Review, October, 1935

Abul Fazal Allami from the Mughal period and Mahatma Gandhi from the modern era during the great struggle for Indian freedom. The works of Chanakya and Fazl lives as a testimony to the system of political governance and administration during the era of the Mauryas and Mughals. This two theories also has various striking similarities between the thoughts of the Western scholars. The idea of Gandhi also has a lot of striking connections with that of Marxist theory but, again he did'nt accept the viewpoint of Socialistic form of development as it tends on macro – level development, which according to him will not benefit the weakest sections of the society. The ideas of Chanakya and Fazl show us how amazingly, the administration was done in a perfectly planned way for a larger part of the territory. This shows the vast amount of abundant knowledge that our scholars did have. Finally, I conclude by saying that the theories proposed by these scholars were highly effective as Kautilya's and Akbar's was followed in our past already which remains as a history and the idea of Gandhi though not fully applied, it may lead to solutions for the problems which we Indians face.

VII. REFERENCES

Primary Sources :

- Arthashastra by Kautilya, translated in English B. Shamasastri.
- Ain – I – Akbari by Abul Fazl ibn Mubarak, translated in English by H. Blochmann.
- Satyagraha in South Africa by M.K. Gandhi.
- My Experiments with truth by M.K. Gandhi.
- Constructive Program : Its meaning and place.
- Modern Review by M.K. Gandhi.

Secondary Sources :

- Kautilya and the Concept of good governance, by S.S Ali, Vol. 67, No. 2 (APR.- JUNE, 2006).
- Unit – 11, IGNOU Text, Abul Fazal : Monarchical Authority and popular well – being by Dr. Swasti Rao and Manohar Parrikar.
- Dynamics Of Central Administration under Akbar and Mughal’s military system by Ashi Khatri (thesis submitted to Veer Bahadur Singh University, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh).
