and altogether insufficient and unworthy", and Edward II for having broken the "coronation oath".

1. *People's Control over the Crown.*

In at least two historic instances the attitude of the Hindu mind in regard to kingship was identical. Brihadratha, the last Maurya Emperor (B. C. 191—185), was "crushed" because, as we read in Bâṇa's *Harṣa-charita* (seventh century), he was *pratijnâ-durbala* i. e. weak in keeping his coronation oath.[1]

A specimen of the *pratijnâ*, promise, vow or oath made by Kings to the people is thus worded in the *Aitareya Brâhmaṇa*:[2] "Between the night I was born and the night I die, whatever good I might have done, my heaven, my life and my progeny may I be deprived of, if I oppress you." And the *Mahâbhârata*[3] furnishes the traditional form of the oath administered to Veṇa's son Prithu in the following terms: "I shall always regard the *bhauma* (the country) as the Brahma (the highest God). And whatever is to be prescribed as law on the basis of statecraft I shall follow without hesitation, never my own sweet will." A *samaya*[4] or compact was in this way entered into by the king and the people. The non-fulfilment of the *pratijnâ* was tantamount to the violation of the compact, comparable to the feudal contract introduced in Norman England, which Adams considers to be the real origin of limited monarchy in Europe.

Another case of expulsion in Hindu history is that which resulted in the founding of the Śiśu-nâga Dynasty in B. C. 602. The populace were led to depose the reigning king, Nâgadasako the "impious", because of his parricide. Really they condemned the whole House as a "parricidal race", as another ruler of the family, Udayibhaddako, the perfidiously impious son of Ajâtasattu, had put his parent to death.[5]

Besides, in the *Mahâbhârata* the plea for the deposition and execution of the tyrant Veṇa[6] is that he was *vidharma* i. e. unlawful or unconstitutional and the "slave of wrath and malice". On these and similar

---

[1] p. 193.

[2] VIII, 4, 1, 13.

[3] *Śânti-parva*, Ch. IX, 106, 107.

[4] *Ibid*, LXVII, 17, 24. The "feudal contract" theory is the special feature of Adams' *Origin of the English Constitution* and *A Constitutional History of England*. cf. Carlyle, III, 39—40.

[5] *Mahâvamso*, Ch. IV, p. 15. See the stories in the *Râja-tarangiṇi*, *Supra*, pp. 69—70.

[6] *Sânti-parva*, LIX,94; Jayaswal's "Constitutional Aspects of the Rituals at Hindu Coronation" in the *Mod. Rev.*, January 1912; Law's "Ancient Hindu Coronation and Allied Ceremonials" in the *Ind. Ant.* (1919); Basu's *Indo-Aryan Polity*.

grounds Vedic India also was used to the expulsion of rulers. The story of *aparuddha* or expelled kings is familiar to the readers of the *Brâhmaṇas* and *Samhitâs*.[1]

2. *The People as King-makers.*

Nor as regards title to kingship has the political psychology of Asians been at variance with that of Europeans. Succession to the mediaeval German Empire was determined, as a rule, by election. In France none but the immediate successors of Charlemagne were elected by the people. And in the history of the English Constitution election has been almost as important as the hereditary principle.

Now, while hereditary succession was the rule in Hindu polity, the history of India can exhibit several authentic instances of popular election. The latest is that of Gopâla (*c* 730—40), the son of a successful soldier, who was "made by the *prakriti* (the people) to accept the throne".[2] Eventually he became the founder of the Pâla Empire of Bengal and Eastern India. Harṣa-vardhana (606—47) became Emperor of Upper India through election by ministers and magistrates in an assembly presided over by Premier Bhandi "the distinguished".[3] On that occasion the people's approval was "shown in their songs".

Rudra-dâmana (*c* 125—150) acknowledged his claim to the crown in the Satrapy of Western India because of election by "all the orders of the people".[4] And Śiśunâga's Dynasty was set up, as we have seen, as the result of a mass movement. The city mob,[5] infuriated at the parricide of Nâgadasako, and desirous of gratifying the whole nation, "unanimously installed in sovereignty the eminently wise minister bearing the historically distinguished appellation of Śiśunâga" (B. C. 603). Further, the *Mahâbhârata* records the tradition that Kuru[6] was elected king by "all the people" because he was *dharmajna* i. e. proficient in law, and that the "people of the cities and villages" prevented Devapi's accession to the throne because he had *tvagdoṣa* or skin-disease[7] (leprosy) and installed Śântanu the youngest son.

3. *Succession determined by Vox Populi.*

Even in the election of the heir-apparent the people of India had a voice, at least in the epics. We read in the *Mahâbhârata* that on several

---

[1] Atharva Veda, III, 3, 4; *Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa*, XII, 9, 3, 3; *Taittirîya Samhitâ*, II, 3, 1.
[2] Banerji's *Memoir*, p. 45.
[3] *Si-yu-ki*, Vol. I, pp. 210, 211.
[4] *Ep. Ind.*, 1905—06, 43.
[5] *Mahâvamso*, p. 15.
[6] *Âdi-parva*, XCIV, 49; *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1889, pp. 137, 139, 143.
[7] *Udyoga-parva*, CXLIX, 23.

occasions the revolts of the folk brought about a modification in the choice of a crown-prince. It was only with the people's consent secured after a fracas that Yayâti could instal his younger son, Puru, as crown-prince against the technically rightful eldest son Yadu.[1] And Dhritarâṣtra was compelled by the people's protests to elect his nephew as heir-apparent instead of his unworthy son.[2]

Such "democratic" settlements of crown-princeship, described also in the *Râmâyaṇa*[3], may be taken to have anticipated (in theory, at any rate, as long as evidences from the strictly historical sources are not forthcoming) the recorded instances in the procedure of mediaeval Europe. The *Ordinatio Imperii* of Lewis the Pious in 817 is the document that provided for the partition of his dominions between his sons. In accordance with its provisions, after the ceremonial fast of three days his eldest son Lothair was elected by Lewis and the whole people to be his colleague in the empire. Then "with common counsel" it was decided to give the younger sons, Pippin and Lewis, the title of kings and to allot to them certain lands by definite *capitula*. These were considered and then "confirmed by Lewis and all his faithful subjects".[4] Now, if Megasthenes' observations be of any value, the *Mahâbhârata* or the *Râmâyaṇa* ideal was not the mere fine frenzy of poets. For, says the Greek ambassador, *vox populi* was consulted by the responsible officers in determining succession on the failure of heirs, and the regulating principle was merit.[5]

---

[1] *Âdi-parva*, LXXXV, 22.

[2] *Ibid*, CXL, 23.

[3] *Ayodhyâ-kânda*, Ch. I.

[4] Carlyle's *Med. Pol. Theory*, Vol. I, p. 237.

[5] Fragment L.

CHAPTER V.

The Hindu Machinery of Imperial Nationalism.

Section 1.

The War Office.

In no branch of national life was the administrative genius of the Hindus more in evidence than in the organization of the army and the navy. It was not only in the numerous aggressive wars within the Indian continent that the efficiency of the race in generalship and as a fighting machine was put to the fire test. Hindu military might was also equally manifest when pitted against foreigners who threatened the freedom of India. From Seleukos to Menander (B. C. 305—B. C. 155) the Hellenistic Greeks of the Afghan bufferland were successfully driven back within their own folds by Hindu archers, horsemen, and elephant corps. In later times, the Huns also had to sustain severe defeats, first, from Skanda-gupta between A. C. 455 and 458, and, secondly, from Narasimha-gupta about 528.

1. *Militarism in Hindu Culture.*

Indeed the Charlemagnes and Fredericks, by whose *parâkrama* (prowess) the frontiers of India were advanced so far as to include, on several occasions, Afghanistan and Central Asia on the land side, and the islands of the Indian Ocean to the south, had their hands always full with the problem of training and equipping the soldiers and sailors. The profession of arms and the command of the fleet called forth as a matter of course the administrative capabilities of Young India from age to age, — in the northern, eastern, central, western and southern provinces. And the spirit that pervaded these disciplined forces is what came out in the fourth gymnosophist's reply to Alexander's query. Alexander asked him as to why he had persuaded Sabbas (Śambhu) to revolt. Because, as we read in Plutarch's *Lives*, said the Hindu sage, "I wished him either to live with honor or die as a coward deserves."[1]

[1] Plutarch's *Life of Alexander*.

And this was not an empty word of the philosopher cited like a maxim, as it were, from the *Mahâbhârata*. We are told by Plutarch that Alexander experienced no less trouble from the priests, preachers, and religious teachers of India than from the warriors who "used to fight for pay". It was the endeavour of the "philosophers" to fix a mark of infamy upon those princes, who, like the king of Taxila, declared for the Macedonian and became traitors to Indian independence. The free republican nations also were excited by what appear to be the learned and priestly classes, i. e., the *intelligentsia*, to take up arms against the alien invaders. Many are the Hindu philosophers who therefore had to espouse the martyr's doom meted out to them by Alexander's vindictive court-martial.

In order to appreciate the age-long militarism of the Hindus and their organization of the general staff it is necessary to have an idea of the Roman institutions of national defence and war-machinery.[1] In B. C. 225 the republic placed 65,000 soldiers on the field and had 55,000 in reserve at Rome.[2] At Trebia (B. C. 218), as Polybius writes in his *History of the Roman Conquest from B. C. 264—146*, the strength of the army was 38,400. And the largest force that the Romans are known to have mustered during their republican period was that under Scipio for the Second Punic (Hannibalian) War (B. C. 218—202).[3] On this occasion the army consisted sometimes of 18,20, or even 23 legions. A "legion" at that time was made up of 4,000 or 5,000 soldiers, and of this number about 300 or 400 constituted the cavalry.

In point of numbers the Roman armies must have been regarded as pigmy indeed or but as "pocket armies" by the generalissimos of Hindu nationalities. For, the fighting hordes maintained by the states of India appear to have always been formidable in size. A "standing army" of half a million was nothing extraordinary in military India's psychology. Among the fragmentary notices of the nations, some of them difficult to identify accurately, that we can glean from Megasthenes' stories (*c* B. C. 300) we find that the Pândyas[4] of the extreme south who were ruled by women had an army of 150,000 foot and 500 elephants. The ruler of Gujarat[4] on the Arabian Sea coast was in command of 1,600 elephants, 150,000 infantry and 5,000 horse; and the force wielded by the sovereign of the races[5] between the Ganges and the Himalayas,

---

[1] Greenidge's *Roman Public Life*, pp. 68—74 (Roman army according to the Servian classification).

[2] *Enc. Brit.* (Article on Roman Army).

[3] Ramsay's *Roman Antiquities*, p. 432.

[4] Mc Crindle's *Anc. Ind.* (*Meg.*, LVI), 147.

[5] *Ibid*, 138.

occupying the districts of north Bihar, north Bengal, and possibly western Assam, was composed of 50,000 infantry, 4,000 cavalry and 400 elephants.

In Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* we learn, further, that the king of Magadha (the Gangaridae and Prasii nations on the banks of the Ganges) in Eastern India was master of 20,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 2,000 chariots, and 3,000 or 4,000 elephants. Evidently this ruler was one of the "nine Nandas". The size of one of the smallest Hindu armies can be given from Pliny's *Natural History*.[1] It belonged to another people of the eastern provinces of India, viz., the Gangaridae Kalingoe, ancestors of the modern Oriyas. Their king with capital at Protalis had 60,000 infantry, 1,000 horse, and 700 elephants "always caparisoned for battle". But, as usual, in regard to most of the periods of Hindu military and naval history, authentic information is wanting about the system of discipline, salaries, hierarchy of officers and other items of the War Office, except what may be gathered from the *nîti-śâstras* and other literature on polity.

2. *The Gupta and Pâla Digvijayas.*

About A. C. 360 Hari-ṣeṇa, a *mahâdanda-nâyaka* (high grade military or judicial officer) of the Gupta Empire, composed in Sanskrit what he called a *kâvya*.[2] It was an ode, in verse and prose, in eulogy of Samudragupta's conquest of "all the world". That panegyric "in one single gigantic sentence", which half a century later furnished Kâlidâsa with an epigraphic precedent for his own romantic account of Raghu's *digvijaya* ("conquest of the quarters") is at present the only contemporary account of a Hindu military enterprise that has satisfactory details as to the names of nations and rulers. Hari-ṣeṇa exults over the "violent extermination" of old states, and describes how kings were "captured and then liberated" by his hero. We are told that Samudragupta's "officers were always employed in restoring the wealth of the various kings who had been conquered by the strength of his arms".

As might be naturally expected, in this description of the aggressor's

---

[1] Book VI, Ch. xxii; *Vide* also *Meg.* LVI, B.

[2] Text of the *kâvya* in *Gup. Insc.* The English translation by Fleet was corrected in Bühler's German article on Indian Artificial Poetry, and this has been Englished by V. S. Ghate for the *Ind. Ant.* (1913). *Re* the date of the composition *vide* the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1898, pp. 386—387. The identification of some of the regions overrun by Samudra-gupta seems to be open to question. H. C. Ray Chaudhuri says in the *Mod. Rev.* (Oct. 1921) that the Western Deccan lay outside of the sphere of Gupta conquests. He accepts the interpretation in Dubreuil's *Ancient History of the Deccan* and rejects Smith's identifications.

triumphant expeditions through kingdoms, forests, hills and rivers we read of the "blows of battle-axes, arrows, spears, pikes, barbed darts, swords, lances, javelins for throwing, iron arrows" and many other weapons that disfigured or rather "beautified", as the poet-laureate would have it, the "charming body" of Samudra-gupta with the "marks of hundred confused wounds".[1] But while the world-conqueror is portrayed as "skilful in engaging in a hundred battles of various kinds", with "*parâkrama* (strength) of his own arm for his only ally", the officer-biographer leaves us in the dark as to the Indian Napoleon's plan of campaign, methods of field organization, and administration of the army services. We can only guess the thoroughness of the military department from the fact that the extensive Alexandrine career of uninterrupted success covered no less than three thousand miles of territory and was spread over about twenty years (330—350).

Hardly anything has been unearthed as yet in regard to the Bengali legions with which Dharma-pâla started from Pâtali-putra on his Upper Gangetic Valley campaign about 783 in order to set up a nominee and protege, Chakrâyudha, on the throne of Kanauj. The adventure of this expeditionary force led to the temporary conquest of Malwa, North Eastern Rajputana, Eastern Punjab and Sindh, Western Punjab and the Northwestern frontier provinces, and parts of Afghanistan. The soldiers of Bengal were thus in a position to enjoy the waters as far to the northwest as at Kedâra in the Western Himalayas and as far to the southwest as at Gokarna in the North Kanara District of the Bombay Presidency.[2]

In the Khâlimpur copper plate inscription we have a hint that Dharma-pâla had to build a bridge of boats at Pâtali-putra. And "the manifold fleets of boats proceeding on the path of the Ganges made it seem as if a series of mountain tops had been sunk to build another causeway". The general superintendent of boats was then as in Kautilya's language known as *târika*.[3] The organization of Devapâla's extensive campaigns by which he compelled entire Northern India from sea to sea to pay tribute to Bengal is as unknown as that under his predecessor. The name of one general can be wrung out of the inscriptions, that of Someśvara, the son of the Premier, Darbha-pâṇi. For obvious reasons Bengal has always had a boat service attached to the army.

---

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, VIII, p. 31, 172; Fleet's *Gupta Ins.*, p. 12, 14, 16.

[2] Banerji's *Memoir*, pp. 51—53, 55—56; *Bânglâr Itihâsa* (*History of Bengal* in Bengali), Vol. I. pp. 167—170; *Ind. Ant.* 1892, p. 257.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, 1896—1897, pp. 252, 253.

Under the Sena Emperors (1068—1200), as under the Pâlas, *nau-vala* (naval force) was an important arm of the military establishment.[1]

It is known among archeologists today that during the tenth century there was a series of triangular conflicts[2] between the ambitious *digvijayî* monarchs of Bengal, Upper India and the Deccan. But the military achievements of the Gurjara-Pratîhâra and Râṣtra-kûta *sârva-bhaumas* are as unillumined, so far as the details of field work, training of officers, commissariat or transport service are considered, as are those of the Pâlas.

3. *The Tamil War Office.*

The army of the Chola Empire in Southern India appears to have been divided into sections according to the kind of arms they carried, and according as they were mounted or otherwise.[3] There were the "chosen body of archers", the "chosen foot-soldiers of the body-guard", the "chosen horsemen" and the "chosen infantry" of the "right hand" (i. e. the infantry recruited from the artisan class). Among the commanders of the elephant corps we find the names of a few princes. According to the plan of cities with which early Tamil literature makes us familiar, young recruits to the army received military training in quarters specially set apart for them outside the city. Conjeeveram,[4] for instance, had an "outer city" with open spaces that were reserved for breaking the war elephants and horses. The grounds were utilized also for drill, parade and manoeuvres.

The Chola Emperors had a powerful navy. With its aid Râja-râja the Great (984—1018) destroyed the fleet of the rival Chera state on the West coast, and annexed Ceylon to his empire, which eventually embraced the whole of modern Madras Presidency, Mysore, and southern half of Orissa. The army and navy of Râjendra-chola (1018—1035) won a pan-Indian and even extra-Indian reputation on account of his numerous successful campaigns. In his time the Bay of Bengal, the Indian Mediterranean, became a Chola lake. His naval engagements brought about the conquest of "countless old islands", viz., the Laccadives and the Maldives. He crossed the Bay over to the Burman side and captured the kingdom of Prome or Pegu. His navy annexed also the Nicobar and Andaman Islands. Lighthouses were constructed at the leading ports of the Chola Empire.[5]

---

[1] *Ind. Ship.*, p. 220.

[2] Banerji's *Memoir*, p. 52, 56.

[3] Aiyangar, p. 184.

[4] Ayyar's *Town Planning*, p. 70.

[5] *Ind. Ship.*, pp. 175—177, 137; Aiyangar, 185; Ayyar, p. 15.

4. *Military India in the Seventh Century.*

Bâṇa tells us in his biographical story-book, the *Harṣa-charita*,[1] that Emperor Harṣa made his *debut* with a solemn vow. "How can I rest", declared this *vijigîṣu* (aspirant to world-conquest) of the seventh century, "so long as my feet are not besmeared with an ointment found in every continent, consisting of the light of precious stones in the diadems of all kings?" Accordingly in 606 he set out on his career of triumph; and we know from Hiuen Thsang the figures as to the strength of Harṣa's army at two dates. It was at the head of 50,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry and 5,000 elephants that the Vardhana hero went forth "conquering and to conquer. But by the end of his first period of campaigns, continuously spread over five years and a half during which he brought Northern India to subjection, he was in command of 100,000 cavalry, and 60,000 elephants.[2] From Bâṇa's story we know, further, that Kuntala was a chief officer of the Vardhana cavalry, Simha-nâda was a *senâpati* (general), Avanti was the supreme minister of war and peace, and Skanda-gupta was commandant of the whole elephant troop.

But the powerful army of Harṣa-vardhana's formidable adversary, Pulakeśî II, the Chalukya *sârva-bhauma* of Southern India, who compelled the northerner to know the limits of his ambition, is remembered today only by the triumphant resistance that he offered from the mountain-passes on the Narmada to the aggressor's southward march (620). Hiuen Thsang mentions only that the *forte* of the Deccan Emperor lay in the elephants. The Maratha monarch had, besides, a "fleet consisting of hundreds of ships". Purî, the Lakṣmî (the goddess), i. e. the queen of the Arabian Sea, is known to have been reduced by him as the result of naval engagements.[3]

In the seventh century, probably both in Northern and Southern India, as we understand from Hiuen Thsang's general summary,[4] the military force was divided into the traditional four arms, viz. infan ry, cavalry, chariots and elephants. The elephants were covered with strong armour and their tusks were provided with sharp spurs. The chariots were drawn by four horses abreast. Two attendants drove the chariot according to the command of the leader who sat between. The general issued orders from his chariot and was surrounded by a body of guards who kept close to his chariot wheels.

---

[1] pp. 177, 180, 187, 188, 189. *Vide* the description of mobilization, pp. 199—201, 206—209. See Harṣa's vow, p. 188.

[2] *Si-Yuki*, Vol. I, p. 213.

[3] R. G. Bhandarkar's *Early Hist.*, sec. X.

[4] *Si-Yu-ki*, Vol. I, p. 82, 83, 87.

The cavalry spread themselves in front to resist an attack, and in case of defeat they carried orders to and fro. The infantry by their quick movements contributed to the defense. They carried a long spear and a great shield; sometimes they held a sword or sabre and advanced to the front with impetuosity. All their weapons were sharp and pointed.

Soldiers were levied according to the requirements of the service; they were promised certain payments and were publicly enrolled.

5. *The Deccan and the Punjab through Hellenistic and Roman Eyes.*

Previous to the rise of the Châlukyas the dominions of the Deccan had for centuries been held by the Ândhras. Like the other nationalities of India south of the Vindhya Mountains the Ândhra monarchy was a naval power with base on the Madras Coast. A large two-masted ship[1] was the device of the coins that were struck by Yajna-śrî (*c* A. C. 173—202). It was intended evidently to be an emblem of the people's maritime importance. About five hundred years previous to this date the founders of the Ândhra Dynasty had measured their strength with the mighty Mauryas (*c* B. C. 300) only to submit to their superior numbers. The Deccan army was at this time made up of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry, and 1,000 elephants, according to both Megasthenes and Pliny.[2]

From the accounts of Greek and Roman writers it would appear that in ancient times the Punjab was, what Bengal has always been, a land of navigable rivers. Like the Easterners, therefore, the Northwestern Hindus were naturally skilled in riparian warfare. The Punjab fleets were strong elements in India's opposition to Alexander. The Xathroi or Kṣatriyas[3] may be described as having been by far the most noted naval architects and shipping experts.

It was, again, the boats of the various Punjab republics that made up the fleet, 800 to 2,000 vessels strong, with which Nearchos was entrusted for the voyage down the Indus and up to the Persian Gulf.[4] It is said that 4,000 Hindu boats had been assembled on the Indus to resist the earlier invasion of India by Semiramis, the Assyrian queen, and also that in much later times Mahmud the Moslem invader had to encounter

---

[1] *Ind. Ship.*, 119; For the boundaries of the Ândhra Empire see D. R. Bhandarkar's "Dekkan of the Sâta-vahana Period" in the *Ind. Ant.* (1918), pp. 150, 151, 156; See also the studies of V. S. Sukthankar for an altogether new light on the expansion of the Ândhra dominions (*R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volumes*, Poona, 1920).

[2] *Meg.* LVI; *Natural History*, Book VI, Ch. xxi—xxiii; *Ind. Ant.*, 1918, p. 70.

[3] *Infra*, p. 144.

[4] Vincent's *Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients*, Vol. I, p. 12.

the measures of national defense organized by a Punjab fleet of the same strength.[1]

6. *Defensive Measures against Alexander.*

The gallant resistance offered by the nations of India, both single and united, to the all-sweeping raid of Alexander, is obviously an important event in the annals of the Hindu army. The ancient European historians of that invasion furnish us with some figures about the troops of the various states that stood in the way of the Macedonian's penetration into the Indo-Gangetic plains. The first formidable opposition came from the Assakenoi of Afghanistan. They defended their fort at Massaga with 30,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry and 30 elephnts.[2] The next defendant of Hindu freedom was Poros, ruler of the Punjab between the Hydaspes (Jhelum) and the Akesines (Chenub).[3]

Poros opposed Alexander with an army over 50,000 strong. At the battle of the Hydaspes (July B. C. 326) the centre of the Hindu army was occupied by 200 elephants stationed at intervals of a hundred feet from one another and probably in eight ranks. The infantry numbering 50,000 were placed behind the elephant corps, but with files pushed forward between the elephants. There were 3,000 cavalry and 1,000 chariots to defend the flanks. The *vyûha* (battle-order) of this force resembled a city, says Diodorus. The elephants looked like the towers and the men at arms between them resembled the lines of wall between tower and tower.[4]

The spirit of the Macedonians was abated, says Plutarch, by the combat with Poros, and they resolved not to proceed any further in India. It was with extreme difficulty that they had succeeded in defeating the small army of the Punjab hero. They, therefore, opposed their chief with the greatest firmness when they came to learn that the monarch of the farthest east on the banks of the Ganges was ready to fight the foreign aggressor with 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8,000 chariots and 6,000 elephants.

But before Alexander could finally retire from the Punjab he had to contest his way through every inch of the lower Indus valley. Incessant and severe were his military engagements with the sturdy republics.

---

[1] Robertson's *Disquisition*, pp. 296—297 (notes). See Bejoy Kumar Sarkar's "Water Transport in Mediaeval India" in the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Vol. IV (Calcutta 1921).

[2] Mc Crindle's *Invasion of India* (*Arrian*, XXV; Curtius, X), 66, 194.

[3] *Ibid* (Plutarch's *Alexander*, LXII), 310.

[4] *Ibid* (*Diodorus*, Book XVII, Ch. lxxxvii), p. 274.

The Agalassoi met him with 40,000 foot and 3,000 horse.[1] The most warlike of these autonomous non-monarchical nations were the Malloi or Mâlavas. At the present juncture they happened to contract an alliance with the Kṣudrakas, their sworn enemies for ages. The combined armies amounted to 90,000 infantry, 10,000 cavalry and 900 chariots.[2] During this period the shaft used by the Indian archers was three yards long. Nothing could resist their shot, says Arrian,[3] — neither shield nor breast plate, nor any stronger defence, if such there be".

7. *Imperial Armies: Hindu and Roman.*

The mind of military India quickly shook off the nightmare of Macedonian invasion (B. C. 327—324). Nay, Hindus lost no time in rising to liberate the Punjab from the yoke of Alexander's army of occupation (B. C. 322). The force that accomplished this expulsion of European garrisons from the "land of the five rivers" was the nucleus of what in a decade or two developed into the standing army "on daily pay", as Pliny puts it, of Chandra-gupta, the founder of the Maurya House of the Magadhan Empire. And when Seleukos the Greco-Syrian had to submit to the Hindu monarch and cede Afghanistan and Baluchistan to the victor (B. C. 303) the Maurya army was composed of 600,000 infantry, 30,000 cavalry, 9,000 elephants and about 8,000 chariots.[4] Excluding followers and attendants, but including the archers, three on each elephant, and two fighting men on each chariot, the whole army consisted of 690,000 men. The exact figures of the Maurya naval force are not forthcoming yet.

Let us here place the military facts from the side of European imperialism. The temporary national militias of republican Rome became a "standing army" for the first time under Augustus.[5] He bequeathed to Tiberius (A. C. 14—37) probably the largest army that Imperial Rome ever commanded. Besides the praetorian guards and three fleets it was made up of 25 legions (of Roman troops) and 25 legions of *auxilia* (i. e. soldiers furnished by foreign dependents and allies, comparable to the Imperial Service Troops of the feudatory or protected states in British India). And the total force numbered 320,000.[6] It is clear that the Maurya General Staff had the ability to drill, equip, finance and

---

[1] [2] *Infra*, pp. 143—144.

[3] Arrian's *Indika* XVI.

[4] Pliny's *Natural History*, Book VI, Ch. xxii; Plutarch's *Alexander*; *Meg.* LVI.

[5] Arnold's *Roman Provincial Administration*, 114.

[6] Ramsay, 432; Arnold, 113.

manipulate more than double the man-power of the imperial-Roman war-machine.

8. *The Maurya General Staff.*

A good percentage of the national revenues must have been earmarked for the army and navy by the Mauryas. The fighting men were maintained, as Megasthenes[1] records, at the king's expense and were always ready, when occasion called, to take the field. And the pay was so liberal in Arrian's estimation that they could "with ease maintain themselves and others besides".[2]

The Supreme War Office of the Mauryas was administered by a council of thirty members.[3] This consisted of six boards, with five members to each. Army and admiralty formed the joint charge of one of these boards. The second board looked after supply, comprehending transport, commissariat and war service. It was responsible for the bullock trains that were used for "transporting the engines of war, food for the soldiers, provender for the cattle, and other military requisites". It had to furnish the servants who beat the drum and others who carried gongs, grooms also for the horses, and mechanists and their assistants. To the sound of the gong they sent out foragers to bring in grass and by a system of rewards and punishments ensured the work being done with dispatch and safety. Another board was in charge of the infantry. Cavalry, war-chariots and elephants were likewise entrusted to three separate boards.

There were royal stables for the horses and elephants and also a royal magazine for the arms because the soldier had to return his arms to the magazines and his horse and his elephant to the stables. The chariots were drawn on the march by oxen, but the horses were led along by a halter that their legs might not be galled and inflamed, nor their spirits damped by drawing chariots. In addition to the charioteer there were two fighting men who sat up in the chariot beside him. The war elephant carried four men, three who shot arrows, and the driver.

The naval arm of the Maurya war office was as minutely looked after as the military. The *nâvadhyakṣa* or superintendent of ships and boats dealt with all matters relating to navigation, not only of oceans but also of rivers and lakes, natural or artificial. His functions combined the supervision of fleets for riparian or maritime warfare with the administration of customs and harbor laws.[4]

---

[1] Mc Crindle's *Ancient India*, p. 85.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 211.

[3] *Ibid*, pp. 88—89.

[4] *Artha*, Book II, Ch. xxviii; *Ind. Ship.*, 104—112.

The centre of eight hundred villages in the Maurya Empire was the seat of a fortress calles *sthânîya*, if the finance minister Kautilya's directions were carried out. A fortress called *droṇa-mukhya* was constructed in the centre of four hundred villages. Two hundred villages had at their centre a fortress called *khârvâtika*. And a fortress called *samgrahaṇa* was situated at the centre of ten villages. Such is the strategic scheme of fortifications described in the *Artha-śâstra*.[1] From the military standpoint, then, or rather from the angle of national defense, the Maurya Empire was a thorough *federation de l'empire* i. e., a centralized organization of states or provinces. And it served to furnish all future empire-builders with the prototype of a perfect system of "preparedness" that might be the solid basis of effectual *pax sârva-bhaumica* (peace of the world-state).

9. *"Peace Insurance" in Hindu India.*

In this Maurya achievement of imperial nationalism is to be found the nucleus of the code of duties by which Vîra-sena,[2] the commander of the Sunga fortress on the banks of the Narmadâ, was guided towards the end of the second century B. C., as well as of the military manuals that were in use among the officers of the Vardhana General, Skandagupta, in the seventh century A. C. The curriculum of studies in the war-academies of Bengal under the administration of General Someśvara (ninth century) must likewise have accorded a prominent place to the military institutions and practices described by Kautilya. And these were no doubt adapted with modifications to the local conditions of the Gangetic Delta by Vallâla Sena's war-minister Hari-ghoṣa in the twelfth century.[3]

For want of positive evidence it is not possible yet to single out a Gustavus Adolphus of ancient India as *the* genius of Hindu military science and art from among the score of "world-conquerors" down to the *Gangâikonda* Chola (1013—1108). Nor can any of the extant Sanskrit

---

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1905, p. 7. Elaborate details about Maurya military administration and Hindu ideas on the subject of warfare prevailing in the third and fourth centuries B.C. are to be found in the *Arthaśâstra:* IX. The Work of an invader: Knowledge of power, place, time etc. Time of recruiting, Annoyance in the rear, Loss of men, External and internal dangers, Persons associated with traitors and enemies; X. War: Encampment, March of the camp, Treacherous fights, Battle-fields, Array of troops; XII. Powerful enemy: Battle of intrigue, Slaying the commander in chief, Spies with weapons, Capture of the enemy; XIII. Strategic means to capture a fortress: Sowing seeds of dissension, Enticement of kings by secret connivances, Work of spies in a siege, Operation of a siege, Restoration of peace in a conquered country.

[2] *Malavikâgnimitra*, p. 7.

[3] Banerji's *Memoir*, 106.

texts on warfare and war-office be definitely fathered on one or other of the historic emperors, generals, or presidents of military colleges. But to all writers[1] on strategy, tactics, battle-array, fortification, and arms and accoutrements, whether for the *dhanur-vedas* and *nîti-śâstras*, or for the *Manu-Samhitâ* and the *Mahâbhârata*, the military and naval chapters of the *Artha-śâstra* must have been but the postulates of the science of warfare and national defense. And these every theorist had to accept as the A, B, C of his investigation on "world-peace", or as Stockton, the American militarist, would have it euphemistically, on "peace insurance".[2]

Section 2.

The Civil Service.

1. *Centralization in Tamil India.*

Each of the provinces of the Chola Empire in Southern India was under a vicerory, who was either a scion of the dispossessed royal families or a prince of the blood. As a rule, it was the near kinsmen such as uncles, brothers or sons that obtained the voceroyalty.

Even previous to Râjarâja the Great (984—1018), royal records were preserved on palmyra leaves in the office buildings at the capital. And orders promulgated from the imperial headquarters were registered in a book of documents[3] by the *mahâ-sabhâs* (central *panchâyats*) of the rural districts.

We have a few facts about the working of the Chola bureaucracy. The inscriptions point to a good deal of intervention on the part of the civil service in the affairs of the local bodies, especially in rural finance. Two imperial officials, the *adhikârin* (the magistrate) and the *senâpati*

---

[1] It must not be ignored, however, that some of the *ideas* and institutions described in the *Mahâbhârata*, the *Manu Samhitâ*, the *nîti-śâstras* and the *dhanur-vedas* may have been older than Kautilya. *Cf. Śukra-nîti*, Ch. IV, sec. vii. Note the relative proportion of the constituents of the army in lines 41—52, and the eight battle-arrays in lines 527—536; *J. A. O. S.*, 1889 (military tactics, pp. 192—219; chariots, pp. 235—262; cavalry, 262—265; Elephant riders, 265—269; weapons, 269—308). See the list of weapons in the *Râmâyaṇa* (*Vâla-kânda*, Ch. XXVII). Some of these and other literary evidences have been used in P. Swami's pamphlet on *Warfare in Ancient India*, and in Banerjea's *Public*, 196—218. But such material has been avoided by the present author.

[2] H. W. L. Hime's *Origin of Artillery*, pp. 74—85; E. A. Altham's *Principles of War*, Vol. I, p. 43; M. I. D. Cockle's *Bibliography of Military Books up to 1642*; Fiske's *Art of Fighting*, p. 47—49; Stockton, p. 203; The Hindu *Gitâ* is cited by Maude in the introduction to Graham's translation of Clausewitz's *War*.

[3] Aiyangar, 175.

(the commandant) appear to have regularly inspected the accounts of the village assemblies. It was according to their directions that the different taxes realized by the communes were scheduled and the appropriations regulated.[1] These officers used to go out on tour of inspection through their circle, examine the rural funds, and audit the accounts. They also made allotments out of the public revenues, although of course the *panchâyats* themselves had to make the appropriations for the special purposes. On one occasion the supervisors had reasons to suspect a reduction in the expenses. The officials of the local soviet were therefore asked to "state the revenue and expenditure" "in accordance with the royal order and the royal letter". The vigilance of imperialism in the Tamil states must evidently have robbed the village *sabhâs* of fiscal autonomy.

Very rarely does the Hindu civil service seem to have been paid in money. The officials of Chola-mandala were renumerated by gifts of land or assignments of revenue.[2] Hiuen Thsang also noticed that the governors, magistrates, ministers and other officers of the Vardhana Empire (seventh century) had portions of land consigned to them for personal support.[3] For Gupta India Fa Hien (fifth century) mentions only that the royal officials did not have to fleece the people but were maintained by the state with regular salaries.[4]

2. *Nation-making under the Mauryas.*

But for the present we have more facts about the earliest epoch of Hindu imperial polity than for any others. Under Asoka the Great (B. C. 269—232), as we gather from the Edicts, the Maurya Empire was divided for administrative purposes into at least four viceroyalties. These were intended for what may conveniently be called the northern, eastern, western and southern prefectures. A *pucca* "imperialist" was this Asoka, a fully self-conscious *chakravarti* or *sârva-bhauma*. The "problem of the empire" was a serious concern to him; and he set before himself the definite task of maintaining "uniformity in administration and penal procedure"[5] throughout a territory, the dimensions of which were hardly to be attained in the annals of "haughty Rome" or by the ephemeral Napoleonic empire at its height (1808—1812). The viceregal staff and

[1] *Ibid*, 165.
[2] *Ibid*, 184.
[3] Beal's *Si-Yuki*, I, 87—88.
[4] Legge's *Fa Hian*, XVI, pp. 42—43.
[5] Pillar Edict IV.

office organization in each prefectural province were accordingly modelled on those of the Emperor himself. Believer as he was in Śâkya's *appamâda* (energism and strenuous exertions),[1] Asoka was personally in charge of the home government comprising the capital and the central regions.

The imperial executive of the Mauryas consisted of eighteen departments.[2] Each of these departments was helped by a board or boards of advisers. Uniformly with the six divisions of the municipal corporation of Pâtali-putra and the six divisions of the War Office, these boards of the Executive were constituted on the literal *panchâyatic* principle of the village assemblies; i. e., there were five members on each board.

The Maurya civil service superintended the rivers, measured the land "as was done in Egypt", says Megasthenes, and inspected the sluices by which water was let out from the main canals into their branches so that every one might have an equal supply of it. The forest officers among them had charge of the huntsmen with the power of rewarding or punishing them according to their deserts. Taxes were collected by these authorities, and the occupations connected with land, e. g. those of wood-cutters, carpenters, blacksmiths and miners, fell within the scope of their supervision. Construction of roads was one of their important functions, and in this connection it is reported that pillars were set up at every ten *stadia* (i. e. a little over one mile) to indicate the by-roads and the distances.[3]

3. *The Domesday Surveys of the Hindus.*

The principle of centralization that was observed in the management of the army and the navy was manifest also in the administration of public finance and other branches of civil government. The village was, as we have seen, the unit for purposes of military organization. It was the unit for revenue and police purposes as well. The member at the lowest step in the bureaucratic system was known as the *gopa*. This magistrate-collector was placed in charge of five or ten villages and was ultimately responsible to the *samâhartâ*, the collector-general. As the rural limb of the imperial civil service, it was the duty of the *gopa*[4] to maintain the boundary marks not only of villages, but also of fields, gardens, roads, pasture lands, assembly halls, irrigation works, cremation grounds, charitable houses, temples, groves and bathing places.

---

[1] Minor Rock Edict I.

[2] *Artha*, I, Ch. viii, xv; II.

[3] *Meg.* XXXIV.

[4] *Artha*, Book II, Ch. xxxv; *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 5.

He had personally to supervise the transactions of gift, sale or mortgage of lands and other properties of the villagers. He used to keep a register giving in detail the number of souls living in each house. The people were classified by him according to castes and occupations such as agriculture, pasturage, trade, arts, manufactures, manual labor and menial service. This census[1] and vital statistics was all-inclusive. It was applicable also to slaves, quadrupeds, and birds maintained in each household. And, of course, in the same register the *gopa* had to note not only the amount of taxes and tolls that each house had to pay to the government, but also the probable dues in working men and fines.

These comprehensive inquiries made by the village officer of the Maurya Empire could be copied *in toto* in Europe over thirteen hundred years later. The items of information which William the Conqueror needed for his *Domesday Book* (1086) in order to get a complete idea of the "geldable" (taxable) resources of England were identical with those mentioned by the Hindu Richelieu. "What is the name of this manor?" as the *Inquisitio Eliensis*[2] or the *questionnaire* of the Norman Duke who wanted to prevent in English society the disruptive tendencies of continental feudalism proceeds, "Who held it in the time of King Edward? Who holds it now? How many acres are there? How many ploughs belong to the lord of the manor? How many belong to the villeins, cottars, slaves, freeman, and sokemen? How much woodland is there? How much meadow? How much pasture? How many mills and fisheries are there? How much has been added to or taken away from the estate? How much was the estate formerly worth? How much is it worth now? How much has or had each freeman or sokeman there? Could it be made worth any more?" There was nothing distinctively Occidental in the queries. These had been anticipated by the political genius of Asia.

Moreover, a curious chronological coincidence is to be noted between the East and the West. In 1086, the very year of the English Domesday inquiry, a second survey of the Chola dominions was instituted by Kulot-tûnga I. the Chola-Châlukya.[3] On the occasion of this re-survey the tolls were abolished, but in certain cases we notice an enhancement of the rates. The re-adjustment was evidently in high request as some lands had been over-assessed in the previous settlement which was organized by Râjarâja about a century previous to this date. The first

---

[1] Law's *Hind. Pol.*, pp. 106—114 (Census).

[2] *Domesday Commemoration* (1086—1886): *Domesday Studies*, Vol. I, pp. 7—8; Maitland's *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 24.

[3] Aiyangar, 144, 149—150, 176; *Epigraphist's Report* for 1900, sec. 25, p. 10.

survey (*c* 986) was so minute that accuracy was guaranteed to $\frac{1}{50,000}$ th of a square inch.[1] There were two kinds of assessment. One was known as "calculated" (i. e. according to previous surveys) the other as "settled" (i. e. according to the actual yield). It was by this Instrument of Râja-râja that the village assemblies were authorized to take possession of lands whose owners failed to pay the government dues for three years. It may be observed here, in passing, that the dues were collected in kind, or in gold or in cloth.

4. *Roads and National Unification.*

Census and cadastral survey were thus normal processes in the Hindu machinery of imperial nationalism. Among the agencies by which the civil service contributed to the establishment of *pax sârva-bhaumica* (peace of the world-empire) we must also mention the roads, both strategic and commercial. These were deliberately laid out by the bureaucracy in order to bring the different parts of the empire within easy reach of one another. One such imperial thoroughfare was the grand trunk road all along the Coromandel coast (Eastern) covering about 1200 miles from the banks of the Mahânadî in Orissa to Kottaru near Cape Comorin at the southern tip of the Indian peninsula.[2] It was constructed by Kulot-tûnga (1070—1118) specifically for the extensive campaigns that he undertook in the north and the south. As bulwarks of his vast empire he, moreover, planted agricultural colonies along this road. Really of a military character were these plantations, as the territories were allotted to the army officers who occupied the settlements at the head of the forces at their command.[3]

It is evident that in the annals of imperial Rome nobody was a greater administrative genius than the Châlukya-Chola monarch of the early twelfth century. And Kulot-tûnga, "the highest in the family", was but continuing the tradition of the first *sârva-bhaumas* of India, the Mauryas, whose civil engineers had constructed a magnificent highway from Pâtali-putra to the Afghan frontier, a distance of 10,000 *stadia* (over 1,100 miles).[4] Besides, in an account of the achievements of the Hindu civil service we must not omit to mention the monumental irrigation works that signalized the "developmental functions" of Indian states

---

[1] Aiyangar, 175—177.
[2] *Ibid*, 188—189.
[3] *Ibid*, 143.
[4] Arrian's *Indika*, III.

from at least the time of Megasthenes' observations, — in Kashmir as in Ceylon, in Gujarat as in Madras.

5. *Administration of Irrigation Works.*

Kashmir[1] had always given small produce, as Kalhana writes in the *Râja-taraṅgiṇî*, because it was liable to be flooded by the waters of the Mahâpadma Lake and was intersected by many streams. But during the reign of Avanti-varman (833—58) a phenomenal economic revolution was brought about so that the price of a *khâri* of rice fell from 200 to 36 *dinars*. This marvelous result is attributed by the Hindu historian to the engineering feats of the "illustrious" Sûyyâ, the *anna-pati* (lord of food).

Sûyyâ noticed that the water-locked tracts along the banks of the river Vitastâ were chiefly responsible for the calamities and famines of Kashmir. Accordingly he addressed himself first to the draining off of the water. Next he proceeded to dam up the river by a stone structure. Finally he removed the dam. Having thus given freedom to the stream Sûyyâ constructed several "new beds for the Vitastâ", i. e. canals, "wherever he knew inundation-breaches to occur during disastrous floods".

Sûyyâ's operations ultimately changed the very topography of the country. Through technical skill he succeeded in making the different streams "move about according to his will" "just as a snake-charmer does with the snakes". A new confluence of the Vitastâ with its most important tributary, the Sindhu, was artificially created by the engineer's genius, and "it will last" says Kalhana, "to the end of the world". Sûyyâ also constructed stone-embankments for about thirty miles along the Vitastâ and dammed in the waters of the Mahâpadma. Having "raised the land from the water" he founded several villages. As the water was kept by means of circular dykes the villages looked like round bowls. The previous dependence of the locality on rainfall was thus rendered unnecessary through an achievement of the human brain.

The activities of the Kashmirian officer did not stop at this point. The amount of water necessary for irrigation was calculated by him in an interesting manner. He began with an hygrometric examination of the different classes of land. All village lands were first subjected to a temporary inundation under certain conditions. Then he took some soil from each village and observed the time it took to dry up. The different periods within which irrigation would be required for the

---

[3] Kalhana, Book V, verses 68, 116—117, 72, 90—95, 97—98, 102, 106, 109—112.

different soils were thus ascertained. He then arranged accordingly on a permanent basis for the size and distribution of the watercourse for each village. The Ânula and other streams were utilized for the purpose.

The story of one irrigation-tank can be told for about eight centuries. The Sudarśana Lake at Girnar in Kathiawar near the Arabian Sea was constructed by Puṣya-gupta, a *râṣtrîya* (governor) of the western prefecture under Chandra-gupta Maurya.[1] Sluices connecting the tank with the agricultural areas were opened out by Tuṣaspha, the viceroy of Asoka. About A. C. 150 repairs of an adamantine character were undertaken by Suviśâkha, assistant to Rudra-dâmana, a satrap probably of the Kuṣân Empire. In Skanda-gupta's time the dam had to be repaired a second time (458). The re-building was superintended by Chakrapâlita, a governor of the Gupta Empire.[2] Constitutionally speaking, *pax sârvabhaumica* has to be realized from the fact that both under the Mauryas and the Guptas Girnar was a remote corner of the empire, over 1,000 miles from Pâtali-putra, the capital.

The Sudarśana reservoir was built by damming up a small stream. The civil engineers of the Tamils conceived another idea in irrigation. Theirs was the plan of controlling a river at the head of its delta. The principle of anicuts is the distinctively original contribution of the Cholas to mankind's economic development. Their scheme of dealing with deltaic land has since been accepted everywhere. No nation has been able to improve upon it yet.[3] The hundred-mile embankments on the Kâverî and the main channels for irrigation were constructed by Kârikâla (*c* A. C. 150). Râjendra (1018—1035) excavated a large artificial reservoir at his new capital, Gangâikonda Śolapuram. The embankment was sixteen miles long and was provided with several substantial sluices.[4]

Equal, if not more, energy and funds were devoted by the civil service of Ceylon to the problem of irrigation. Parâkrama Bâhu I (*c* A. C. 1150) constructed 1470 tanks and 534 canals, and repaired 1395 large with 960 smaller tanks and 3621 canals. Today there is no part of the island, except the central mountain districts, in which the remains of canals and tanks are not to be found. And it appears on close investigation that almost all irrigation-works were links in a chain of large connected systems. There is, therefore, no hyperbole in the statement of Tennant that "excepting the exaggerated dimensions of Lake Moeris

[1] *Ep. Ind.*, 1905—1906, pp. 46, 47, 49.
[2] *Gup. Insc.*, pp. 56—65.
[3] Deakin, 252.
[4] Aiyangar, 185—188.

in Central Egypt and the mysterious basin of Al-aaram, the bursting of whose embankment devastated the Arabian city of Mareb, no similar constructions formed by any race, whether ancient or modern, exceed in colossal magnitude the stupendous tanks of Ceylon."[1]

6. *Pax Sârva-bhaumica and Pax Romana.*

The administrative history of the Ândhra, Kuṣân, Pâla, Châlukya and other Empires still awaits the minute scrutiny of epigraphists. The stray notice about the Sudarśana tank in the fifth century proves that the Gupta Empire at any rate was no less efficiently governed than had been that of the Mauryas. And what was their system of national government? The Hindu *chakravartis, châturantas, sârva-bhaumas* or world-rulers of the third and fourth centuries B. C., dictated duties to the governors of provincal capitals at Taxila on the Afghan frontier, Tosali in Orissa, Ujjayinî in the west and probably Suvarṇa-giri in the Deccan south of the Narmadâ. They knew how to command a net-work of fortresses situated at mathematically-calculated strategic points. They built up a bureaucratic hierarchy, which emanated from Pâtali-putra and filtering through the "district" jurisdictions administered by *sthânikas* came down to the village-nuclei under the *gopas*. Their financial organization embraced in its all-seizing sweep, as we shall see later on, the destination of every material resource and the destiny of every animal and human being. Evidently the Hindus of Maurya India were past masters in the art of nation-making i. e. centralized and unified rule.

The Oriental student of comparative politics may therefore legitimately ask: "What more was achieved by European imperialism, by the *pax Romana* of Diocletian and Constantine,[2] for instance? Were the efficiency and thoroughness of Maurya statesmen surpassed in any epoch of occidental polity?"

The evidences of the Tamil inscriptions of Southern India, the Sanskrit inscription of Rudra-dâmana, Asoka's Edicts, Megasthenes, and the *Artha-śâstra* in regard to Hindu imperial nationalism and provincial administration can be borne out by the accounts of empire-states given in epics like the *Mahâbhârata*,[3] and suggested in law-books like those of Gautama, Âpastamba, and Manu. The picture of nationalities that these literary sources exhibit is that of a centripetal tendency and homo-

---

[1] Deakin, 239—242. An account of Ceylonese civil service is furnished in Coomaraswamy's *Mediaeval*, pp. 19—20.

[2] Frank's *Roman Imperialism*, 353; Abbott's *Roman Political Institutions*, 334—340; Arnold, pp. 158—162, 188, 191.

[3] *J. A. O. S.*, 1889, p. 84.

geneous compacture of the kind systematically promoted by the Bourbons from Louis IX to Louis XIV.

7. *The Richelieus of India.*

Thus in Manu's[1] scheme every township or village was presided over by a vicegerent, who was subordinate to the ruler of ten townships. The ruler of ten was subordinate to the ruler of twenty; and the ruler of twenty to the ruler of a hundred, who, again, was subordinate to the ruler of a thousand villages. The civil service could be recruited from among the priestly, the military as well as the mercantile classes. The officers were responsible for the collection of revenue and preparation of reports relating to the area under supervision. And they had to protect their territories from robbers and criminals. It was the function of the village magistrate to keep his jurisdiction free from thieves to the distance of two miles in all directions. If the township were large, the police duties of the collector were more extensive. The distance that he had to guard against robbers was eight miles of the country surrounding his station. These officers were bound to repay to the loser whatever was stolen within their district.[2]

None of these magistrate-collectors of any grade had judicial functions. Institutionally, the judiciary of every rank appears to have been totally separate from the executive (i. e. the police and fiscal staff). In the gradually extended circle, based as it was on the decimal system, the lower grade magistrates collected revenues, received reports and passed them on to the higher grade men in succession, until the sinews of war and the news of the realm were finally focussed in the king or emperor, the lord of all.

If it may be allowed to combine this plan of imperial constitution laid down in the *smriti-śâstras*, *nîti-śâstras*, and the epic with the few epigraphic facts, if not as supplement, at any rate, as an illustration of the channels along which Hindu administrative *śakti* (genius) worked, we have in Maurya India (B. C. 322—185 B. C.) a picture of France organized under the *Intendants* of Richelieu for an area seven times as large.[3] How many such Maurya Empires can be credited to the political capabilities demonstrated in European history?

---

[1] Manu, VII, 115—117, 118—122, 123—125; *cf. Śukra*, I, lines 381—384, V, 162—169.

[2] *Âpastamba*, II, 10, 26, 6—8; *Gautama*, X, 46—47.

[3] Brissaud, p. 396. There is hardly any evidence to support Mookerji's contention that the Hindu empires were decentralized and minimum-functioned states (*cf. Local*, pp. 9—10). But see *Supra*, pp. 58—60; Sarkar's *Pos. Back*, Vol. II, 59—62.

Section 3.

The Judiciary.

1. *Early Conciliar Tribunals.*

Some of the earliest judicial tribunals among Hindus are those obtaining in the federated republic of the Vajjian States in Eastern India about the fifth century B. C. We have a picture of ultra-democratic judicial proceedings at the mote-hall of these United States. A succession of regularly appointed officers administered the criminal law. These were the justices, the lawyers, the rehearsers of the law-maxims, the council of the repesentatives of the eight clans constituting the union, the commander-in-chief, the vice-consul, and the *râjâ* (i. e. archon or consul) himself. The accused could be acquitted by each of these officers of the hierarchy. But if they considered him guilty, each had to refer the case to the next higher authority. The consul or president of the republic was the final judge as to the penalty in accordance with the law of precedents.[1]

The fountain-head of the judiciary of this and succeeding periods in Hindu administrative history has to be traced back to the *sabhâ*, council or soviet which formed the nucleus of the Vedic polity, and which figures conspicuously, although no doubt as a royal paraphernalia, among the institutions with which the poets of the *Mahâbhârata* and the *Râmâyaṇa* were familiar. It is out of this "homogeneous" gathering of the primitive tribes with its all-round functions that judicial tribunals of Śâkyan and post-Śâkyan India must have been "differentiated" through ages of evolution, in much the same manner as the modern courts of justice in West-European countries and in America are, historically speaking, descended from the folk-moot described by Tacitus in his *Germania*.[2]

The Hindu judiciary was essentially a system of assemblies or councils (*sabhâ*),[3] the "many" or the "few" sitting in judgment. By the end of the fourth century B. C. the institutions had attained a highly developed stage. And down to the thirteenth century imperial courts, original and appellate, with salaried judges and clearly defined jurisdiction over tribunals of lesser importance continued to be essential organs of the administrative machinery.

---

[1] *Buddhist India*, Ch. II; *Infra*, p. 148.

[2] Stubbs, Vol. I, 29; Jenks' *Law and Politics*, pp. 139—141.

[3] For the theory of judicial assemblies *vide* Manu XII, 110—112, 114.

2. *Maurya Judiciary.*

For the present, we know more about the Maurya than about other periods. The lowest courts of course were those of the village *panchâyat.* These were the councils of village elders, the "soviets of the *Mirs*", so to speak, and were presided over by the *gopa* or headman.[1] A thief or an adulterer could be deported by them out of the village. As a member of the village-court, the *gopa,* who was the fiscal and police head appointed by the Emperor, appears thus to have had some judicial function too. But the higher courts of Maurya India were presided over by officers thoroughly independent of the executive.

Such courts were of six ranks. First, there were courts at every town "forming the headquarters of villages". The next higher tribunals were the courts at every town which was the "headquarters of 400 villages". Next came those at every town, which was the "headquarters of 800 villages". The courts at places "centrally situated between every two provinces of the empire", and the tribunals at Pâtali-putra, the capital, constituted the next two successive rungs of the judicial ladder. Finally, came the keystone of the whole system, the highest court of judicature, at the capital, with the Emperor presiding in person over an assembly of judges. Louis IX's *Parlement* of Paris,[2] in so far as it was a court of justice, and exclusive of its legislative functions, could be modelled on this Supreme Court of the Mauryas as regards jurisdiction, authority, and control over the lower limbs of the hierarchy.

Excluding the lowest court of the *gopa* and the highest court of the Emperor, each of the five classes of tribunals comprised two courts of two distinct jurisdictions. The functions of one branch were *dharma-sthîya* or what may be described as "civil", the scope of the other was *kantaka-śodhana* (i. e. removal of the thorns of the state) or "criminal". Thus at every headquarter of villages, at every headquarter of 400 villages, and so on, there were two courts independent of each other. Pâtali-putra had therefore three courts including the Imperial Tribunal.

The *dharma-sthîya* courts were made up of three judges. They had power to inflict light fines. The cases involving validity of contracts, relation between master and servant, defamation, boundary disputes, damage to agriculture, pasture, and public roads, duties of man and wife, inheritance, succession and so forth fell within the cognizance of

---

[1] It is not clear if this headman is to be taken as identical with or distinct from the *gopa* of the civil service (who is in charge of five or ten villages). cf. Banerjea, pp. 291—294, and Majumdar, p. 59.

[2] Brissaud, pp. 432, 435, 441.

these tribunals. The *kantaka-śodhana* courts were likewise made up of three judges. They had power to inflict heavy fines and capital punishment. Within their jurisdiction came the suits relating to protection of artisans, merchants and peasants, measures against national calamities, robbery, mutilation of limbs, post-mortem examinations, etc.[1]

The judicial system of the Mauryas included of course the jury. But it is not clear as to whether the gilds were allowed to retain their privileges of self-legislation and self-adjudication. It is evident, however, that a millennium and a half before the Common Pleas ceased to follow the English king in his perambulations and began to be "held in some fixed place" through a reform initiated by the Magna Carta (1215) the principle of "fixed courts" had been well established among Hindus. And indeed the Maurya judiciary embodied in itself the same centralization from the rural unit up as was effected in the executive organs of administration.

3. *Itinerant Justices.*

One of the centralizing agencies in the judicial organization was the system of circuit judges. During the eleventh century, in Ceylon,[2] royal officials used to go out from the capital annually on circuit to administer justice in the country. The work of these itinerant justices was calculated to be an effective check on the irregularities of the local tribunals. They were to take to task the village elders in case they had transgressed any of the rules under which the *panchâyat* courts were constituted. Nor was this central control an unnecessary intermeddling; for the powers vested in the village judiciary were of a high order and needed careful supervision. In King Mahinda IV's time (1016—1042) the headmen and householders of the Dasagâma villages used to sit in session even in regard to the crimes of murder and robbery. The "proceedings of the inquiry having been so recorded that the same may be produced thereafter", the village court had the authority to inflict capital punishment on the murderer. The *gopa* and his assembly were also authorized to restore the identified property to the proper owners and hang the thieves who had perpetrated the violence. Similar judicial power was administered by the rural communes of the Chola Empire.[3]

---

[1] Law's *Hind. Pol.*, pp. 117—121.

[2] *Ep. Zeyl.*, Vol. I, no 21; The Ceylonese laws *Niti-nighanduva* are available in English (Colombo, 1888); *vide* Coomaraswamy's *Mediaeval*, p. 20; Jenks' *Law and Pol.*, Ch. IV, 131, 133.

[3] Infra p. 57. *Vide* Prahlad C. Divanji's "Judicial Administration in India in ante-Mohammedan Times" in the *Ind. Ant.* (July 1915) and "Ancient Hindu Law of Evidence" in the same journal (May 1920); Row's *Ancient Hindu Judicature.*

4. *Tribunals in Legal Literature.*

The characteristic features of this judicial organization were well reflected in the writings of the jurists.[1] In the six classes of courts of justice described in the *dharma-śâstras* and *nîti-śâstras* we find the same centripetal principles as in the actual institutions. Three of these are royal or imperial tribunals, beginning with the court of the sovereign, who is assisted by learned Brâhmaṇas as assessors. This tribunal is peripatetic, being held, like the English courts before the Great Charter, where the king abides or sojourns. Below this is the court of the *prâd-vivâka* or *dharmâdhyakṣa* i. e. chief judge. He is appointed by the sovereign and sits with three or more assessors not exceeding seven. The tribunal of the chief justice is a stationary court, being held at an appointed place. The next in order are the courts of the *puisne* judges appointed by the sovereign. Their jurisdictions are local. From their decisions an appeal lies to the *prâd-vivâka's* court and thence to the king in person.

The other three tribunals generally mentioned in all treatises on law and polity are what may be called the people's courts as distinguished from the royal courts. These represent the folk-element in Hindu judiciary. The highest of these popular tribunals are those of the *pûgas*. These are assemblies of townsmen, or soviets of persons (belonging to various tribes and following different professions but) inhabiting the same place. The next lower in importance are the courts of the *śreṇîs* (gilds). These are the organizations of traders or artisans, and conventions of persons (belonging to different tribes but) subsisting by the same profession. The third in the series are the *kulas*, or meetings of kinsmen, i. e. assemblies of relations connected by consanguinity.

The general tendency of the *dharma-śâstras* and *nîti-sâstras* is to treat these folk-tribunals as rather tentative courts.[2] They are not final organs of adjudication. The *kula's* decision may be revised by the *śreṇî*, if necessary, and the *śreṇî's* by the *pûga*. The authors consider the *pûga* (town) as less liable to partiality than the *śreṇî* (gild), and the *śreṇî* less than the *kula* (family). Appeals from the *pûga* lie to the *prâd-vivâka* or chief justice of the state. And the highest court of appeal is, of course, the tribunal of the sovereign himself.

---

[1] Colebrooke's "Hindu Courts of Justice" in the *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1828); *Mahâbhârata* (*Udyoga-parva*), LV, 58; Manu, XII, 111, Baudhâyana I, 1, 1, 8, Nârada, *Legal Procedure*, 7.

[2] Brihaspati I, 30; Śukra IV, v, lines 57—62; Nârada, I, 7; Yâjnavalkya II, 30.

Section 4.

National Finance.

Budget-making is an essentially modern institution. It is only since the time of Napoleon that regular estimates of receipts and expenditures have been yearly prepared in France.[1] And in spite of the comparative abundance of reliable data no ingenuity of modern research has been able to reconstruct the sheet of liabilities and assets for any period of the Roman Empire. But the administrative history of Hindu India is yet in its beginnings. It is out of the question therefore to attempt such wide guesses about the annual expenses even of the Maurya Empire (B. C. 322—185) for which information is more plentiful than for others as have been done in regard to the Athenian state by Bökh[2] or about the total revenues as have been done in regard to the Roman Empire by Gibbon and Guizot.[3] Nor of course is it possible to test the fiscal policy of Hindu states by the modern canons of taxation, especially on the complicated questions of justice, faculty, i. e. ability to pay, or equality of assessment.

1. *A Lay Balance-Sheet* (*c* 640 *A. C.*).

A contemporary account of the finances of the Vardhana Empire (606—647) is furnished by Hiuen Thsang, the Chinese state-guest of Harṣa's. It is said that forced labor was not exacted by the government. When the public works required it, labor was exacted but paid for in strict proportion to the work. Those who cultivated the royal estates paid a sixth of the produce as the share of the state. The river passages and the road barriers were open on payment of a small toll. In regard to public expenditure there are said to have been four charges on the private demesnes of the crown. The first charge was of course the management of the affairs of state and the provision for sacrificial offerings. The second was for providing subsidies for the ministers and chief officers of state. Honorariums for men of distinguished ability constituted the third charge, and the fourth was religious charity. Altogether, in the Chinese scholar-pilgrim's opinion, the taxes on the people were light, and personal service required of them was moderate.[4]

---

[1] Palgrave's *Dictionary* (Art. on "Finances-France"), Vol. II, p. 68; Leroy-Beaulieu's *Traité de la science des finances*, Vol. II, p. 11, 12.

[2] Schömann's *Antiquities of Greece*, p. 445.

[3] Ramsay and Lancian, p. 282.

[4] *Si Yu-ki*, Vol. I, pp. 87, 88.

Evidently we have here the material for a very elementary balance-sheet much too naive for an imperial organization[1] based as it was on the triumphs of *dig-vijaya* and military aggression[2] no less than on the victories of peace. The reporter was a lay-man and naturally failed to notice the "sinews of war" that operated the administrative machinery of *pax sârva-bhaumica* (peace of the world-state).[3] It is on such facile statements about "light taxes" and "religious charities", however, that students of comparative politics in the nineteenth century were used to founding their estimate of the Hindu political systems. In the publications on finance, as in the treatises on legislation and jurisprudence it has been the custom, therefore, to summarily dismiss the Oriental monarchies as primitive polities of the "patrimonial" type. Today the states of Old Asia are treated by scholars more or less in the same light as the feudal kingdoms of mediaeval Europe, i. e., as organizations modelled on a private household, the domestic establishment of the ruler.[4]

2. *South Indian Revenues* (*c* 900—1300).

But let us examine the imperialism of Hindu *sârva-bhaumas* (*Weltherrschern*) on the basis of their own charters, decrees and promulgations (*śâsanas*) that have been rendered accessible by the archeological investigations of recent years. The statesmen of the Chola Empire (900—1300) would appear to have been at their wits' end in devising new forms of revenue. No complete list of all the heads of government income is available for this south Indian (Madras and Mysore) state. But several Tamil inscriptions[5] describe the immunities from dues to the government enjoyed by certain villages through the grant of royal charters. From the schedule of these "privileges" we can automatically see a great part of the other side of the shield, viz. the normal contributions to the imperial treasury for which each village was ordinarily liable. Not all the items are, however, fully intelligible.

The available list indicates only the revenue from villages or village-unions. But it is questionable if we are justified in treating it exclusively as what should technically be a branch of "local finance". The village through its panchâyat was indeed responsible as a unit for the reali-

---

[1] See the extent of the Vardhana Empire on the map facing p. 340 of *Early Hist.*

[2] *Harṣa-charita*, p. 188.

[3] *Infra*, p. 223.

[4] Art. on Finance in the *Enc. Brit.*

[5] *South Ind. Insc.*, Vol. II, pt. i, no. 22; *Vide* H. Krishna Shastri's "Fiscal Administration under Early Cholas" in the *R. G. Bhandarkar Commemorative Essays* (Poona, 1917).

zation of all public income within its area.[1] But the heads of income do not seem to have been classified and specifically ear-marked as local and national. We need not, besides, attempt here a classification of the Chola revenues according to one or other of the accepted taxonomies. They can easily be brought down to the tripartite division into taxes, fees, and prices.[2]

a) *Sources other than Land.*

In the first place, there was a "tax in money".[3] It is not clear as to what should be meant by this item. It may have been a direct tax *per capita* like the poll tax of 1377—1380 in England during the Hundred Years' War or the *tributum* in Rome.

Something like "general property tax" has to be seen in several imposts. Like the horses and cattle taxed by mediaeval German states[4] "animals" were counted to contribute to the Chola exchequer. The furniture, clothing, and ornaments are not enumerated in the schedule of taxes on "personalty". But "movable" property as contrasted with the real estate was assessed in the form of "fixed capital" like looms and oil-mills. Tanks also were included in the list of property-dues.

A tax was realized on weights, whatever it might imply. But some light may be thrown on this item from the legislation of the Mauryas. In the *Arthaśâstra* of Kautilya (fourth century B. C.) we read that no trader was allowed to have his own weights and measures. Every day the business men had to have their scales and weights stamped afresh by the government.[5] The authorities realized a revenue from the stamps. Now if this custom of the first Hindu empire were followed by the Tamil *sârva-bhaumas*, we may consider this business tax on weights to be another property tax. The rate may have been small, but the total receipts of the empire under this head must have shown a high figure, as the number of taxable individuals including the pettiest retailer was obviously large.

It is doubtful if the business or license tax paid by the Tamil goldsmith should not be scheduled as a charge on property. But "unripe fruit" in the Kartigai month, though a levy in kind, must be regarded as such. Stocks, bonds and mortgages that are so prominent in modern economic life and necessarily occupy an important place in the taxation

[1] Aiyangar, pp. 161, 163, 164.

[2] Plehn's *Intro. to Pub. Fin.*, pp. 76—79, 92—100; Seligman's *Essays in Taxation*, pp. 430, 431.

[3] The list can be seen conveniently in Aiyangar, pp. 165, 166, 180—182.

[4] Seligman's *Ess.* p. 39. Cf. Aghnides' *Mohammedan Theories of Finance*, pp. 526, 527.

[5] Shamasastry's article on "Chânakya's Land and Revenue Policy" in the *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 50, 51.

of property are not naturally to be looked for in Hindu finances of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. But it is interesting to note that — the "sonship" was assessed among certain social classes, e. g. the "right hand" and "left hand" orders. The public income from the sonship dues was identical with that accruing from inheritance tax, or estate or "death duty", i. e. the charge made by modern governments on the transfer of property from the dead to the living.

None of these property dues were of course prices charged by the government for economic or other services rendered to the people. They were all deduced from the power of the state to obtain revenue by "compulsory dues and charges upon its subjects", i. e. taxes in the strictest sense of the term. None of them can moreover be regarded as income from "state property" and "state monopolies", the two sources that contribute about 25 per cent of French revenues.[1]

Taxes on consumption (*Aufwand-steuern*) were, besides, not neglected by the Chola Empire. There was a tax on bazars. The levy of tolls was common. The tax on trade or sales like the Athenian and Roman excise of 1 per cent[2] was another regular feature of the financial system. As taxes on the necessaries of life these excise duties could not but touch the community at every grade. They served, therefore, economically speaking, as real poll taxes though of an "indirect" denomination. We do not know if salt was a state monopoly as under the Roman republic[3] or as in Maurya India. But the French *gabelle*[4] was not to be forgotten by the Tamils who were too mindful of their revenues to overlook tapping this necessity of life that is bound to obey the law of "inelastic demand". We shall have details about Hindu salt tax in connection with Maurya finance.

A rent or license tax was realized from the fishers. Taxes on the collection of rents also are mentioned. Tax-"farming" may thus have been a fact in certain directions. Furthermore, the "penal power" of the state was effectively made use of to cooperate with its finance department. We do not have a long list of fines demanded of the delinquents by the Tamil Empire. It is known only that apothecaries were fined for "rotten drugs". An income of minor character is obvious in Kulot-tûnga's legislation (1070—1118) by which the state charged a seigniorage upon coining.[5]

---

[1] Palgrave, Vol. II, p. 69.
[2] Schömann, p. 449.
[3] Ramsay, p. 277.
[4] Brissaud, p. 505.
[5] Aiyangar, pp. 149, 150.

Income from the "services" of the state is mentioned in three connections. First, the villagers had to contribute their mite to maintain the watchman who was placed over the *vettis* (paths). This was for obvious reasons a regular rate or cess, though local, for one of the minimum functions of government. Secondly, the state seems to have supplied the *karman* to measure the paddy of the cultivators. He had to be paid for by the rural commune at a certain rate. Lastly, a water-rate or "tax on water-courses" for irrigation was an inevitable charge upon every peasant.

Mines, though they must certainly have been important sources of Chola revenues, are not mentioned in the inscriptions. Nor are the customs duties referred to. Of course neither of these could form part of the regular dues of a village to the government. But we are in a position to realize that when all these dues and others not enumerated in the inscriptions that happen to have been found are considered in their totality the income of the Tamil Empire would rise to a considerable amount.

b) *Collections from Land.*

We have now to add the revenue from property *par excellence*, the "real estate" as it is called. Not only in primitive communities but in Rome also even under the Empire land revenue was the mainstay of the government. And this land revenue was essentially a rent from "crown-land", *ager publicus*, i. e. public domain. It took the Romans long to get used to the idea of a non-land revenue. Taxes like the *tributum* were considered by the republic as "forced loans" to be repaid out of the loot of conquest, and these were resorted to only when the proceeds of the "domain" proved inadequate to meet the extraordinary expenses.[1]

Under the Tamils also south India's financial backbone must have been furnished by the realizations from land. The rate was not low. The Early Roman Empire used to levy land revenue at the rate of $^1/_{10}$th of the produce.[2] But in Chola India the government demand was $^1/_6$th. The high rate was indeed the normal *bhâga* or share of the government in land-produce according to the stereotyped "pious wish" of the *dharma-śâstras* (law books) and *nîti-śâstras* (political science).[3] And yet in

[1] Seligman's *Ess.* p. 35. The same Roman views are expressed in the sixteenth century by the French political philosopher Bodin in his *Les six livres de la république* (Bk. VI, Ch. ii, *Des Finances*).

[2] Ramsay, p. 276.

[3] *Infra* pp. 155—160.

Realpolitik this conventional norm was but a fiscal camouflage that may deceive the academic student of financial history but did not fail to press the taxpayers themselves. For in Chola legislation the additional imposts on land, besides the tolls and octrois, were clearly defined as being $^1/_{10}$th of the yield. The total revenue from land was thus $^4/_{15}$ths or more than 25 per cent of the gross outturn in Râjâdhirâja's time (1035—1053).[1]

An interesting theoretical study in connection with the Chola revenue from real property would be that bearing on its precise character as to whether it was rent or tax. Incidentally it may be pointed out that communism in landownership is practically unknown in Hindu law-books.[2] The trend of ancient thought on land-tenure is to regard it as individual concern. But in *Tamil* inscriptions, while the individualistic tenure (the *ryotwari*, to use the British Indian term) is easily to be inferred, communal property in certain lands is also assured to village *panchâyats* by the legislation of Râja-râja the Great (985—1018).[3] We may take it that so far as the Chola Empire is concerned, land was owned both in severalty as well as in common.

This does not, however, settle the question as to how far, if at all, the crown was the legal proprietor of land, i. e. how far the "village community" (wherever it may have existed) or the individual cultivator were but "tenants" of the state-landlord (paying "economic" rents for the usufruct of public property) and how far their dues were "direct taxes" paid on their own immovable possessions. It is the tendency of modern indologists to postulate all lands as state property and the income from land necessarily as crown rent. But it is hardly possible to maintain this position on the strength of actual proprietary documents, *sâsanas* (laws or charters) and epigraphic records. For all practical purposes the presumption rather should be that Hindu India did not know of state-landlordism, i. e. land-nationalization[4] except of course in very limited areas. The land revenue of Hindu states was therefore generally speaking, a tax. But, as Giffen[5] explains away the distinction between rent and tax, "the fact of a government levying so general a charge may be held *ipso facto* to convert the charge into a tax having

---

[1] Aiyangar, pp. 181, 182.

[2] Jolly's *Recht*, pp. 93—96; Hopkins' *India* (Land Tenure), pp. 221, 225, 229; *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, pp. 245, 246.

[3] Aiyangar, pp. 161, 163, 164.

[4] See the discussion on "public lands" in Rau's *Finanzwissenschaft*, pp. 127—133; *cf.* Bodin, pp. 623—634.

[5] "Taxation" in the *Enc. Brit.*

much the same economic effects and consequences as a tax". For in strict theory, "where the government makes a charge, it levies a tax". The features of monopoly and compulsion on the taxpayer associated with all forms of land-revenue "make the charges difficult to distinguish logically from other taxes".

c) *The "Modern" Character of Tamil Finance.*

On the whole the Chola revenues were bulky in dimensions and the people of southern India heavily taxed. Only one ruler is spoken of as having slightly reduced the amount of the people's dues. Kulot-tûnga's name became a household word in Madras of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, for in 1086, the year of the Domesday Book, he abolished the tolls[1] after the completion of cadastral survey, — the second such survey of the Chola Empire. But the general story of *les nerfs de la république*, the nerves of the state, as Bodin puts it, under the Cholas was uniform. Like the governments of Europe in the days of Adam Smith,[2] the South Indian monarchs knew how to exact as much as they could "only desirous of finding the easiest means of doing so". The one redeeming feature seems to be that the Empire was conscious of the high price at which *pax sârva-bhaumica* was being enjoyed by the people. Râja-râja accordingly expressly instructed the finance officers to be elastic in the collection of revenues.[3] But no figures are available as to any of the heads of government income, and there is no means of making an estimate as to the probable national income. It is naturally impossible to form an idea as to the taxable capacity or "faculty" of the people. Nor is it convenient to hazard a conjecture as to the actual "burden of taxation", i. e. the proportion of the aggregate wealth of the people that the state demanded for all its functions and services.

Taxation as such was unknown in France previous to 1300.[4] As a function of the state and as an institution of "public law" it virtually ceased to exist with the destruction of the Roman Empire by the Teutons. In its place was substituted the "private claim" of customary dues, fines or tolls by landlords and barons.[5] The transition from this "feudal" to "modern" finance was a lengthy process in England.[6] It was not before the rise of nation-states in the fifteenth and sixteenth

---

[1] Aiyangar, pp. 149, 150.

[2] *Enc. Brit.* (Taxation).

[3] Aiyangar, p. 182.

[4] Brissaud, pp. 487—491; Leroy-Beaulieu, Vol. II, pp. 6, 7.

[5] *Enc. Brit.* (Finance).

[6] *Ibid.* (article on "English Finance").

centuries that the right of government to levy "taxes" became established or rather re-established in the western world. But, for purposes of comparative politics it is necessary to note that the Chola finances do not exhibit the features of the disintegrated feudal polity of mediaeval Europe. The revenues of the Chola Empire possessed the same variety in form as the Roman-Imperial and the modern French. They may be classified by students of *Finanzwissenschaft*, if required, according to the Latin *patrimonium*, *tributum*, and *vectigalium*, or the more popular *domaine*, *contributions directes*, and *contributions indirectes* of modern science. And of course the right of taxation was firmly planted in the political consciousness of Chola India.

3. *The Consumption-Schedule of Chola India.*

It is not difficult to explain why the imperial structures of the Hindus should have been heavily assessed organizations. The reasons are to be sought in the great variety and quantity of the state's "consumption". They are essentially identical with what economists like Nitti and Leroy-Beaulieu[1] have traced in the growth of public expenditures in modern times. The functions of Hindu governments were manifold. Consciously or unconsciously, whether backed by a definite theory of *nîti* (statecraft) like the late German empire or not, every state in India was a *Kulturstaat*. The invariable end of all Hindu polities was the protection and development of *dharma*. Like *Kultur* and Arnoldian "culture", *dharma* is a very comprehensive category. Exceedingly elastic in its significance, again, like the English term "law", the concept of *dharma* is the basis of distinction, the *fundamentum divisionis* between man and the brute. *Dharmeṇa hînâh*, says the *Gîtâ*, *paśubhih samânâh*. In *dharma*, the analogue of the "virtue" in Plato's *Republic*, is to be found the *differentium* between the human world and that of *paśu*, or "beasts and birds" as Hobbes would have it. An agency for the promotion of humanism, i. e. for the advancement of all that lets "the ape and tiger die" and develops the people's material and moral interests, of anything, in short, that is conducive to national well-being was necessarily a multifunctional corporate organism. The *dharma-staaten* of India had therefore before them an almost unlimited range of what in scientific parlance is known as "developmental" activity. Not of an Arcadian character could thus be the "appropriations" of the Hindu empires.

---

[1] Leroy-Beaulieu, Vol. II, pp. 171—181. Hindu history is diametrically opposite to the picture suggested in Mookerji's statements about the functions of Indian states (*Local*, 3—4). *Vide Infra*, pp. 171—173 for the *nîti* theory of the scope of state activity.

We need not enumerate the duties of government stated in the *nîti-sâstras*. Let us note only the functions of the historic state-systems that may be gathered from the inscriptions and contemporary reports. The economic development of the country was undertaken by the Maurya, Gupta, Kashmirian, Tamil, and Ceylonese governments. Their care for irrigation[1] in different parts of the empire is a solid testimony to their recognition of the secular interests of the state. The construction of magnificent roads was another function along the same line.[2] The beautifying of cities and measures for street-cleaning, sanitation, etc were important items of state business in Chola territories.[3] The promotion of aesthetic as well as "productive" arts and crafts was a normal function of almost every Hindu state. The encouragement or "protection" of skilled workmen, the steady maintenance of shipbuilders and naval architects, and state employment of miners and other industrial artisans were among the duties of the Maurya civil service. Shipbuilding[4] and manufacture of arms and ammunitions were in reality crown monopolies. Wood-cutting, carpentry and smithery works came naturally therefore under state control. All governments undertook to lay out parks and grounds for recreation and pastime. Pharmaceutical gardens were treated as public necessities.[4] Palaces and public halls were likewise some of the "useful magnificences" that no state could dispense with. The Pândya rulers (*c* 100—300 A. C.) were patrons of *pariṣats* or academies of literature.[5] The Guptas[6] and the Pâlas[7] considered universities among important charges on the imperial exchequer. Temples and *vihâras* or monasteries were built at government expense both by the Vardhana and the Châlukya emperors of the seventh century,[8] indeed by all ruling houses. Not the conventional religion and morality of the time alone found an asylum in these institutions. The financial authorities must have regarded them as schools of higher learning as well. From the cultural standpoint these were at once the art-galleries and museums of the people. And as resorts for the relief of the sick,

---

[1] *Ep. Ind.* 1905—1906, pp. 46—49; *Gup. Insc.*, pp. 56—65; Kalhana, Bk. V, 68—117; Venkayya's "Irrigation in Southern India" in the *Arch. Sur. Ind. Ann. Rep.* 1903—1904; Deakin, 239—242; Aiyangar, 185—188.

[2] Mc. Crindle's *Anc. Ind.* (Meg. XXXIV), p. 86; Arrian, III; Aiyangar, 188, 189; Law's *Hind. Pol.*, pp. 68—75.

[3] Ayyar's *Town*, pp. 42, 44, 51.

[4] Mc. Crindle's *Anc. Ind.*, p. 86; Strabo, XV, 46; *Ind. Ship.*, p. 192.

[5] Aiyangar, pp. 70, 337, 359, 360, 379—382.

[6] *Itsing*, pp. 65, 154, 177.

[7] *Ind. Ant.* 1888, pp. 308—311.

[8] *Si Yu-ki*, Vols I and II (See Hiuen Thsang's account of any of the states visited by him).

the distressed and the poor the ostensibly religious buildings discharged an important economic function like the Catholic institutions of mediaeval Europe. Add to all this the minimum functions of every state as state, viz. the protection of person and property, or national defense by army and navy as well as internal policing by adequate executive and judicial staff. The extent of these minimum functions can be realized from the fact that in the Maurya Empire the appropriations on this head absorbed 25 per cent of the total revenues.[1]

It is not necessary to compare the functions of Hindu states, item by item, as regards quantity and variety, with the long list of modern state activities, expanding daily as they have been under the impact of socialism. The socialistic trend of *dharma*-states is apparent enough. One must not surmise, however, that every public work among Hindus was the undertaking of the state. For, private effort i. e. the patriotism of citizens was responsible in every age for the founding and maintenance of useful institutions. In Gupta India hospitals[2] were built and endowed by the public-spirited townsfolk of Pâtali-putra, the Rome of the Hindus. Rudra-dâmana (*c* A. C. 150), a satrap of Gujarat, repaired the Sudarśana reservoir at his own expense, the ministers having refused to supply funds from the government treasury.[3] General Uṣavadâta's (*c* A. C. 100) endowments in the Andhra Deccan may serve as a standing example of the manner in which the people coöperated with the state and supplemented its activity along developmental or cultural lines.

One of the hill caves in Govardhana (Nasik District in the Bombay Presidency) was excavated at Uṣava-dâta's expense.[4] Among his numerous benefactions we read of the gift of 300,000 cows, the construction of the flights of steps on a river and the giving away of sixteen villages for religious purposes. This philanthropist used to maintain 100,000 scholars and priests with board. He bore the marriage expenses of eight Brâhmaṇas at Somnath in Gujarat. His quadrangles, public halls and halting places as well as gardens, tanks and wells were spread over the country from Broach and Bassein, the ports on the Arabian Sea coast, to Daśapura in Malwa, far inland in Upper India. Ferry boats were placed by him over six rivers in northern Bombay. Both sides of these rivers were also furnished with rest houses and equipped with arrangements for the distribution of water to travellers. Moreover, he founded

---

[1] *Ind. Ant.* 1909, p. 263.

[2] Beal's *Fa Hien*, p. 107.

[3] *Ep. Ind.* 1905—1906, *loc. cit.*

[4] *Nasik Inscr.* No. 17; *Early Hist. Dek.* sec. iv.

certain benefactions for the support of several academies of Vedic learning in various parts of the Maratha country.

Such private endowments for public purposes were undoubtedly numerous in every epoch of Hindu history. But none the less the financial burden of public administration weighed heavy upon the "pillars of the state". The government could not afford to depend solely upon local patriotism and voluntary contributions. The expenses of national house-keeping had to be met regularly from the resources of the empire. The finance department had therefore to raise the necessary revenue by hook or by crook.

Census[1] was an important institution of the Mauryas. It was used by the municipal corporation of Pâtali-putra as well as by the imperial civil service. The *gopa* or village magistrate, the *sthânika* or district magistrate, as well as the *nâgaraka* or mayor of the city were alive to the importance of vital statistics. The numbering of persons, houses and cattle, as well as the measurement of lands, pastures and gardens furnished the *samâhartâ* or collector-general with definite data for the valuation and assessment of the people's wealth.[2] The cadastral surveys organized by the Cholas[3] in 986 and 1086 were also calculated to ensure the same end. Both these instruments tended to bring about centralization and consolidation of the public revenues and were indeed together with the war office, the judiciary and the executive service the most effective means of establishing *pax sârva-bhaumica.* The financial organization aimed at by the Hindu empires was thus akin to the "integration" of national outlays and revenues that has been the steady achievement of modern Europe since the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. And in classical times it is the system of the Roman Empire with its official tax-collectors who replaced the *publicani* or revenue-"farmers" of the republic that should be kept before the mind's eye while appraising the public expenditure, national resources or heads of income, and financial administration of Hindu India from B. C. 322 to A. C. 1300.

4. *Kautilyan Finances* (*c* 300 *B. C.*).

We shall now proceed to analyze the revenues of the Maurya Empire. One of the functions of the *gopa*, the officer at the lowest rung of the executive hierarchy, was to register the probable dues of the villagers in "working men"[4] along with taxes, tolls and fines. It is not clear

[1] Law's *Hind. Pol.* 106—114.

[2] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 5.

[3] Aiyangar, 144, 149, 150, 175—177.

[4] *Ind. Ant. loc. cit.*

if we are to understand that the empire used to receive contributions in "services" like the Roman republic in its earlier stages,— such, for instance, as is recommended by Viṣṇu,[1] Manu,[2] or Śukra.[3] In Megasthenes's account of India, again, we read that one of the objects of the vital statistics kept by the census officials of the municipal corporation of Pâtaliputra was the levy of a tax.[4] If some particular tax is to be singled out because of this statement it was evidently a poll tax on the citizens per head.

The financial authorities themselves classified the revenues into seven principal groups according to the kind of resource tapped by them. "Fortified cities" constituted the first revenue jurisdiction. The *râṣṭra* or "country" districts constituted the second. Mines were treated as a distinct source of public income. Gardens and forests also formed two independent groups. Quadrupeds like cows, buffaloes, sheep, goats, asses, camels, horses and mules likewise contributed their quota. The seventh head was traffic both by land and water.

Each of these sources is described in detail in the *Artha-śâstra*.[5] The several items of income from the "country", the second in the above grouping, comprised six heads. Crown-lands yielded the first revenue that was known as *sîtâ*. The second head was *bhâga* (share) or revenue in kind realized from private landlords. A special tax, *bali*, was demanded for religious purposes corresponding to the dues realized by Athens for the festivities. Sundry collections known as *kara* were made in money. *Târa* was the toll realized on boats, ferries and ships. The sixth item consisted of various dues, *vartanî* (road-cess), *śulka* (toll), etc. and was levied as a rate on all traffic.

The fortified cities contributed to the imperial exchequer under twenty different heads. These were toll, fines, weights and measures, jails, currency, passports, excise, slaughter-houses, oils, *ghî* (clarified butter), salt, goldsmiths, commerce, courtesans, gambling, house-building, artisans, gate-dues, and religious institutions. There were special taxes on a people called Bahârikas. They appear to have been mercenary soldiers or some wealthy community living at Nâlandâ, the famous university town of later ages. Like Jews in Europe this race was considered by the Hindu empire to be a good victim for fleecing.

Altogether, there were at least fifty different names under which

[1] Ch. III, 32.
[2] VII, 138.
[3] Ch. IV, sec. ii, line 241.
[4] Mc Crindle's *Anc. Ind.* 87—88.
[5] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 47.

revenues flowed into the treasury. For our present purpose we shall classify them into eight modern categories: (1) land revenue, including the income from forests and gardens, (2) customs duties, (3) excise on sales, (4) "direct" property taxes of various denominations, (5) fines as penalties for all sorts of offence, (6) economic "earnings" or profits from the commercial undertakings of the naval department, (7) income from the crown monopolies in extractive (mine, salt, etc) and other industries, (8) miscellaneous collections like port-dues, etc.

a) *Land Revenue.*

As with the Roman Empire[1] the chief source of Maurya income was the receipt from land. In the West the process of fiscal reorganization from Hadrian to Diocletian led up to the system of assessment for fifteen years. But in regard to the Mauryas no information is available as to the period for which the valuations were made.

In Athens land belonged to the state. In Maurya India certain passages of the *Artha-śâstra* may lend color to the hypothesis as to the "public ownership" of the chief "agent of production". If Kautilya's statements may be taken as "positive law" on the subject, both land and water belonged to the government. The people could exercise their proprietary right in regard to all other species of property excepting these two.[2] But, on the other hand, this position will appear to be inconsistent with the fact noted above that two distinct items were enumerated as land-revenue from the *râṣtra* or country districts of the empire. The *sîtâ* was the income from the crown-lands, and was therefore rent. The other realization was specifically known as *bhâga*, the "share" of the state in the "produce" of the people's lands. The private proprietors were known as *sva-vîryopajîvinah.* Besides, the right of private property in real estate was clearly recognized in the law of sales. According to the legislation in the *Artha-śâstra*,[3] village lands were to be sold in the presence of forty neighbors who owned land in the vicinity. The state could demand only the legitimate excise on the sale. The same proprietary right is to be inferred from, though also limited by, the ruling that lands could be sold by cultivators only to cultivators, and that persons enjoying revenue-free lands could sell them only to persons who already possessed such lands. The distinction between crown-lands and private lands is also to be noted in the law of escheat. By the general

[1] Arnold, pp. 203, 204; Ramsay, 275—281; *Enc. Brit.* (Finance).

[2] *Artha* II, i, vi. Cf. the Mohammedan theory of public domain, Aghnides, pp. 500—521. Note the conditions of land tenure in Japan, Asakawa's *Early Inst. Life*, p. 73.

[3] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 10; Law's *Hind. Pol.* pp. 161, 162.

law on the subject the rights of ownership over houses, fields, gardens, tanks and temples were forfeited if proprietors took no cognizance for a continuous period of five years.[1]

In the budget of the Maurya Empire as in that of the Roman we have therefore to look for two entries, theoretically considered, under land revenue. The first was rent paid by the *ryot* or tenant to the state-landlord, the second was a "direct tax" paid by the citizen to the government. The imperial demand from land was very high, higher even than what we have seen under the Cholas. For the land alone,[2] where irrigation was carried on by hands the due was $^1/_5$th of the yield; where irrigation was carried on by conveying water on shoulders or through water raised from tanks, lakes and streamlets the due was $^1/_4$th; and where irrigation was carried on by pumping (*sroto-yantra*) water from rivers, the due was $^1/_3$. An additional *udaka-bhâga* or water-rate was charged by the government at $^1/_4$th or $^1/_5$th of the produce. The total rates ranged therefore from $^2/_5$ths or 40 per cent to $^7/_{12}$ths or about 57 per cent of the gross outturn. Provisions for the remission of taxes are recorded. But it was not done on any *doctrinaire* principle. Abatements were graduated according to the difficulties and cost of improvement effected by cultivators.[3] Gardens were assessed at the same rates as cultivated lands. An additional one-sixth or $16^2/_3$ per cent had to be paid as excise on sales.[4]

b) *Taxes on Consumption.*

Important taxes of the Mauryas were twofold: customs and excise. Along with land revenue these must have constituted the mainstay of their finance. In Athens[5] under Pericles the policy of free trade appears to have been adopted as the city depended for its food supply on external sources. Its normal customs duty was therefore as low as 2 per cent. The Roman *portoria*[5] (customs dues) were higher, the earliest maximum being 5 per cent. The extreme maximum under Constantine was $12^1/_2$ per cent. But the Maurya tariff was high enough to verge on, if it did not actually establish, an economic "protection". Thus in regard to imported salt the empire demanded in the first place, one-sixth or $16^2/_3$ per cent of the entire commodity, and in the second place a 5 per cent as trade or sale tax on the remaining $^5/_6$ths.[6] Similarly foreign

[1] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 9, 105, 113.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 110. Note the 50 per cent in Islamic theory, Aghnides, 529.
[3] See details, *Ibid*, p. 9.
[4] *Ibid*, p. 114.
[5] *Enc. Brit.* (Finance). For a detailed account of Athenian finances see Schömann, pp. 432—464.
[6] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 53.

liquors, wines and intoxicants had to bear heavy import duties which varied from one-fifteenth or $6^2/_3$ per cent to one-tenth or 10 per cent of their value.[1] In both cases, in addition to the tariff the government charged an extra duty in order to compensate the loss in the sale of local produce. The total maximum may have approached the British customs rate, which though down to 1700 not generally higher than 5 per cent rose to 25 per cent by 1759.[2]

The normal Maurya duty on foreign goods was one-fifth of their value, i. e. 20 per cent. One-sixth, i. e. $16^2/_3$ per cent was realized from fresh fruits, vegetables, pepper, dried fish, flesh and other perishable goods. The rates on conches, diamonds, pearls, etc were to be fixed at the custom house by experts. Silk garments, arsenic oxide, skins, carpets, etc were charged *ad valorem* from 6 to 10 per cent. The minimum rates on the tariff schedule were 4 to 5 per cent. In order to be consistent, of course, the Empire severely dealt with all cases of smuggling. The highest fine of 3,000 *paṇas* or $ 750 was the punishment prescribed for this offence by the penal code.[3] This was nothing extraordinary considering that the penalty for smuggling according to the latest law in the United States is a fine of $ 5,000 or imprisonment for two years or both. No figures are available as to the gross customs receipts. But it may be surmised that the 27 per cent of the total German Imperial revenues as accruing from customs alone would not have been envied by the Maurya chancellor.[4]

It might seem as if the Empire intended almost to place an embargo on foreign import. But there were certain tendencies in the fiscal policy of the Mauryas in regard to international trade that should indicate a different character of the tariff. The protective duties were high indeed but they were not intended to be "prohibitive". Rather, on the other hand, there was a deliberate attempt on the part of the authorities to encourage foreign imports. They regulated the prices[5] in such a manner that a reasonable profit was assured to the dealer in imported goods. And if necessary, special instructions were issued to the proper officials

---

[1] See details, *Ibid*, pp. 50, 55.

[2] Dowell's *History of Taxation and Taxes in England*, Vol. I, pp. 82—88, 145, 146, 163—167, 211—223; Vol. II, p. 37.

[3] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 49, 50; Higginson's *Tariffs at Work*, p. 112.

[4] Plehn, 184.

[5] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 57. Note the seven distinct expenses of marketing, *śulka* (toll), *vartanî* (road-cess), *ativâhika* (conveyance-cess), *gulma-deya* (duty payable at military stations), *târa-deya* (ferry charge), *bhaktâ* (porter's wage), and *bhâga* (share of the state), that were calculated by the customs officials in fixing the price of the imported commodities.

to accord concessions in certain particulars to foreign merchants. Under these conditions it is doubtful if the Maurya tariff should be considered as "protective" in any significant sense. In any case its character as a measure for revenue purposes is unquestionable.

The duty of 1 per cent on all sales was a regular tax of the Roman Empire. Such an impost, call it market due, toll or octroi, was, as we have noted, prevalent in Athens also. The rates in Maurya India were much higher. Commodities sold by cubical measure were charged $6^1/_4$ per cent, those by weighing 5 per cent, and those by computation $9^1/_{11}$ per cent *ad valorem*.[1] This tax, known by the generic name of excise or inland trade revenue, was assessed by the Mauryas in two ways. In certain lines, e. g. salt, precious metals, etc they retained the monopoly of manufacture and sale for the government. But the general method of assessment was the grant of a license to the vendor or manufacturer.

The excise branch of the revenues was throughly centralized. The licensing procedure was most efficiently observed. Nobody was permitted to sell the goods at the places of growth or manufacture, e. g. fields, gardens, forests and mines.[2] All commodities had to be brought to the customs house or toll office near the city gate. These were then marked with the state stamp called *abhijnâna-mudrâ* (mark of identification) in *sindûra* (vermilion). The tax was levied, however, only after sale. The law was strict, as evasion of the excise was a capital offense. False statements to the officials made by merchants in regard to amount or price were moreover punished as cases of theft, i. e. by fine, mutilation or even death.[3]

It is evident that the customs and excise receipts of the Maurya Empire were much more voluminous than those of the Roman Empire. Analogues for this aspect of Hindu finance have to be sought in modern states like England, France, and Czarist Russia, where half of the national revenues is made up of the returns from customs duties and excises, or the United States where virtually the whole of "federal" revenues is derived from these two elements in the *Aufwand-steuern*.[4]

Recent authorities on the *Überwalzung* or "shifting" of taxation are for practical considerations inclined to do away with the formal or verbal distinction that economists have long drawn between the taxes on consumption (like customs and excise) and the taxes on property

---

[1] *Ibid, loc. cit.*

[2] See details, *Ibid*, pp. 50, 114.

[3] *Ibid*, pp. 48, 49. *Artha* II, xxi.

[4] *The Statesman's Year Book.*

or income.[1] But using the conventional nomenclature we have to mention that in addition to customs and excise, the so-called "indirect" taxes, the Maurya Empire levied "direct" taxes as well. It has already been pointed out, of course, that a great part of the land revenue was a direct tax on real estate in so far as land was the private property of citizens. The taxes on personalty or movable property have now to be enumerated.

c) *Direct Taxes.*

In Kautilya's list we do not have the taxes on looms, oil-mills, etc that are mentioned in the Chola inscriptions. Nor do the Tamil taxes on "sonship" or inheritance and succession appear in the Maurya statements. But, as we have seen, weights and measures were taxed.[2] Gamblers had to pay a license.[3] Dramatists, players, singers, and musicians were charged 5 *paṇas* ($ 1.25).[3] This figure does not, however, explain the rate. A tax was levied from prostitutes as in Athens[4] and in Rome under Caligula.[5] As a rule, cattle were not taxed *per capita.* They figured in the *samâhartâ's* (collector-general's) books only in connection with excise on sale. But under abnormal conditions, when an emergency finance was the problem, a special due was charged on domestic quadrupeds.[6] The same circumstances brought painters, sculptors, and artists generally within the tax-collector's grip.[7]

It seems, on the whole, however, that the Mauryas considered the taxes on property rather as a safety-valve to fall back on in dire necessity than as a normal source of regular imperial revenues. And when the necessity arose (e. g. through war conditions) the Empire did not hesitate to levy what were virtually "super-taxes" on both immovable and movable properties of the wealthier classes. In the first place, the rates of land tax were enhanced.[8] But regions barren or difficult to cultivate were exempted from this emergency taxation. And persons engaged in "essential industries", e. g. in agriculture, forestry, and elephant-training, were likewise granted a privilege. In the second place contributions in "services" were levied from "lacklanders", especially

---

[1] Giffen's art. on Taxation in the *Enc. Brit.* (*The Different Kinds of Taxes*); Seligman's *Shifting and Incidence of Taxation*, pp. 310, 311.

[2] See details, *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 50, 51.

[3] *Ibid*, 58.

[4] Schömann, p. 449.

[5] Seligman's *Essays*, pp. 36, 37.

[6] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 114.

[7] *Ibid*, p. 59.

[8] See details, *Ibid*, p. 115; also *Ind. Ant.* 1909, pp. 260, 261; *Artha*, V, ii.

from culprits and bad characters. The government in cooperation with the *samâhartâ* and the superintendent of agriculture was to improvise "war-farms" and "war-gardens" and induct such able-bodied persons into the work of cultivation.[1]

In the third place, persons rearing pigs and cocks had to contribute 50 per cent of their stock. Those who had sheep and goat farms were taxed $16^2/_3$ per cent, and herdsmen who reared cows and buffaloes 10 per cent.[2] In the fourth place, a special levy of 500 *paṇas* ($ 125) was raised from merchants in diamonds, horses, and elephants. Dealers in cotton goods had to pay 400 paṇas, dealers in grains and liquids 300, traders in glass and glassware 200, artisans and carpenters 100, and dealers in mud-pots, inn-keepers and small retailers 50.[2] In the fifth place, dramatists (and theater managers?) as well as prostitutes had to surrender half their annual earnings.[2] And lastly, as in Athens,[3] the government exacted extraordinary donations and gifts from temples and religious establishments.[4] The process might almost be described as a legalized looting of ecclesiastical property by the secular authorities.

Some of the war-taxes were described by Kautilya euphemistically as *praṇaya* or "love"-gifts.[5] The Empire used to pose as "beggar" and appeal to the "patriotism" of the citizens for "voluntary" subscriptions. And in order that the "modernism" of Maurya finance may be appreciated still further it has to be pointed out that titles of honor were conferred by the government on the patriotic contributors. Subscribers to the "liberty fund" were honored, for instance, with a rank in the court, an umbrella, or a turban or some ornaments in return for their gold.[6] Moreover, the government took special steps to advertise and give publicity to the donations of the patriots in order to create a spirit of rivalry among the rich in the acts of self-sacrifice.

It was not with an alleged Machiavellian wickedness but in quite the scientific methods of "high finance" that Kautilya approached the problem of financing a war or meeting an emergency. The financial experts of the Maurya civil service knew how to cause the rich to "vomit" (*vamana*) their accumulated wealth or otherwise deplete and

---

[1] See details, *Ibid*, p. 115; also *Ind. Ant.* 1909, pp. 260, 261; *Artha*, V, ii.

[2] See details, *Ibid*, p. 116. *Vide* Gupta's "Courtesanship in Buddhist India" in the *Hindustan Review*, Aug. 1919.

[3] Schömann, p. 454.

[4] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 117.

[5] *Ibid*, pp. 115, 117; *Cf.* "benevolences" in British fiscal history, Dowell, Vol. I, pp. 155—157, 202, 203, 243, etc.

[6] *Ibid*, 1909, p. 261; *Artha*, V, ii.

drain (*karṣaṇa*) of their property.[1] Exploitation of "gold-lords" by the state was a process of expropriation that the *Artha-śâstra* does not hesitate to pronounce as the objective of the "ways and means" committee. Like the "liturgies" and *eisphora* of the Athenian city state[2] high imposts of various denominations were therefore borne by people of large incomes in Maurya India. And the impact of war or emergency finance must have tended to make the demands of the government even in normal times "progressive" in spirit, if not mathematically so.

d) *Fines.*

We shall now consider the "non-tax" revenues of the Maurya Empire. These were principally of two classes: one derived from the penal (*danda*-inflicting) power of the state, the other from the economic activities of the government. The Empire as *danda-dhara* i. e. "sanction"-exercising organization must have realized an enormous amount from fines, as these were the usual penalties inflicted by the courts of justice. The list of "crimes" was lengthy. The arms of law could reach almost any individual. Dealers in foreign goods had as many chances of transgressing the *śâsanas* (commands of the state) as the butchers in municipal areas. The number of offenses against sanitary laws[3] was as large as that against the prescribed hours and places of fording rivers.[4] Persons committing nuisance on roads and other specified spots were fined one *paṇa* (twenty five cents). Travellers without passports (bearing government stamps) had to pay a fine of 12 *paṇas*.[5] Bearers of false or forged passes were fined 1,000 *paṇas*. No foreigners were admitted into the country without permit. Delinquents had to pay a fine of 3000 *paṇas*, the highest fine[6] sanctioned in Maurya legislation. This was the fine also meted out to those who tried to smuggle foreign goods in evasion of customs duties.[7] Negligence in having the day's government stamp fixed on weights and scales was fined $27^1/_4$ *paṇas*.[8] A fine of 600 *paṇas* was inflicted on the merchant who having imported foreign salt failed

---

[1] *Artha*, IV, iii.

[2] *Enc. Brit.* (Finance).

[3] See the list of fines in municipal areas in the *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 51, 52, also in regard to the construction of buildings, pp. 58, 59. Note the fines realized from slaughter-houses, p. 55.

[4] See the ferry regulations, *Ibid*, p. 111.

[5] *Vide* the passport regulations in regard to travellers, *Ibid*, p. 54, and in regard to traffic in goods, pp. 47, 48.

[6] *Ibid*, pp. 51, 52.

[7] *Ibid*, pp. 48—50.

[8] *Ibid*, p. 51.

to compensate the government for the loss it might incur in not finding customers for its own salt.[1]

e) *Economic Earnings.*

The second head of non-tax revenue comprises the items of income that the Empire derived from its economic enterprises. Shipping lines[2] with fleets of boats for passengers and goods were operated by the state. The traffic by sea was large enough to render the undertaking a lucrative proposition. The Empire carried on another business under the supervision of the naval department. State boats were let out on hire by the *nâvadhyakṣa* or port commissioner for purposes of pearl fishery and the fishing of conch shells.[2] The ferry charges on rivers must also be considered in connection with the government's commercial ventures. These were regulated according to the size of rivers and the amount of freight carried.[3] Any load of commodities whether for sale or not was charged four *mâṣâs* (about six cents). One *mâṣâ* was paid by a traveller with a minor quadruped carrying some load. Two *mâṣâs* were demanded for a load carried on the head or on the shoulders, a cow or a horse. Double was the rate for transporting a camel or a buffalo. The ferry charge for a small cart was five *mâṣâs*, for one of medium size drawn by bulls six *mâṣâs*, and for a big cart seven *mâṣâs*. The ferry dues on large rivers were twice the respective rates.

But by far more important than these quasi-political commercial undertakings as sources of "sinews of war" or "roots of the army" were the industries owned and run or controlled by the government. Altogether three state-monopolies are mentioned in the Kautilyan schedule. The first monopoly was oil. The oil seeds were all brought to the government granary and pressed and made into oil by the state mills.[4] The administration of tobacco monopoly in France since the time of Colbert (1674) furnishes a modern analogue. The next monopoly was salt, as we have mentioned above. In order to "protect" this government industry the Empire legislated that purchasers of foreign salts must have to pay compensation to cover the loss sustained by the state.[5] Evidently foreign salt was not excluded altogether from the territory. There was, besides, the system of granting license by which private

---

[1] *Ibid*, p. 54.

[2] *Ind. Ship.* pp. 103, 106. Note *en passant* the regulations to protect passengers on ships operated by private companies, *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 113.

[3] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 53, 111, 112. Sixteen *mâṣâs* make one *paṇa*.

[4] *Ibid*, p. 55.

[5] *Ibid*, p. 54.

capitalists could manufacture and sell the commodity. In addition to the economic "profits" from the salt industry the government thus came to realize a large revenue from the customs, excise, and licenses.

The realization of salt *gabelle* was threefold. First, the importing merchant had to pay the regular $16^2/_3$ per cent as customs plus the 5 per cent on the remainder as excise. Secondly, the indigenous manufacturer purchased license from the government on the same terms. There was thus no economic discrimination against foreign salt. The effects of a countervailing excise duty were brought in operation, indicating the "fiscal" character of the tariff. And thirdly, it appears that the government charged $13^1/_8$ per cent as premium on the money that it received as price for the salt collected from the importer and the home manufacturer.[1]

The most important monopoly of the Maurya Empire was the mines and minerals. Indeed the manufacture of salt was scheduled in the *Artha-śâstra* under the category of mining. As defined by Kautilya mining was a comprehensive term, including as in mediaeval British law "wreck of the sea and royal fish".[2] There were therefore two branches of mining under the Mauryas: (1) ocean mining, i. e. pearl fishery, the fishing of conch shells and corals, and manufacture of salt, and (2) land mining.[3] The revenues from land mining were described as those accruing from gold mines, silver mines, mines of rubies, and metals such as iron, copper, etc.[4]

In ancient and mediaeval legislation or custom mines were "public" everywhere.[5] The silver mines at Laurium were owned by Athens. Mines were state property under the Roman Empire. Down to 1688 all English mines belonged to the crown. In 1568 the Exchequer Chamber stated the theory that the "king shall have the whole of the base metal."[6] Under the Mauryas also both land and ocean mines as well as the essaying of ores, coining, and commerce in minerals were *jura regalia*, or crown rights *sui generis*. But the mines were not worked by the government except when the operations needed small outlay. Modern advocates of modified *laissez faire* i. e. partial public ownership may quote the Maurya precedent as an instance of the "individualistic minimum" of state intervention in industry. As a rule, the Empire

---

[1] *Ibid*, p. 53.

[2] Palgrave, Vol. II, p. 765.

[3] Law's *Hind. Pol.*, pp. 5—10.

[4] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 47.

[5] For a general discussion on "state mines" see Bastable's *Public Finance*, pp. 174—176.

[6] Palgrave, *loc. cit.*

let out the mines on royalty basis to private enterprise. The royalty included nine distinct items.[1] As usual, the rates were high. The rental for the Laurium mines was only $4^1/_6$ per cent.[2] The French mines yielded 10 per cent.[3] The English rate on copper was $12^1/_2$ per cent to the state plus $11^1/_9$ per cent to the landlord.[4] But the Mauryas demanded $16^2/_3$ to 20 per cent as *vibhâga*, i. e. the government's "share" in the yield. In addition the capitalists had to pay $13^1/_8$ per cent plus 5 per cent as sundry charges.[5]

There may have been some other industries similarly undertaken or let out on license with a view to augmenting the public income. The shipbuilding and munitions industries were of course state monopolies, as has been mentioned above. But obviously they are to be considered not so much from the standpoint of finance as of national defense.

f) *Miscellaneous Collections.*

Several miscellaneous taxes remain to be discussed as minor sources of income. The port duties[6] realized by the *nâvadhyakṣa* were distinct from both customs and excise. Villages on sea shores and on the banks of rivers and lakes were assessed at certain rates. The fishing license demanded by the state was one-sixth or $16^2/_3$ per cent of the actual haul. Merchants had to pay the customary tax of port towns. Another group of minor collections came from currency. A premium of $13^1/_8$ per cent was regularly charged on coins of private or foreign mintage.[7] Besides, the same amount was realized by the government on every occasion that any body had to pay fine in cash.[8] Lastly, we have to mention the escheats. Houses, fields, gardens, tanks and temples lapsed to the state, as we have seen, if the proprietors neglected to exercise their rights of ownership for five years.[9] Similarly the Empire was the heir of prostitutes' property in the absence of daughters.[10]

No conceivable resource of the people appears thus to have been left untapped by the Maurya Empire. The all-reaching tentacles of Hindu finance lie on the surface. And if, as Adam Smith remarks, there

[1] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 113.
[2] Schömann, p. 448.
[3] Brissaud, p. 487.
[4] Palgrave, *loc. cit.*
[5] *Ind. Ant. loc. cit.* Islamic law has 20 per cent, cf. Aghnides, 528.
[6] *Ind. Ship.* p. 106.
[7] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 53.
[8] *Ibid*, p. 54.
[9] *Ibid*, p. 9; cf. Manu, VIII, 30.
[10] *Ibid*, p. 57.

be nothing in which governments are so prone to learn of one another as in the matter of new taxes, the first and the last empires of pre-Moslem India can still give points to the latest specialists in public finance. For, the methods and principles of statesmen from Kautilya to Kulottûnga were eminently matter-of-fact and realistic. Indeed, with the exception of stamp duties, national debt, postal receipts and a few others characteristically modern, the assets schedule of the first class powers of today can hardly exhibit any taxes and non-tax revenues in addition to what the Hindu *sumantra* (finance minister) and his board of experts hit upon pragmatically in the third and fourth centuries B. C. in order to "cover" the appropriations on the governmental machinery of what would hardly fall short of the largest and most extensive of all empires in the world's history.[1]

5. *The Ability to Pay.*

A study of the finances provokes naturally the correlated investigation into the general economic condition of the empire. But as yet it is hardly allowable to attempt a wide solution as to the "ability" of the people to meet the diverse demands of the government. In the first place, an enormous rise in prices may be postulated because of the high rates of customs and excise. This was sure to be felt by the entire community as consumers. In the second place, the normal land tax of 40 to 57 per cent, though it may not have shorn the landowning or agricultural classes to the skin, was certainly not a moderate levy. In the third place, the traders and the intellectual middle classes could not get scot-free from the imperial demand as the property tax was mercilessly applied to them especially in emergencies. And in the fourth place, the moneyed aristocracy, bankers, gilds and other wealthy groups had to "vomit" out their gold at the call of the empire.

Economically speaking, then, we have no grounds for believing that there was any class-discrimination of the type to which France, for instance, was a victim during the *ancien régime*. The Mauryas maintained no privileged class on anything like an appreciable scale. Nor would the government demands, though heavy, appear to have been oppressive

[1] See the map of the Maurya Empire in the third century B. C. facing p. 162 of Smith's *Early Hist.* Compare the area with that of any of the European Empires in Freeman's *Hist. Geo.* (with Atlas), or specifically with that of the Roman Empire at its greatest extent (third century A. C.) in the *Atlas of Ancient and Classical Geography*. Note, in comparison, that India is all Europe *minus* the Russia of the Czars, and that Maurya India, although it excluded the southern fringe of the peninsula in a condition of semi-dependent autonomy, included the whole of Afghanistan and Baluchistan. *Vide supra*, p. 26.

or likely to sap the economic foundations of the society. On the contrary, there were certain distinctive services by which the state sought to develop the "staying power" and taxable capacity of the *prakriti*. We have spoken above of the socialistic trend of Hindu states as *dharma-staaten*, in so far as the sphere of their activity was coextensive with the range of human interests. It is necessary now to add that the same tendency is noticeable in two other directions.

First, the Maurya Empire owned several industries and controlled the production of wealth in certain lines. Government supervision of some sort or other brought the economic functions of the people within the compass of partial "public ownership." The consequent abolition of *entrepreneurs* or middlemen in a few channels of business was a positive advantage to the community. Secondly, the Empire sought to regulate by legislation the more important branch of a nation's economic life, viz. distribution and exchange, i. e. value. The maximum rate of interest was determined by the government.[1] The market was protected from the ravages of "profiteers". Reasonable prices and fair profits were fixed by official experts after calculating the legitimate expenses of production including the cost of marketing.[2] The government scheduled likewise the rates of wages and fees for laundrymen, painters, dramatists, singers, and artists.[3]

Such an imperial intervention in the *prakṛiti*'s economic activity, or what is the same thing, such "state socialism" under "enlightened despots", must have been appreciated at least by the common laborer. The rate of wages in Maurya India was 5 *paṇas* a month or 15 dollars a year.[4] It is interesting to observe that in Chola India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries a temple janitor earned $8^1/_2$ Rupees per month, i. e. $ 30 a year.[5] These rates, howsoever low by the present day American standard, were much above the Ricardian "iron law of wages" when compared with the current prices and the purchasing power of money during the two periods.[6]

And as for the salaries paid by the government they were liberal enough to satisfy the officers' appetite. They were indeed, humanly

---

[1] The rate was 15 per cent per year (Law's *Hind. Pol.* pp. 171—177). The usual rate at Athens was 12 to 18 per cent (Schömann, p. 435).

[2] See details in the *Ind. Ant.* 1905, pp. 55—57.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 59.

[4] *Ibid*, p. 53.

[5] Aiyangar, p. 181.

[6] *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 53. One Rupee in Maurya India bought 40 *sers* (Madras) of rice. In British India one Rupee today buys not more than 8 *sers*. *Cf.* Aiyangar, p. 183.

speaking, calculated to prevent the desire for "squeeze".[1] The common soldier of the Maurya Empire received 500 *paṇas* ($ 125) per year. The highest salary in the third and fourth centuries B. C. e. g. that for the generalissimo was 48,000 *paṇas* ($12,000) a year. The *samâhartâ* (collector-general) was paid at half this rate. The earning of a middle class man e. g. of an accountant in southern India under the Cholas was $16^2/_3$ Rupees per month, i. e. 60 dollars a year.[2] Payments were either in kind or in money. The Cholas used to pay even handicraftsmen often in land for customary work. Under the Mauryas payment in gold might be commuted for that in kind at fixed rates.[3]

We are not concerned here with "index numbers" or the statistics of wages and prices nor with the manner in which the tariff, if it was really protective to some extent, may have affected the course of investments, commerce and industries. The stray figures for the third and fourth centuries B..C. and the eleventh and twelfth centuries may be taken for what they are worth. Only, it is necessary to bear in mind that in British India today the average *per capita* income is 20 Rupees or $6^2/_3$ dollars *per annum*. On the whole, then, it may reasonably be concluded that the financial burden[4] of *pax sârva-bhaumica*, howsoever heavy it might be whether absolutely or relatively, was easily borne by a contented peasantry, and working class, a prosperous industrial and commercial aristocracy, and last but not least, a well-paid civil service and army, especially in view of the fact that under Chandragupta and Asoka the people of India had the conscious satisfaction of being citizens of the first and greatest power of the world.

---

[1] *Vide* the list of salaries in the *Artha*, V, iii. (*Ind. Ant.* 1909, pp. 263, 264).

[2] Aiyangar, p. 181.

[3] *Ind. Ant.* 1909, p. 264. For 5 *paṇas* one obtained 165 *sers* (Madras). *Ind. Ant.* 1905, p. 53.

[4] For a Hindu theory of state housekeeping see *Pos. Back.* Vol. II, pp. 111—126.

Chapter VI.

Gaṇas or Republics of the Hindus

—(*c.* B. C. 600—A. C. 350).

The aspects of the Hindu constitution described thus far open up the norm in the *Realpolitik* of monarchical India. The rights of the people and their democratic achievements under Hindu royalties were generically on a par with those of the nations ruled by *le grand monarque* and such "enlightened despots" as Peter, Frederick and Joseph. The political psychology that lay behind the Hindu institutions was not different in any way from that of the French under the Bourbons or of the Germans until the War of the Liberation.

India's institutional experience was not, however, confined to the monarchical sphere. The Hindu constitution grew along republican or non-monarchical lines also.[1] Let us exclude from our present consideration the patriarchal-democratic "crowned republics" of Vedic India,[2] the *kula-samghas* (family-soviets or communal republics) referred to in the *Artha-śâstra*[3] as "invincible", or the *gaṇas*, described in the *Mahâbhârata*[4] as nationalities constituted on the principle of "equality". Epigraphy and numismatics are now in a position to safely declare that there were at least three periods in the early history of India during which Hindus developed the *gaṇa* or *samgha* polity of the Hellenic and pre-Imperial Roman type.

---

[1] *Vide* Law's "Forms and Types of Hindu Polity" in the *Mod. Rev.* for Sept. 1917; Jayaswal's "Introduction to Hindu Polity" in the same journal, May-July, 1913, and "Republics in the Mahâbhârata" in the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 1915, pp. 173—178; Mookerji's *Fundamental Unity*, 74—75, and *Local*, 31, 215; Banerjea, 42—46; Majundar, pp. 87—122. The attention of scholars was first drawn to this subject by Rhys Davids in his *Buddhist India*, Ch. II, cf. Lal's "Republican Tradition etc." in the *Mod. Rev.* (January 1920); *Pos. Back*, Vol. II, 46—51.

[2] *A. P. S. R.* Nov. 1918, pp. 592—595; Basu's *Indo-Aryan Polity*.

[3] I, 35.

[4] *Śânti-parva*, Ch. CVII, 23—24, 30—32.

Section 1.

Republicanism in the Occident.

But before proceeding to describe the republics of the Orient, it is desirable to have an estimate of the political mentality of republican peoples in the Occident. For, Eur-American scholars are likely to attribute the least undesirable incidents in the East to the alleged inherent defects of the so-called Oriental character. But they need only remember that the course of republic has not run smooth even in Occidental France.

France was declared a republic in 1792. Napoleon, the first servant of the people, became emperor in 1804. His empire lasted till the occupation of Paris by the allies in 1814. The Bourbons were then restored to the French throne, and reigned till 1830. Thus, for the first twelve years of this period there was a republic (if the regime under Napoleon as First Consul after the overthrow of the Directory in 1799 should still be called republican), and for the next twenty five years there was the *ancien régime.*

The July revolution of 1830 dethroned the Bourbon Charles X, and set up in the Duke of Orleans a "citizen king". Louis Philippe did not, however, play the president of a republic, as had been expected. In reality he extented for another eighteen years the one-man-rule of the preceding Restoration. In 1848 he was forced to abdicate, and the second French republic was established. This lasted for four years.

In November 1862 Louis Napoleon, the president of the second republic, "managed" to have himself elected emperor. The second Napoleonic Empire went on till 1870. It was the defeat and capture of Napoleon at Sedan by the Prussians that led to his dethronement and the establishment of the third republic by the infuriated mob.

The form of government at home often depends on the success or failure of a foreign policy. Under our very eyes William II's miserable failure in the attempt to wrench "world-dominion" from Great Britain's hands has led not only to a phenomenal democratization of the German constitution but to the subversion of monarchy itself. During the middle of the fifth century B. C. the Confederacy of Delos under the leadership of Athens, which had been at first organized against Persian aggressions, transformed itself into an Athenian empire; and Pericles, the first citizen of Athens, worked his way up to a virtual despot. But the demos of this the most perfect of ancient European democracies tamely submitted to Periclean autocracy because it was triumphant abroad and spread the reputation of Athens far and wide. Similarly the French advocates of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" cast their democratic

principles to the winds while Napoleon Bonaparte was laying out suburbs of Paris and French "spheres of influence" in every country of Europe. Their cry then was *Veillons au salut de l'empire.* And if Napoleon III could defeat the Prussians at Sedan, it may be surmised not without reason that France would have continued till today to be a monarchy, no matter whether constitutional or despotic.

However, it is the third republic that has been existing in France since 1870. But royalists have not yet disappeared from the society. Until 1875 the republic had to pass through great storm and stress. The Bourbonists, the Napoleonists, and the Orleanists were actively engaged in anti-republican agitation. Since then indeed the career of the republic has been rather peaceful. But this is chiefly because the three royal dynasties have become extinct. The last Napoleon died in 1879, the last Bourbon in 1883, and the Orleanist candidate in 1894. The agitators have not found other suitable candidates for the crown. But even today in the Chamber of Deputies there are parties which call themselves "monarchists" and "Bonapartists". A section of journalism in France has always been pro-monarchic (cf. *L'Action Française* of Paris), and strangely enough, the constitution of 1875 does not definitely provide for the perpetuation of the republican form of government.

The political tendencies of the French people under the Third Republic are anything but democratic. The French are probably the most high-handed of all the colonial powers in Asia and Africa. This republic was not less despotic than were the monarchical nations in the treatment of the late Manchu-Chinese empire. Nor is it more considerate to the Chinese republic. The Lao-hsikai (Tientsien) affair of 1916 is a recent incident. And in spite of the solemn conferences and mutual assurances of the Powers at Madrid (1880) and Algeciras (1906) in regard to the integrity and independence of Morocco, France systematically pursued an aggressive policy in that Sultanate by which finally Germany was exasperated to bring about the Agadir crisis of 1911. Besides, "the tyranny exercised by the army, the alleged influence wielded over the army by the clergy, the fact that military organization is used as a means of propaganda for royalism, the vicious opposition on the part of the majority of the press to all truly liberal ideas and motives of action, the unscrupulous distortion by the same press of all facts opposed to its own ideas of patriotism, all these may be regarded as portents and symptoms of social retrogression".[1]

---

[1] Reinsch's *World Politics*, p. 73. In regard to the earlier phases of American *svа-râj* see the chapter on "Sham Democracy" in Walter Weyl's *New Democracy*.