



**ADMINISTRATIVE THINKERS**

THE PEOPLE'S  
UNIVERSITY

**School of Social Sciences**  
**Indira Gandhi National Open University**

# EXPERT COMMITTEE

Prof. C.V. Raghavulu  
Former Vice-Chancellor of Nagarjuna  
University, Guntur (A.P.)

Prof. Ramesh K. Arora  
Former Professor of Public  
Administration  
Rajasthan University, Jaipur

Prof. O.P. Minocha  
Former Professor of Public  
Administration  
Indian Institute of Public  
Administration, New Delhi

Prof. Arvind K. Sharma  
Former Professor of Public  
Administration  
Indian Institute of Public  
Administration, New Delhi

Prof. R.K. Sapru  
Former Professor Public Administration  
Panjab University, Chandigarh

Prof. Sahib Singh Bhayana  
Former Professor Public Administration  
Panjab University, Chandigarh

Prof. B. B. Goel,  
Former Professor of Public  
Administration  
Panjab University, Chandigarh

Prof. Ravinder Kaur  
Department of Public Administration  
Osmania University, Hyderabad

Prof. C.Venkataiah  
Dr.B.R. Ambedkar Open University  
Hyderabad

Prof. G. Palanithurai  
Department of Political Science and  
Development Administration,  
Gandhigram Rural University  
Gandhigram

Prof. Ramanjit Kaur Johal  
University School of Open Learning  
Panjab University, Chandigarh

Prof. Rajbans Singh Gill  
Department of Public Administration  
Punjabi University, Patiala

Prof. Manjusha Sharma  
Department of Public Administration  
Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

Prof. Lalneihzovi  
Department of Public Administration  
Mizoram Central University

Prof. Neelima Deshmukh  
Former Professor of Public  
Administration, Rashtrasant Tukadoji  
Maharaj Nagpur University

Prof. Rajvir Sharma  
Maharaja Agrasen Institute of  
Management Studies, Delhi

Prof. Sanjeev Kumar Mahajan  
Department of Public Administration  
Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla

Prof. Manoj Dixit  
Deptt. of Public Administration  
Lucknow University  
Lucknow

Prof. Sudha Mohan  
Department of Civics  
and Politics  
University of Mumbai  
Mumbai

## IGNOU Faculty

Prof. Pardeep Sahni  
Prof. E. Vayunandan  
Prof. Uma Medury  
Prof. Alka Dhameja  
Prof. Dolly Mathew  
Prof. Durgesh Nandini

## Consultants

Dr. Sandhya Chopra  
Dr. A. Senthamizh Kanal

## CBCS (Programme Coordinators)

Prof. Dolly Mathew  
Prof. Durgesh Nandini

**Course Coordinator : Prof. Alka Dhameja, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, New Delhi**

**Course Editor (Content, Format and Language): Prof. Alka Dhameja, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, New Delhi**

## COURSE PREPARATION TEAM

	Block	Unit Writer
<b>Block 1</b>	<b>Indian Thinkers</b>	
Unit 1	Kautilya	Dr. Rajvir Sharma Former Senior Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 2	Mahatma Gandhi	Dr. Vijay Srivastava Assistant Professor, Mittal School of Business Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab.
<b>Block 2</b>	<b>Classical Thinkers</b>	
Unit 3	Woodrow Wilson	Dr. Sanghamitra Nath Assistant Professor, Bajkul Milani Mahavidyalaya Vidyasagar University, West Bengal
Unit 4	Fredrick W. Taylor	Dr. Vaishali Narula Assistant Professor, Kamla Nehru College University of Delhi, New Delhi
Unit 5	Henri Fayol	Dr. Vaishali Narula Assistant Professor, Kamla Nehru College, University of Delhi, New Delhi
Unit 6	Max Weber	Dr. R. Anitha Former Faculty, RGNIYD, Sriperumbudur, Tamil Nadu
Unit 7	Mary Parker Follett	Dr. A. Senthamizh Kanal Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi

<b>Block 3 Behavioural and Systems Thinkers</b>		
Unit 8	Elton Mayo	Prof. Uma Medury Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 9	Chester Barnard	Ms. Daisy Sharma Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan
Unit 10	Herbert A.Simon	Dr. A. Senthamizh Kanal Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
<b>Block 4 Socio-Psychological Thinkers</b>		
Unit 11	Abraham Maslow	Dr. Sandhya Chopra Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 12	Rensis Likert	Dr. R. Anitha Former Faculty, RGNIYD, Sriperumbudur, Tamil Nadu
Unit 13	Fredrick Herzberg	Prof. Alka Dhameja Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 14	Chris Argyris	Dr. B. Senthil Nathan HoD, Department of Public Administration, Sri Krishna College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu
<b>Block 5 Management and Public Policy Thinkers</b>		
Unit 15	Dwight Waldo	Dr. Sanghamitra Nath Assistant Professor, Bajkul Milani Mahavidyalaya Vidyasagar University, West Bengal
Unit 16	Peter Drucker	Dr. Sandhya Chopra Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 17	Yehezkel Dror	Ms. Daisy Sharma Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan

## PRINT PRODUCTION

Mr. Tilak Raj  
Assistant Registrar (Pub.)  
MPDD

Smt. Sumathy Nair  
Section Officer (Pub.)  
MPDD

Mr. Suresh Kumar  
JAT/CO, SOSS

February, 2020

© Indira Gandhi National Open University, 2020

ISBN: 978-93-89969-08-5

*All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Indira Gandhi National Open University.*

*Further information on Indira Gandhi National Open University courses may be obtained from the University's office at Maidan Garhi, New Delhi-110 068 or visit University's Website <http://www.ignou.ac.in>.*

Cover Design by Ms Aravinder Chawla (Graphics Designer, New Delhi)

Printed and published on behalf of the Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi by Director, School of Social Sciences.

Lasertypesetted at Graphic Printers, Mayur Vihar, Phase-I, Delhi-110091.

Printed at: P Square Solutions, H-25, Site-B, Industrial Area, Mathura - 281 005





# Course Contents

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	7
<hr/>	
<b>BLOCK 1 INDIAN THINKERS</b>	
<hr/>	
Unit 1 Kautilya	11
Unit 2 Mahatma Gandhi	28
<hr/>	
<b>BLOCK 2 CLASSICAL THINKERS</b>	
<hr/>	
Unit 3 Woodrow Wilson	43
Unit 4 Frederick W. Taylor	52
Unit 5 Henri Fayol	61
Unit 6 Max Weber	70
Unit 7 Mary Parker Follett	85
<hr/>	
<b>BLOCK 3 BEHAVIOURAL AND SYSTEMS THINKERS</b>	
<hr/>	
Unit 8 Elton Mayo	97
Unit 9 Chester Barnard	106
Unit 10 Herbert A. Simon	116
<hr/>	
<b>BLOCK 4 SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL THINKERS</b>	
<hr/>	
Unit 11 Abraham Maslow	131
Unit 12 Rensis Likert	139
Unit 13 Frederick Herzberg	156
Unit 14 Chris Argyris	167
<hr/>	
<b>BLOCK 5 MANAGEMENT AND PUBLIC POLICY THINKERS</b>	
<hr/>	
Unit 15 Dwight Waldo	181
Unit 16 Peter Drucker	189
Unit 17 Yehezkel Dror	200
<hr/>	
<b>Suggested Readings</b>	214
<hr/>	



---

# COURSE INTRODUCTION

---

The Course on **Administrative Thinkers** familiarises you with all the viewpoints of thinkers and administrators on the working of organisations, as well as their impact on workers and environment. It analyses the perspectives of Early Thinkers and Philosophers like Kautilya, Mahatma Gandhi and Woodrow Wilson before discussing the Classical, Behavioural, Systems, Socio-psychological, Policy and Management thinkers. Under the **Indian Thinkers**, that is Block 1, the discussion on administrative system of 'Arthashastra' by Kautilya is the highlight of the Course, as very few Courses on Administrative Theory bring forth the views of Kautilya in such detail. Kautilya visualised the importance of the values and attitudes, merits and qualities of the people engaged in the organisational tasks. His focus on the principles of probity, integrity and honesty holds relevance even today. Gandhi's Theories of Swaraj and Trusteeship are also discussed in Unit 2 of Block 1. Experiments such as Panchayati Raj and Vinoba Bhave's Bhoodan Movement that empirically tested Gandhi's ideologies are described.

Block 2 on **Classical Thinkers** has five units. It explains the relevance of Wilson's Politics-administration Dichotomy in Unit 3. The unit lays focus on Wilson's views of administrative questions being different from political questions, and the need for curbing the tendencies of politicisation of public administration and bureaucratisation of politics. Unit 4 in the Block discusses Taylor's methodology of Time and Motion Study, Shop Floor Management, Differential Piece Rate System, Soldiering, Functional Foremanship, and Mental Revolution in standardising the working of organisations. Unit 5 is on Henri Fayol, which examines his Theory that is largely based on the principle of Unity of Command, Rational Design and managerial empowerment. The Unit describes the *fourteen* principles of Fayol, which are meant to be used in planning and developing organisational structures and processes.

Unit 6 titled 'Max Weber' explains the bureaucratic model of Weber. By categorising authority into traditional, charismatic and legal-rational, Weber formulated certain characteristic features of bureaucracy such as formalised, rules and regulations, which till date hold relevance. Unit 7 in Block 2 is on 'Mary Parker Follet'. It introduces you to some of the major contributions made by Mary Parker Follet in the field of organisation and management. In particular, her concepts of Conflict Resolution, Orders, Power, Authority and Control, Planning and Coordination, and Leadership are dealt with.

Unit 8 on 'Elton Mayo' in Block 3, which is titled **Behavioural and Systems Thinkers** brings forth the outcome of Mayo's studies that mark the emergence of an important management style contributing to industrial productivity. The Unit deals with the features of interpersonal skills and humanistic approach to organisations by elucidating his Hawthorne Experiments of Great Illumination, Relay Assembly, Interviewing Programme and Bank Wiring. 'Chester Barnard' is Unit 9 of the Block. Chester Barnard has made phenomenal contribution towards recognising organisation as a social system and using Systems Approach in analysing it. The Unit explains Barnard's concepts of Fiction of Authority, Zone of Indifference, Cooperation and Contribution-Satisfaction Equilibrium. Unit 10 is on 'Herbert A. Simon', who is considered as the major proponent of Behavioural Approach. The Unit explains Simon's views on 'Administrative Behaviour', 'Bounded Rationality', 'Satisficing Behaviour', 'Role of Intelligence, Design and Choice Activities'.

Block 4 is on **Socio-psychological Thinkers**. It examines the contributions of Abraham Maslow, Rensis Likert, Fredrick Herzberg and Chris Argyris. These theorists have made a significant impact on the way Motivation is looked at in the organisations. In

Unit 11, Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory is examined. His progression of needs from physiological, social, security, esteem to self-actualisation is analysed. 'Rensis Likert' is Unit 12. It explains the role of organisational actors, their interactions with each other and their influence on overall workplace practices. Likert's concepts of Likert Scale and System 5 are examined in this Unit. 'Fredrick Herzberg' is Unit 13. It deals with the importance that Herzberg attached to individuals' preferences and desires in an organisation. The Unit describes his Two-Factor Theory of 'Hygiene' and 'Motivators', which improvised on the already available basket of motivators linked with human needs at different individual and organisational levels. Unit 14 is titled 'Chris Argyris'. This Unit examines Argyris' concepts of Immaturity-Maturity, Improving Interpersonal Competence, Alternative Organisational Structures, T-Group and Organisational Learning.

Block 5 on **Management and Public Policy Thinkers** brings to light the developments in the areas of New Public Administration, Management by Objectives, Learning Organisations and Policy Sciences. Unit 15 of the Block brings forth Waldo's call for developing a theory of development administration, his focus on the conflict between bureaucracy and democracy, and value-laden public administration that is change-oriented, goal-oriented and ethical bear resonance even today. Unit 16 examines Peter Drucker's writings that have predicted many of the major developments of the late twentieth century, including privatisation and decentralisation, the decisive importance of marketing; and the emergence of the Information Society. His concepts of Management by Objectives, S.M.A.R.T Management, Restructuring Government, Delegation are elucidated. Unit 17 is the last Unit of the Block that deals with Yehezkel Dror's adoption of best policy by a judicious evaluation of goals, values, alternatives, costs, benefits based on maximum use of available information and scientific technology. Dror's use of Policy Analysis, Behavioural Science and Systems Approach and his multi-disciplinary approach to Policy Sciences is also discussed.

THE PEOPLE'S  
UNIVERSITY



**BLOCK 1**

**INDIAN THINKERS**

Pignou  
THE PEOPLE'S  
UNIVERSITY



---

# UNIT 1 KAUTILYA\*

---

## Structure

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 About Kautilya and Arthashastra
- 1.3 Principles of Public Administration
- 1.4 Organisation and Structure of Administrative Machinery
- 1.5 Personnel Administration
- 1.6 Financial Administration
- 1.7 Conclusion
- 1.8 Glossary
- 1.9 References
- 1.10 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

---

## 1.0 OBJECTIVES

---

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Explain Kautilya's ideas on the principles of administration;
- Examine the structure and pattern of government machinery in Kautilya's time;
- Discuss the views of Kautilya on the aspects of financial and personnel administration; and
- Bring out the relevance of Kautilya to the present day study of public administration.

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Arthashastra is the oldest treatise on the composite governmental affairs. The Book has been described as a masterpiece, which covers a wide range of topics like Statecraft and the issues of public administration encompassing politics, economics, and administration. The principles of governance and Statecraft evolved and established in Arthashastra were followed by various rulers of India like Ashoka and Shivaji. The greatness of Kautilya, as has been observed by many scholars, is that he made the principles contained in his Arthashastra so applicable that even today they find pertinence and utility. This Unit will focus on Kautilya's key principles of administration and examine their relevance in the contemporary context.

---

## 1.2 ABOUT KAUTILYA AND ARTHASHASTRA

---

Kautilya also known as Chanakya as well as Vishnugupta, has attracted the attention of a number of scholars from political science, economics, management, public administration, psychology, defense studies and strategic sciences. He is known for his seminal work called the *Arthashastra*. He had written this great thesis at a time when Monarchy was the form of government and Kings were expected not only to defend

---

\* Contributed by Dr. Rajvir Sharma, Former Senior Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi.

their territories, but also pursue the expansion of the boundaries by way of waging wars and winning wars. In the process of his analyses of the State and its machinery, Kautilya focused on several dimensions of running a State/ government. He favoured the idea of a strong State, which could be possible only if the ruler or the King, was strong. For this to happen, he prescribed a number of prerequisites – physical, social, political, cultural, moral and administrative.

But before discussing *Arthashastra* in detail, it would be in order to at least know about some of the debates and controversies related to Kautilya. There are *two* main contentions about him and his work. One relates to the age and the other to the authorship. To put it differently, the debate refers to the originality of the work and whether it reflected the real system of government and administration of the time it was assigned to. Many historians have varied opinions about whether *Arthashastra* was actually written by Kautilya or he merely compiled the Book. However, the purview of this Unit does not allow us to go into this debate over here. The main focus of this Unit is to majorly familiarise you with what *Arthashastra* stood for. As far as the composition of the *Arthashastra* is concerned, it contains nearly 6000 *sutras* that are divided into 15 Books, 150 Chapters and 180 Sections. If one attempts a serialisation of the 15 Books, it can be put in the following order:

- Book 1 is on the fundamentals of governance and management, while economics forms part of Book 2 followed by Books 4 and 5 on law and Books 6, 7 and 8 deal with the subject of foreign policy.
- Defence, war and warfare form part of discussion in Books 9-14 and Book 15 is on the methodology and devices used in writing the Book.

As stated earlier, there are varying opinions regarding the originality of the Book, i.e., whether Kautilya was the first to write the Book. Though a common agreement still eludes, it can be concluded that Kautilya never claimed that no one had written on the subject earlier to him. Kautilya himself refers to a number of other writers including *Bhardwaj*, *Visalaksa Parasara*, *Manu* and *Kaunapadanta*, but it does not mean that he did not make any original contribution to the field of governance, management and Statecraft. We can deduce that Kautilya wrote a *Magnum Opus*, by the way of *Arthashastra* and let us now discuss the principles and concepts explained by him.

---

### 1.3 PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

---

It would be pertinent to point out right in the beginning that Kautilya did not discuss any principles of administration separately in any of his Books forming part of *Arthashastra*. Therefore, the discussion relating to the principles would be confined to those that are inferred from his work. It is well-known that the classical thinkers are credited with finding the science of public administration that was based on certain universally applicable principles. For instance, Luther Gulick and Lyndal Urwick insisted that economy and efficiency could be achieved only when an organisation is guided by some prescribed or pre-determined norms and standards of functioning. There is a famous list of *fourteen* principles attached with the name of Gulick and *seven* principles with Urwick. This Unit considers some of them in some detail in order to understand the principles given by Kautilya:

- ***Division of Work***

Division of work or what is known as division of labour is one of the principles that has a bearing on the efficiency and effectiveness of an organisation. Kautilya also divides the work into several departments denoting the importance of assigning different roles



to different persons according to their specialisation and knowledge, so as to enable him to perform his task in a prudent and profitable way. The structure of governmental machinery shows that Kautilya divided the work into 34 departments and each was headed by a designated officer.

- **Hierarchy**

The administrative structure in *Arthashastra* depicts a bureaucratic type of administration that is hierarchical in character. On the apex of the organisational pyramid was the King who was the repository of all authority. The subordinate levels were manned by the officers known as *Mahamatya*, *Amatyas*, *Adhyakshas* or superintendents. However, the system of hierarchy within the subordinates has not been very clearly discussed or mentioned in the Book. For example, the superior-subordinate relationship between the *Mahamatya* and the *Senapati* or the *Ashwadhyaksha* are not established explicitly. Yet, it needs to be underscored that the promotion within the hierarchy was guided by merit and suitability for the positions.

- **Unity of Command**

All the employees of the empire were to seek orders only from one authority, the King. There was no confusion at any level of the government that the King alone had the power to issue orders to the subordinates working in any department or in any position. Whether communication of such an order was direct only or through other officer is also not established in a clear language. For instance, the question whether the king used to be in direct conversation with the head of the department of elephants or was communicating through the *Senapati* or the *Mahamatya* has not been addressed by Kautilya.

- **Centralisation**

Factually speaking, all powers – legislative, executive and judicial – were vested in the office of the King. Centralisation was indeed the organising principle of administration. However, for the purpose of smooth execution of the policies and decisions framed at the centre, the administration was also organised under close supervision of the centre at the grassroots. The empire was administratively divided into provinces, and provincial administration was divided into the district and village and municipal administration. *Pradeshtha* was the head of the provincial administration whereas *Sthanika* headed the *Sthaniya* (District) and *Nagar* (City) administration was looked after by *Nagarika* assisted by a number of *Gopas*. The rural administration was under the charge of an employee known as *Gopa*.

For Kautilya, centralisation of power and decision-making was imperative for the reason of safety, security and prosperity of the empire and for administrative loyalty to the King. Promotion of agriculture, collection and maintenance of data, promotion of manufacture and mining and building of marketplaces also led to the acceptance of the concentration of authority. Kautilya attached significant value to stability and order, social well-being and material prosperity which, in his opinion could be achieved through a centralised system of governance.

The King had to arrive at a correct decision appropriate to a situation prevailing at the lower echelons of government like the province or the district while sitting at a distance in a huge empire. This was possible through participatory rule-making by the King. Two steps were part of the process of decision making. *One*, the King was supposed to consult the officials like the council of ministers before reaching a conclusion and *two*, the King was to have inputs from below, i.e., information relating to the matter

under his consideration for disposal. This arrangement existed in order to have a realistic understanding of the issue to be decided.

- ***Authority and Accountability***

Authority and responsibility go hand in hand. That seems to be the reason why the King is not only vested with all powers of the State, he is also made responsible for the progress and happiness of the subjects. He is supposed to pursue the goal with appropriate use of authority. Kautilya believed in a system of authority and prescribed a number of punishments for a number of offences on the part of the people as well as of government servants.

The fact that the public official should be answerable to the law as well as to the institution they belong to has been emphasised by all administrative thinkers and practitioners alike. However, responsibility for an officer's work or actions is not to be seen merely in a legal framework, it has to be judged in a perspective of professional conduct and ethics including the extent to which an employee's action or behaviour promotes or hinders the values of justice, equity and morality in and among the subjects.

Keeping this aspect of accountability in mind, one finds that Kautilya attached great importance to the legal, moral and ethical dimensions of administrative role dispensation. He clearly laid down the methods and procedures of performing one's duties beginning from the king to the other heads of departments. In his view, the work performance should be judged on the basis of whether the officials employed the just process of discharging their work, while aiming at achieving the results and meeting the ends determined at the highest level.

The King and his subordinates must clearly postulate the costs and benefits of a policy before acting upon it, said Kautilya. The King must exercise the ultimate control over the officers of the State so that every one of them discharges his duties diligently, efficiently and effectively. For that to happen, he prescribes a system of spies and watchdogs. For those engaged in administration of financial matters, for example, a system of accounting and auditing was in place to subject them to close scrutiny. Accountability in administration, one further observes, was to be enforced at all levels from top to the bottom. It was the duty of the King to punish the people for violation of the orders of the State or for non-observance of the commands issued by the King. The punishment was varied from imposition of fine, removal from service or any other punitive action as the nature of offence committed by the official required.

However, it was incumbent on the King that the punishment should be just and fair, that is, it should be in proportion to the quantum and character of the offence, neither more nor less. It should neither be harsh nor mild, as a King with a mild rod is despised; the King just with the rod is honoured. It implies that the King was also not spared of his reasonability to exercise his authority judiciously without giving any space to his whims and fancies. The King was to observe the canons of *Dharma*, while discharging his role. If he failed in his duties as the guardian of right conduct or any of his actions were not in sync with the norms of *dharma*, the people had a right to question the King.

Therefore, only a just King could conquer the whole world. Book 4 on the removal of thorns provides a list of some other officials who were to be held accountable for any administrative lapses including misbehaviour, concealing offences of merchants, failure to ensure safety of travelers on roads between settlements, permitting protected spies to be trapped, injured or killed etc. Thus, one can conclude that there was adequate arrangement to enforce accountability in administration from the higher to the lower level personnel engaged in the performance of the defined and allocated roles pertaining

to their office. The Head of the department was held responsible not only for being negligent, irregular and none or low performance but also for the contravention of rules and regulations.

- ***Precedence of Organisational Interests over Individual***

One of the principles of administration finding place in the list of 14 principles enunciated by Fayol is that organisation is above the individual or to put it differently, organisational interests subsume sectarian interests too. For Kautilya, the interests of the King were to keep above every other interests. Loyalty to the King and the kingdom was the first and the last condition for anyone to enter and remain under the service of the State. King in the *Arthashastra* represents the organisation, the State and not the person. Hence, inference says that every individual is to be the upholder of the State's interests while keeping the personal interests in the background.

- ***Discipline***

This is the prerequisite for any organisation, State being no exception, to work with a sense of unity of goals if it has to be successful. *Arthashastra* attaches great importance when it refers to the need for strict observance and compliance to the orders and rules issued and enacted by the King. Any laxity on the part of any employee on that point was to invite punishment.

- ***Coordination***

The principle of coordination involves efforts to integrate the efforts of all departments and groups in order to establish harmonious and integral working of the governmental machinery. Though it is clear from the Book that this principle also is only implicit in the organisation and functions of administration, the emphasis on it is evident from the statement that chariot can be pulled only with two wheels, not one. So, it is not only the duty of the King to act as the chief coordinator, but it seems imperative for each Head of the Department or Section to command and coordinate the functioning of his subordinates.

- ***Direction***

Directing is taken as an important activity in management and administration. Directing involves a number of attributes to have effective performance from the employees. Directing is a multi-task concept that includes the matters pertaining to leadership, motivation, supervision and communication. Kautilya recognised the relevance of good and effective leadership for the smooth running of the government. Direction, among other things, involves complete engrossment of the leader in the work of the organisation and the working of the employees.

- ***Leadership***

The execution of the direction too is quite often dependent on the qualities of the leader who issues directions. This becomes evident when one notes the traits which Kautilya ascribed to a good leader. Kautilya believed in 'like King, like citizenry'. A good leader is one who keeps the interests of the people and the kingdom above personal interests. This explains vividly the relationship that should exist between a leader and his followers. Referring to the qualities of a transformational leader Kautilya says, "An ideal King is one who behaves like a sage monarch (*Rajrishi*), who is ever active in promoting the *Yogakshama* of the people and who endears himself to the people by enriching them". The word *Yogakshema*, according to Hindu belief, is a combination of *Yoga* (successful accomplishment of an objective) and *Kshema* (peaceful enjoyment of prosperity). An

effective leader brings to his subjects and to him material gain, spiritual good and pleasures (Jain and Mukherji, 2009).

- **Supervision and Control**

This principle has been a part of the theory of administration developed by many Classical thinkers. Kautilya was not oblivious of the importance of supervision and control in an organisation.

- **Value-based Administration**

Kautilya brought in the concept of value-based management and administration, when he identified a number of values in a leader (administrator) and observed that in order to achieve the primary goal of the organisation, a leader should be virtuous, truthful and free from vices. He should also invoke reliability, gratefulness, liberality, promptness, and long-term vision, with the advice of the elders.

**Check Your Progress 1**

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the Unit.

1) Elaborate some of the main principles of public administration as implicit in *Arthashastra*.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**1.4 ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURE OF ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY**

This aspect of administration and governance receives the closest attention in the work produced by Kautilya. For the purpose of governance, Kautilyan State was a centralised system of government, but for the purpose of administration, it could be termed as a decentralised one. So, in the *Arthashastra*, one finds that the government was organised at three levels: the centre, the *pradesh* and the *sthaniya* (local).

- **The Institution of the King**

As has been observed in the introductory part of the Unit, the centre was the epicenter of authority and the government was constituted in the form of a pyramid at the apex of that was the King. All powers of the state-legislative, executive and judicial – were vested in him. One can see the operation of a unitary monarchical system of government in existence. King was the source of law; he was responsible for the execution of the decisions in letter and spirit and he was the ultimate source of justice.

However, he was not an unrestrained power. His role and the methods of discharging that role were clearly defined along with the provision of punishment, which he was supposed to undergo in case he was found wanting in being just and fair in the use of his authority. He has to use the rod/danda/punishment for purpose of spiritual good, material well-being and pleasures of his subjects and for him. If he fails to perform his duties as



per prescription, he is bound to invite peoples' wrath and even rebellion. Clarity of communication and content in the laws, policies or order and edicts vis-à-vis his officers was necessary for their timely and responsive compliance.

There was to be no ambiguity in either the decision or the communication language thereof. A King to be effective and successful must be free from greed, arrogance, anger, lust, conceit and foolhardiness and avoiding overindulgence in all pleasures of senses (Rangarajan, 1992). Besides being self-disciplined, a wise King shall seek knowledge continuously in all branches of knowledge and avoid extravagance, capriciousness, day-dreaming, falsehood, and in all, should not cross the boundaries of good conduct.

As far as the functions and duties of the King are concerned, he had a time schedule within which the listed duties were to be performed. Within a defined time span of one and a half hours during the day and night, he was supposed to discharge what may be termed as routine administrative functions like receiving reports on defence, revenue and expenditure, hearing petitions of people, receive revenues and tributes writing and dispatching letters, receiving secret information from spies, spending time in personal recreation and contemplation and confer with councillors etc.

Even time for his personal use was a part of the schedule. His top-most functional duty however, was to work for and ensure the well-being of his subjects by being ever active in managing economy and following productive economic endeavour to guarantee continuing prosperity and future economic growth (*Ibid.*). This is the only function that should make a King happy. Besides the chief executive (The King), one also finds a mention of a number of officers occupying higher position under the kingdom such as the Purohit and the chief priest, the *Mahamatya*, the *Senapati* and *Amatyas* and *adhyakshas*. Whether these officers were tied in the hierarchically ordered system or it was a flat organisation based on horizontal relationship with the king is not very clear in *Arthashastra*. One thing that is unambiguously established is that all officers in higher positions were accountable to the King in individual as well as collective capacity. They were under the direct control of the King.

### ● ***Bases of Organisation / Department***

Another important aspect of the administrative system worth attention of a student of public administration is that the bases of organisation of work during Mauryan times resemble some of the principles of organisation in the modern age. It can be inferred from various chapters of *Arthashastra* that the organisation of departments was according to people, purpose and process. Department of prostitutes, the department of defence, revenue and agriculture and departments of elephants, horses, jails, jewels and mints among others can be cited as indicative of these bases. Kautilya provides a detailed account of the departments in his Second book which is the lengthiest of all other Books.

The Book mentions 34 *Adhyakshas* each heading one department or unit within a department. These Heads were : *Nagavanadhyaksha*; *Koshadhyaksha*; *Akaradhyaksha*; *Lohadhyaksha*; *Lakshanadhyaksha*; *Khanadhyaksha*, apart from the *adhyaksha* of the departments of Salt, Metals and Jewellery, Warehouses, State Trading, Forest Produce, Ordnance, Weights and Measures, Surveyor and Timekeeper, Customs and Octroi, Textiles, Crown Lands, Alcoholic Beverages, Animal Protection and Animal Slaughter, Entertainment, Shipping, Ports and Harbours, Crown Herds, Cavalry, Elephant Corps, Chariot Corps, Infantry, Passport, Pasture lands, Gambling, Private Trade, Jails and Temples.

When one examines this division of work a little closely, it would appear that some of the departments were in fact the divisions of a department. For example, The *Adhyaksha* or the chief superintendent of Textiles, Mining and Metallurgy, Mines and Metals, Mint and Salt, Coins, Precious Metals and Jewellery etc.; can be easily taken as a part of the department of Industries.

Likewise, the activities falling into State Trading, Private Trade, Weights and Measures, Customs and Octroi, and Chief Surveyor and Timekeeper can be put under the Department of Trade while Shipping, Ports and harbours and ferries can be taken as constituents of the Department of Shipping or the Department of Agriculture could be taken as a combination of divisions like Crown Lands, Productive Forests, Crown Herds, Protector of Animals and Controller of Animal Slaughter. Another inference that can be drawn from this description is that the departments were organised in a more or less hierarchical order. Another important aspect to be noted here is that the Book 2 does not merely describe the duties of the functional heads in details, but also prescribes the qualifications for each Job holder apart from the punishments for the violation or non-observance of the rules and regulations by the Head of the department are extensively given.

The Department of Treasury and Revenue Administration received a special treatment at the hands of Kautilya as he was of the firm view that the strength of the State and of the King lies in the strength of the Treasury. The Head of the Treasury was the Treasurer-General known as *Samnidhatra* assisted by the chief Superintendent of the Treasury and the Chief Superintendent of the Warehouses. The qualifications and the responsibilities of these officials have been clearly mentioned in different chapters of the Book 2.

The functional division of work implies that the heads of these departments were chosen on the basis of the special knowledge in the subject they were supposed to deal with. However, a student faces a state of ambiguity when he notes that Kautilya did not favour permanent stay of an officer in one position or place. Implication is that officers must keep on changing posts/roles. If that was so, the principle of special knowledge in the area of management becomes redundant and one can easily conclude that organisation was working on the principle of generalist administration. As well, it could be the situation to avoid possibility of lethargy, routineness, corruption, inefficiency and indifference overtaking the department.

**Other Officials:** Besides the above named departments and officials, *Arthashastra* also refers to a number of other officials with a specific responsibility to perform. For example, the temple and holy places management is to be looked after by the Chief Superintendent of the temples and holy places; the superintendent of Jails or *Bandhanagaradhyaksha* was entrusted with the task of supervising and controlling activities relating to Lock-ups and Prisons; *Adhipala* or Protector of Deposits incharge of looking after unclaimed pledges and deposits.

#### ● **Administration at the Local Level**

However, the administrative units were also set up at the local level for the purpose of administrative convenience. The Municipal administration was headed by the chief administrator known as *Nagrika* and was assisted by a number of *Gopas* in charge of each of the wards into which the city was divided. The task of the *Nagrika* was to ensure security and safety of the people and property, regulate the places of entertainment and prostitution, the lodges run by the private individuals and the charities, regulation of movements of the people, especially the strangers, the matters pertaining to weights

and measures, provision of civic services and construction of infrastructure, roads and transport, regulation of city trade and business and implementation of everything that came as orders or as instructions from above.

The rural administration was divided into *Sthaniya*, equivalent to modern day district, headed by the official of the name of *Sthanika*. He was responsible for the maintenance of law and order besides having a close supervision over the local level treasury and collection of revenue. The management of pasture lands and security was the responsibility of Chief Controller of Pasture lands. There were a number of Gopas for the smooth handling of the administration of a group of 5-10 villages. Mention has also been made about four more servants at the village level as *Gramakutam*, *Gramaswamy*., *Gramika* and *Gramabhritaka*.

Another institution that played a significant role in the rural areas was the *Gramavriddhah* (the village elders) who were treated as the trustees of the temple property and the minor's property, helping resolve boundary disputes between villages, acted as judges in disputes pertaining to fields besides being witnesses to the sale and purchase of property. *Gramika* was the village Headman performing the tasks of constructing boundaries of the village; make proper arrangements for regulating cattle grazing; collection of revenue for the village for the charges levied on grazing in common land, prescribed fines and the fines levied by the State.

### Check Your Progress 2

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the Unit.

1) Discuss the organisation and structure of administrative machinery at the centre as described in the *Arthashastra*.

.....

.....

.....

.....

## 1.5 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

'A good administration is characterised by the quality of persons who run' it, this is the old saying. The ancient administration as depicted by *Arthashastra* was no exception to this in so far as the details about the public servants in *Arthashastra* are concerned. Kautilya underlines the fact that the State achieves its socio-economic and political aims through the people engaged in the task of administration of decisions, policies and projects. The personnel administration was also important because the scope of the activities of state was wide and varied, which in turn implied the wide and varied scope of public administration.

State was the major source of public employment, besides the fact that the State was basically a Welfare State, wherein the smaller fish had as much right to live as the bigger fish and wherein the subjects were to be treated by the King as his children. It was the responsibility of the State machinery to maintain the orphans, the destitutes, the helpless and the aged. The State policy was to take account of the duty of the State toward the protection of the society, maintenance of law and order, security and safety of the



territories and promotion of the well-being of the citizens. But it is also true that Kautilya does not cover each and every aspect of personnel administration in the modern sense of the term. It is clear from reading the Book 5 that he was conscious of the importance of the methods of selection as well as the improvement of the employee-capacities.

The *two* basic qualities to be discerned in a public employment seeker were the loyalty and commitment to the King and the kingdom that overshadowed any other qualification. In other words, Kautilya was focusing on three types of qualifications in an applicant to be recruited under the State, viz., moral/ethical, technical or professional and loyalty to the ruler and the country. He should be free from *Kaam*, *Kroadh*, *Maya* and *Loabh*. Freedom from greed and allurements is a precondition as only such officer would be able to serve the interests of the ruled and of the ruler in the most effective and satisfactory way. The safety and security of the State and of the people is linked with the high moral and ethical character of the employees of the state. For this to happen, Kautilya prescribes a number of tests of the scale of *Kaam*, *Kroadh*, *Mada* and *Loabh*.

Some of these tests, though, were termed as utopian. Another point to be noted here is that officers of the higher ranks only got the attention of Kautilya, the lower level employees seem to have bypassed his eyes or he might have thought that everything in administration is dependent on the quality and capability of the persons sitting at the top. The followers, i.e., the subordinates would generally copy the behaviour of their boss/master. To some extent this seems to be a case even in modern times as the performance of an organisation is more often than not is linked with the type of the organisational leadership significantly. Out of the elements of personnel administration, the following have found a detailed description:

### ***Recruitment, Promotion and Transfer***

Recruitment is a process to find and select the best or to weed out the incompetent, sometimes referred derogatively as ‘rascals’, for the performance of the defined administrative tasks/functions. There was of course no open recruitment system nor an independent recruitment agency as one finds today, yet the King was responsible for the selection of the higher level officials himself. The source of recruitment is not very clearly mentioned or identified. The inference could be that it was some sort of a closed model of recruitment. Secondly, the requisite qualifications for different functional responsibilities were generally defined on the basis of which a person could find entry or could be either rejected or given a low level task. Even the King was supposed to fulfill a number of eligibility conditions to become the King. So was the case in relation to the Prince or the priest or other heads of the departments mentioned earlier.

The civil servants were subject to a number of tests before being placed in any post or office. There comes a reference, for example of the tests such as *Dharmopadha*, *Arthopadha*, *Bhayopadha* and *Kanopadha* for testing the qualities of the applicants on the scale of freedom from greed, fear, in addition to purity on morals, ethics, integrity and commitment. Those who passed the *Dharmopadha* test were to be placed as *Dharmasthiya* and *Kantakshodhak*, whereas the candidates passing the test of freedom from allurements should be appointed as *adhyakshas* of the Department of Revenue and Warehouse. Persons with proven character should be placed in charge of the Department for Women and King’s Harem. The post of Prime Minister should go to persons having stood all the tests of character and freedom from all allurements. Moreover, Kautilya seems to have recognised the importance of not only the knowledge of the subject or only technical qualifications, but also the importance of practical experience. This comes closer to the present day practice of laying down eligibility conditions for a number of posts under the State ( Shamasastri, 1967).



The list of the eligibilities of *Amatyas* for selection included the following:

- He should be a citizen of the country.
- He should be from a high family and should be influential.
- He should be well- trained in Arts.
- He should possess foresight, boldness, wisdom, intelligence, enthusiasm and energy, strong memory, purity of character, dignity and endurance, affability, strength, health and bravery.
- He should be skillful, eloquent, firm in loyal devotion, endowed with excellent conduct.
- He should be free from fickle mindedness, procrastination and from such qualities that excite hatred and enmity (*Ibid.*).

Promotion and transfer of the officers were totally the discretion of the King. He was to decide on the basis of performance evaluation decided by following observation method, and the feedback. One does not find a detailed discussion on the transfers of the civil servants except when he says that Heads of Departments shall not remain permanently in one job and shall be rotated frequently. Some of the employees were not subject to transfer at all – Guards of royal buildings, forts and country parts, while others could be transferred only as a precaution or remedy against corruption.

### ***Pay and Salaries***

When it comes to the issue of salaries and pay, one finds that the officers were getting fixed amount as salary/pay, which could be raised or reduced at the discretion of the King depending on the achievement or failure of the official to achieve the desired goal/s of the state. Moreover, there was no pay-scale or assured increments as is the case today. The discussion in the *Arthashastra* shows that the grade of pay differed from 48000 *panas* to the lowest of 60 *panas*. The *Mahamatya* (Prime Minister), the *Purohit*, the *Senapati*, the *Yuvaraj*, *Acharaya*, the *Ritwik* (Sacrificial priest), the Queen and the *Rajmata* were entitled to the salary of 48000 *panas*, whereas the *Dauvarika*, *Antarvamsika*, *Prasastra*, *Samaharta* and *Samnidhata* were in the category of 24000 *panas*.

These grades go upto 12 in number; the lowest being of the personal attendants and musical staff etc. who were given a salary of 60 *panas*. It comes out that the salaries were commensurate with the post/position, experience and merit or knowledge. The total salary of public servants was determined on the basis of the principles of:

- 1) The capacity to pay to the countryside and the city.
- 2) It shall not be more than one fourth of revenues of the State.
- 3) The salary should be enough to meet the bodily needs of the employees and shall not be in contradiction to the principles of *Dharma* and *Artha*.
- 4) Salary should be fixed in such a manner that right people with right merit are attracted so as to attain the objectives of the State.
- 5) The salary could be paid either in cash or in kind or both depending on the adequacy of cash available with the Treasury (Rangarajan, *op.cit.*).

Similarly, one does not come across a clear statement about the system of pension or retirement benefits on the lines an employee is entitled for today. Even so, the dependents

of the State servants dying in the service of the State were entitled to the care of the State. On occasions such as funerals, births or illness, the families of the deceased government servant shall be given presents of money and respect. The inference is that, though no explicit scheme of old age pension existed at that time, the employee’s family was the responsibility of the State after the death of the public servant on duty. The second inference is that the service under the State was a lifetime.

**Training of Civil Servants**

Training of the highest level officers of the government attracted Kautilya’s mind the most, as this was the only issue that was given explicit and exclusive in depth treatment by the author of *Arthashastra*. His ideas on the need and importance of training can be properly traced and understood through Book 1, on the topic of ‘Training’ containing 500 *sutras*, 21 chapters and 18 sections. He deals with several aspects relating to training of the officials like the selection of the right persons with right aptitudes and the contents to be transferred or remitted to them.

In a way he emphasised on the training only of the trainable, that is, training should be open not for everyone, but to those who are willing to improve and reform their thought and actionable capacities and capabilities. Therefore, *Arthashastra* maintains that such candidates only should be chosen for training, who had the desire to learn and were endowed with the qualities of a good listener apart from the qualities of retention, reflection, understanding, rejection of the wrong or the false and intentness on truth and not on any other person. The focus on the desire to learn underlined the quality of inquisitiveness and motivation to add to his previous knowledge and expertise.

It would be pertinent to note here that Kautilya was not for the training in theory alone; he was interested in imparting practical training as well. Kautilya seems to have emphasised purposive training in the sense of inculcating discipline among the civil servants. In other words training was considered by him as a fit instrument to promote discipline in an organisation. Even in the modern management era, it cannot be denied that training will produce the desired results if the candidates for training are chosen cautiously with a view to bring about a change in the psychological, professional, and cultural personality of the chosen ones. The organisational efficiency and culture would only then be affected and productivity will improve. Kautilyan principles of training are relevant in the present context of administrative development for making a difference to the wellbeing of the people/subjects. Strangely, the training needs of the lower level employees did not receive much attention in *Arthashastra*; it was mainly concerning the prince, the King, and the other high officials.

**Check Your Progress 3**

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answers.  
 ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Discuss the views of Kautilya on recruitment of civil servants under the State.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Explain the ideas of Kautilya on training of the civil servants.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

## 1.6 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Kautilya assigned high value to the financial health of the State. He was of the firm view that the power of the State rested in the strength of the treasury. That is why he pays special attention to the management and administration of treasury along with the issues of collection of taxes and enhancement of resources of the State. The other area relating to finance that attracted the attention of Kautilya were Budget, Agricultural Taxation, Audit and Accounts.

Treasury was considered to be the most vital part of the administrative system of Mauryan times. The King was to devote his best attention to Treasury; on it as all the activities of the State depended. It is a truism to say that without wealth or money, it is difficult if not impossible to run the administration. Therefore, it has been stated that a King with depleted treasury eats into the very vitality of the citizens and the country. It was the duty of the officers concerned to raise, strengthen and increase the resources, but that was not to be done in any arbitrary, undue and unfair manner. They should impose and collect only such taxes that were due and reasonable.

Kautilyan scheme draws a list of the taxpayers and those exempted from tax payment. Similarly, the villages also were divided into taxpaying and non-tax paying ones. Even today, there are persons and institutions that are tax-exempt. One of the *Amatyas* was appointed *koshadhyaksha* or chief superintendent of the Treasury, known as *Samnidhatra* or treasurer-general, besides the two more officers in charge of all the stores, one was known as chief superintendent of the treasury and the other as the Chief Superintendent of the Warehouses. The King was supposed to exercise direct control over the treasury and the *Koshadhyaksha* was accountable to him. He cautioned about the ways the harm could be caused to the *Kosh* like misappropriation by chiefs, remission of taxes, scattered collection, false accounting and loot by the enemies of the cash collected before it reached the treasury (Rangarajan, *op.cit.*).

The sources of revenue of the State have been accounted for in details and included revenues from Crown agricultural lands, from mines and metallurgy; from Animal Husbandry; from irrigation works; forests, from Industries like textiles, Alcoholic Liquor, Salt; from courtesans, Prostitutes and entertainers, betting and gambling apart from transaction tax, customs duties. octroi, fees and charges on services provided by the State to the citizens and tax on trade etc (*Ibid.*).

### ***Budget, Accounts and Audit***

Budget, as we understood in the traditional sense, is a statement of revenue and expenditure for a fiscal year. It naturally is an estimated amount of revenue likely to flow from all sources and the total expenditure to be incurred on different items. This form of budgeting has been in vogue even now despite the adoption of several new forms and principles of budget formulation and implementation. The budget depicted a detailed

account of income – current, transferred and miscellaneous. Miscellaneous income included the following:

- Debts and dues recovered.
- Fines paid by government servants.
- Surcharges, compensation received in lieu of loss or damage, gifts, confiscated property and treasure trove.
- Income due to profit on sales.

The expenditure was shown separately under different Heads: Allocated Day to Day Expenditure, Unallocated Day to Day Expenditure and Foreseen Periodic (Fortnightly, monthly or annual) expenditure apart from the expenditure on worship and charity, the palace, the administration, the foreign affairs, maintenance of granary, ordnance depots and warehouses, manufacturing, labour, defence, cattle, forest and game sanctuaries, and consumables like firewood and fodder (*Ibid.*, p.276).

Financial accountability forms an important part of the administration of fiscal affairs. Proper maintenance of accounts of the income and expenditure is one of the most significant steps aiming at probity, honesty and responsibility of officials involved in the administration of budget, collection of revenue and making expenditures. Even at the time of Kautilya, proper maintenance of account books in proper form was mandatory. It was also the responsibility of the accounts officers to submit on time the accounts every month failing which they were punished.

Accounts officials were to observe a sort of code of conduct. They were to present themselves for audit at the appointed time bringing with them their account books and the income to be remitted to the Treasury; They shall be ready for audit when the audit officer calls them; They shall not lie about the accounts when questioned during audit and they shall not try to interpolate an (omitted) entry as if it was done inadvertently. Failure to observe these prescriptions was punishable. All high level officers were responsible to submit their respective accounts in full without any contradiction or lies. In case they did commit any such act, they were subject to pay the highest level standard penalty (For details see Rangarajan, *ibid.*, pp. 278-80).

It can be made out from this account that audit was separate from accounts which is one of the features of financial administration in modern India. Discipline and efficiency formed part of the managing of financial affairs of the State. Indifference to work, dereliction of duty and causing financial loss by the Inspectors attracted punishments as prescribed under the rules. For example, the loss caused because of the failure of the inspector in his duty was to be made good by fellow officials, subordinates, sureties, sons, daughters, and wife etc. The officials causing loss to the Treasury because of their ignorance, laziness, timidity, negligence of duty, corruption, short temper, arrogance or greed were imposed penalty in accordance with the gravity or seriousness of the offence.

Cheating the government, i.e., misappropriating the public money or exploiting the public by government servants were the acts that were treated as serious financial misbehaviour. Kautilya lists 40 ways of embezzlement, fraud and stealing by the public servants. Out of this list 10 methods related to the fraudulent behaviour, while the rest were related to the types that included obstruction, using government property for personal work, falsification of date, collecting less than prescribed revenue or incurring more than allocated expenditure, misappropriation acts inclusive of non-delivery of revenue to the treasury, misrepresenting income received, favour shown for money, payment due to one paid to another etc. Punishment was to be awarded only after proper investigation and trial.



**Check Your Progress 4**

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the Unit.

1) Finance and financial administration is at the centre of everything Kautilya writes about the State and its machinery'. Discuss.

.....

.....

.....

.....

**1.7 CONCLUSION**

Now what are the lessons one can draw after going through the details of the principles and framework of administration as drawn in the *Arthashastra*, especially with reference to the features of Kautilyan administration and in relation to the relevance of his thoughts on administration in the present times? In the case of the first, one may identify the main features of the administrative system in the ancient times in which Arthashastra was written as follows:

- It was a centralised system.
- It was a bureaucratic system.
- It was organised on the principles of administration; later expounded by a number of the administrative thinkers belonging to the administrative management school.
- It was a welfarist administration. It could be termed as an example of benevolent authoritarian system.
- It was careful of the needs of a good administration.
- It was a government by consultation as one finds an elaborate mention of the consultative mechanism for decision making in the form of a council of ministers (*Mantri Parishad*). Though the advice and the method of consultation by the King with them were not binding on him, it was necessary to reach a well-reasoned decision.

One finds that many of his administrative thoughts were not only relevant to his times, they are as much relevant even today. For example, his penetrating analysis of the causes and remedies of corruption in administration and his emphasis on good governance are still relevant. “The *Arthashastra* of Kautilya shows that the ancient system of governance and administration was quite contemporary in operational guidelines when dealing with corruption. It also quite convincingly demonstrates that corruption is not an exclusive feature of modern times alone. The fact that the menace has survived and thrived through the ages speaks volumes about its endurance. Governments of all historical eras have recognised its illegality and devised legal instruments to tackle the problem, but they have not been able to overcome its spread as well as its acceptability in society”.

However, the structural dimensions as depicted in *Arthashastra* are of no value in the modern day Indian context, but there are a number of countries that prefer centralised system over the decentralised ones. The monarchies in different global locations are

may or drawing from the theory expounded by Kautilya. Similarly, his views regarding the importance of finance and financial administration in the establishment of a strong State still holds good as do the thoughts on the principles of administration. His ideas about the leaders and the necessary qualities required in a leader cannot be overlooked by a modern day student of administration and management.

Furthermore, Kautilya visualised the importance of the values and attitudes, merits and qualities of the people engaged in the organisational task for an efficient, effective and people centric performance of their organisation. Focus on the principles of probity, integrity and honesty continue to be of perennial importance and concern in public administration, irrespective of the type of regime. Even in relation to the global influence of a country, his views seem to be path making as the financial and military strength of a country still plays a deterministic role in community of nations. However, it still remains to be recognised that any author, Kautilya is no exception, is influenced by the environment of his times. Yet it can be safely stated that Kautilya in many ways outpassed his time for having looked into the administrative needs of the future societies and the States.

---

## 1.8 GLOSSARY

---

<b>Adhyaksha</b>	: Superintendent
<b>Amatya</b>	: Mantri
<b>Bandhanagaradhyaksha</b>	: Superintendent of Jails
<b>Dharma</b>	: Ethics and Duty
<b>Khanadhyaksha</b>	: Superintendent of Mines
<b>Koshadhyaksha</b>	: Head of the Treasury
<b>Mahamatya</b>	: Prime Minister
<b>Nyaya</b>	: Justice
<b>Samaharta</b>	: Collector General
<b>Samnidhata</b>	: Treasurer- General
<b>Sthanika</b>	: District Superintendent

---

## 1.9 REFERENCES

---

Banerjee, P. N.(1916). *Public Administration in Ancient India*, London, U.K: Macmillan.

Kangle, R.P (1969). *Kautilyan Arthashastra*, Bombay, India: University of Bombay.

Kumud, R. M ( 1988). *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times*. New Delhi, India:Motilal Banarasidass.

Parmar, A.(1987).*Techniques of Statecraft: A Study of Kautilya's Arthashastra*. New Delhi, India: Atma Ram.

Prasad, R.P et. al. (Eds.) (2010). *Administrative Thinkers*. New Delhi, India: Sterling.

Rangarajan, L N. (1992). *Kautilya, the Arthashastra*, London, U. K. Penguin Books.

Shamashastry, R. (1967). *Arthshastra of Kautilya*. University of Mysore, India: Oriental Library Publications.

Trautmann, T. R. (1971). *Kautilya and Arthashastra: A Statistical Investigation of Authorship and Evolution of the Text*. New York, U.S: Random House.

## 1.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

### Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
  - You should draw upon the material contained in part 1.3 of the Unit. The answer should begin with an introduction followed by the narration of the principles as inferred from the discussion on the organisation and working of the machinery of government in the *Arthashastra*.

### Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
  - Your answer should include a discussion on the institution of the King as well as of other departments and their Heads. You may refer to the matter mentioned in Section 1.4 of this Unit.

### Check Your Progress 3

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
  - He should be from a high family and should be influential.
  - He should be well-trained in Arts.
  - He should possess foresight, boldness, wisdom, intelligence, enthusiasm and energy, strong memory, purity of character, dignity and endurance, affability, strength, health and bravery.
  - He should be skillful, eloquent, firm in loyal devotion, endowed with excellent conduct.
  - He should be free from fickle mindedness, procrastination and from such qualities as excite hatred and enmity.
- 2) Your answer should include the following points:
  - Training should be open not for everyone, but to those who are willing to improve and reform their thought and actionable capacities and capabilities.
  - Such candidates only should be chosen for training, who have the desire to learn and have been endowed with the qualities of a good listener apart from the qualities of retention, reflection, understanding, rejection of the wrong or the false and intentness on truth and not on any other person. The focus on the desire to learn underlined the quality of inquisitiveness and motivation to add to his previous knowledge and expertise.

### Check Your Progress 4

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
  - The contents of your answer should include: a) the importance of finance and financial management of the strength and authority of the state, b) discussion of the measures necessary for effective financial management and c) conclusion. You may consult the matter given in Section 1.6 of this Unit.

---

## UNIT 2 MAHATAMA GANDHI\*

---

### Structure

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Gandhi's Idea of Swaraj
- 2.3 Gandhi's Views on Trusteeship
- 2.4 Trusteeship in Practice
- 2.5 Conclusion
- 2.6 Glossary
- 2.7 References
- 2.8 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

---

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

---

After reading this Unit, you would be able to:

- Identify the core principles underlining Gandhian concept of *Swaraj*;
- Explain Gandhi's views on Trusteeship; and
- Analyse Gandhi's ideas from an empirical perspective.

---

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) was an unparalleled charismatic leader of modern India. He was not only a leader but also a thinker, editor, writer and social reformer. Born in traditional merchant family in Gujarat, he took his formal training in Law from South Africa. He implemented his beliefs in non-violence, freedom of speech and movement, equality and autonomy in the form of satyagraha and non-violent protests in South Africa itself from 1896 to 1914. His major achievements against the Apartheid regime there include his Indian Ambulance Corps effort during the Boer War, experiments at Phoenix and Tolstoy Farms and Campaign in Transvaal. Known as the father of nation, he is considered one of the champion figures of Indian freedom struggle movement, he has attracted the whole world through his unique style of non-violent methods or *Satyagraha*.

Gandhi wrote prolifically on many subjects of philosophy and social sciences. His ideas were theological and interdisciplinary in nature. His pen touched subjects including law, social reforms, civilisation, economic and social order and nationalism. In his speeches, writings, monographs and editorial works, one can see his command and scholarly diversification over many a subject. He wrote on problems of then existing socio-economic structure with erudition. His ideas were interconnected with one another. '*Hind Swaraj*', '*Panchayati Raj*', '*India of My Dreams*', '*My Experiments with Truth*' are his more important writings. Besides, he has given his views on various aspects through his editorials in newspapers like '*Young India*', '*Harijan*' and '*Navjeevan*'.

His journalistic approach towards understanding the social problems makes him different from other scholars of social sciences. He was not just a theoretical scholar but also an

---

\* Contributed by Dr. Vijay Srivastava, Assistant Professor, Mittal School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab.



empirical thinker. He adopted and practiced each and every theory, which he propagated in his real life, in the form of constructive programmes. In this Unit, we will discuss Gandhi's major ideas and philosophy. In particular, his viewpoints on *Swaraj* and *Trusteeship* will be explained. We will also try to relate them with contemporary social and political scenario.

## 2.2 GANDHI'S IDEA OF SWARAJ

Gandhi was a firm believer in the philosophy of *Swaraj* and democratic values, but his conception towards democratic republic is different from the western thinkers. We need to understand that the Gandhian idea of *Swaraj* is not the outcome of Gandhi's writings alone. The Gandhian activists and scholars have contributed more towards this conception after the demise of Gandhi, particularly in the post-independence era.

Gandhi really wanted *Swaraj* or 'self-rule' by the people of India who represent the rural masses to become a reality. Gandhi observed that "the soul of India lives in its villages". He wanted that power structure should begin from below. Gandhi wanted true democracy to function in India. He, therefore, observed, "true democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village".

He dreamt of 'village republics' in free India. Gandhi (1962) observed, "Panchayat Raj represents true democracy realised. We would regard the humblest and the lowest Indian as being equally the ruler of India with the tallest in the land. Mahatma Gandhi advocated *Panchayat Raj*, a decentralised form of government, where each village is responsible for its own affairs, as the foundation of India's political system. The term for such a vision was *Gram Swaraj*. Gandhi wanted political power to be distributed among the villages of India. Gandhi preferred the term *Swaraj* to describe what he called true democracy. This democracy was based upon freedom. Individual freedom in Gandhi's view could be maintained only in autonomous, self-reliant communities that offer opportunities to the people for fullest participation (Roy, 1984).

According to Gandhi (1962, *ibid.*), "my idea of *Gram Swaraj* is that it is a complete republic, independent of its neighbour for its own vital wants and yet interdependent for many in which dependence is a necessity". Gandhi's *Gram Swaraj* is a human-centred, non-exploitative, decentralised, simple village economy providing for full employment to each one of its citizens on the basis of voluntary co-operation with an object of achieving self-sufficiency in its basic requirements of food, clothing, and other necessities of life.

Gandhi's dream was that democracy through people's participation could be ensured only by way of *Gram Swaraj*. He wanted *Gram Swaraj* in villages, where there will be a village republic and management of affairs would be done by the people themselves. According to Gandhi, in *Gram Swaraj* "every village should be a democracy in which they will not depend even on neighbour for major needs". No one should be without food and clothing. Everybody should get sufficient work to meet one's necessities. This ideal can be achieved only when the means of production to meet the primary needs of life are in control of the people (Joshi, 2002).

The vision of an 'ideal village' or 'village republic' is central to Gandhian concept of *Swaraj*. This ideal village will be based on the Gandhi's non-violent social and economic order, where production of necessary items will be done by the small-scale and cottage industries. It means that "Without decentralised order of production, construction of Gandhian ideal village is not possible". In other words, "Ideal village is an important

part of decentralised economic order” (Gandhi, 1958). Political structure under Gandhian ideal village can be constructed only on the basis of production of economic structure.

Gandhi (1958, *ibid.*) averred, “my ideal village will contain intelligent human beings. They will not live in dirt and darkness as animals. Men and women will be free and able to hold their own against anyone in the world. There will be neither plague, nor cholera, nor smallpox, no one will be idle, no one will wallow in luxury. Everyone will have to contribute his quota of manual labour. . .” It is possible to envisage railways, post and telegraph. . .the like. . .In simpler words, Gandhi’s ideal village should be basically self-reliant, making provision for all necessities of life such as food, clothing (*khadi*), clean water, sanitation, housing, education, and other requirements, including government and self-defence.

Gandhi strongly advocated decentralisation of economic and political power through the organisation of Village *Panchayats*. In simpler words, the fundamental concept of *Gram Swaraj* is that every village should be its own ‘republic’. Gandhi proposed to work from bottom upwards. He said Independence must begin at the bottom. Thus, every village will be a Republic or *Panchayat* having full powers.

Gandhian *Gram Swaraj* is not the renewal of old village panchayats but the fresh formation of independent village units of *Swaraj* in the context of the present-day world. Gandhi believed that independence must begin at the bottom. Thus, every village will be a Republic or *Panchayat* having full powers. It follows therefore, that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world. It will be trained and prepared to perish in the attempt to defend itself against any onslaught from without. Thus, ultimately it is the individual who is the unit.

Gandhi envisioned for independent India a ‘polity’ that would be based on the principle of democratic self-government or self-rule. In this polity’ transcendence of self-centeredness and selfish interests would be an automatic process. Socially responsible and morally disciplined citizens of such a polity may not ideally require a State. Thus, a non-statal polity was what was closest to Gandhi’s view of ‘Swaraj’ . . .Gandhi opted for ‘ordered anarchy’ under which citizens enjoyed maximum freedom consistent with minimum necessary order” (Parekh, 1989, *cited in* IGNOU Material, 2011).

The guiding principles of Gandhi’s Modern Polity:

- Non-violence.
- The autonomy of the individual.
- Sense of power among its people.
- Strong and vibrant local communities.
- Cooperation among people.
- Literacy Requirement.
- Regeneration of Indian culture.
- National unity
- Self-governing local communities organised in the form of a central government but not creating a centralised structure of authority (*Adapted from* IGNOU Material, *ibid.*).

Gandhi believed that the village community would over time build up a ‘strong sense of local strength and solidarity’, Provide ‘meaningful’ interpersonal relationships, encourage a sense of social responsibility and the spirit of cooperation, and act as a nursery of civil virtues’. Beyond the relatively self-sufficient villages the country was organised in terms of ‘expanding circles’. The villages were grouped into talukas, the latter into districts, the districts into provinces, and so on, each governed by representatives elected by its constituents units. All the different levels were autonomous yet bound by a strong sense of community. Thus, every province had the option of drawing up its own Constitution in conformity with the country as a whole (Cited from Parekh, IGNOU Material, *ibid.*).

The political philosophy of Gandhi rests primarily on this concept of ‘*Swaraj*’. In the opinion of several scholars, ‘*Swaraj*’ is a more basic concept than non-violence since non-violence is only a means to ‘*Swaraj*’ whereas ‘*Swaraj*’ is an individual’s state of being (Cited from Parel, 1997, IGNOU Material, *ibid.*). We find Gandhi invoking the concept of ‘*Swaraj*’ in varied senses in different situations:

- ‘*Swaraj*’ carrying the context of independence of the country from alien rule.
- Assertion of the political freedom of the individual.
- Assurance of the economic freedom of the individual, and
- Attainment of spiritual freedom or autonomy of the individual. (IGNOU Material, *ibid.*)

In the political sphere the notion of sovereign independence gives meaning to Gandhi’s ‘*Swaraj*’. However, qualifications were attached by him to this independence. He wrote in *Young India* (6<sup>th</sup> August, 1925): “Self-government means continuous effort to be independent of government control, whether it is foreign government or whether it is national. *Swaraj* government will be a sorry affair if people look up to it for the regulation of every detail of life”. Gandhi strongly advocated the use of pure means for attaining sovereign independence. He was unequivocal in his recommendation of only the non-violent means “Violent means will give violent *Swaraj*. That would be a menace to the world and India herself“(Gandhi in *Young India*, 17 July 1924 cited in IGNOU Material, *ibid.*).

### Check Your Progress 1

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the Unit.

1) Explain Gandhi’s vision of *Swaraj*.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

## 2.3 GANDHI’S VIEWS ON TRUSTEESHIP

Trusteeship originated from three fundamental Gandhian concepts: Non-violence, *Swaraj* and equality, which are all interlinked with one another. The Theory of Trusteeship

talks about exploitative economic cycle. Gandhi wanted to change this violent economic cycle into non-violent economic system. According to Gandhi, there is not only conflict between labour and capital in capitalist system, but conflict exists between necessities and luxuries.

The Theory of Trusteeship is Gandhi's novel contribution in the sphere of political philosophy. It is, in fact, an economic extension of his political philosophy. The main thrust is on treating resources as a public trust with man being the trustee, so that the riches of nature and society are equitably used. The Theory was intended to combine the advantages of both capitalism and communism, and to socialise property without nationalising it.

Gandhi was of the view that all material property was a social trust. The owner therefore was not required to take more than what was needed for a moderately comfortable life. The other members of society who were associated with the property were jointly responsible with the owner for its management and were to provide welfare schemes for all. The owner and the rest of the people were to regard themselves as trustees of the property.

The idea of Trusteeship occupies an important place in Gandhi's thinking and State's role. The roots of Gandhi's Theory of Trusteeship are deeply related to the Gandhian ideas of Exploitation and Inequality. In other words, it explores the Gandhian views of equity, justice and conflict. In the Gandhian political economy (Ramesh and Lutz, 1980), this idea of Trusteeship plays crucial role to establish a non-exploitative society. It also deals with the concept of *Aprarigraha* (non-possession). Trusteeship is regarded as one of the alternative to capitalist order. The basic reason behind the conflicts between labour and capital is increasing economic inequalities in society. These economic inequalities are generated due to unequal distribution of resources and income between labour class and capital class. This unequal distribution becomes the root cause of exploitation of unprivileged sections of society.

Gandhian concept of Trusteeship has deep philosophical base. It was not a new idea which Gandhi gave to the world, but he presented this idea in a new form. In every religion of humankind, there is a concept of non-possession and simple lifestyle. Even Gandhi's concept of spiritual man in non-violent economy can be seen in writings on Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam. In the verse of *Shrimad Bhagwat Puran*, it is clearly mentioned that man should not earn more than what is needed for the fulfillment of his necessity. Luxurious life is the root cause of generational economic inequality and it also leads to exploitation of one by another. "Men are entitled to regard as their own just what would suffice to satisfy their hunger. Whoever would appropriate more to himself is a thief, and should be punished as such".

Gandhi himself admitted that his concept of non-possession originated from the teachings of *Bhagwad Gita*. Not only *Aprigraha* but *Samabhava* (equability) also came in to his mind due to philosophical study of *Bhagwad Gita*. Gandhi has said in his autobiography that the study of *Gita* illuminated the meaning of 'trustee', and the word, in its turn solved for him the problem of non-possession. Not only Gandhi influenced but Vinoba Bhave; known as the spiritual successor of Gandhi and Acharya of the Bhoodan Movement drew from the *Bhagwad Gita*. He uses the word '*Vishwastavritti*' in his philosophy of *Sarvodaya*.

To Vinoba Bhave (2007), "the conclusion is that whatever talents, physical strength, wealth or other capacities a person might possess, he should take them as having given to him as a trustee for the benefit of the world. This is a noble idea of Trusteeship. But



selfish people have so debased the word that it seems nearly impossible to restore it to its pristine purity. I have, therefore substituted it with another word, *Vishwastaviritti*, i.e., the attitude of confidence – a word which is free of any undesirable associations”.

Possession over knowledge, power, glory and finance creates decay in human society. Trusteeship principle teaches us that how to transform the feeling of ‘*Main*’ (I) into ‘*Hum*’ (We). K.G Mashruwala has rightly observed that “the theory of Trusteeship makes no distinction between private and non-private property. All property is held in trust; no matter who possesses it ... Indeed the Theory of Trusteeship applies not only to tangible and transferable property, but also to places of power and position and to intangible and non-transferable property such as the muscular energy of a labourer and the talents of a Helen Keller. Every human being not mentally deranged is only a trustee of all that is within his control” (Mastruwale, 2007).

It is very important to mention here that in Gandhian non-violent socio-economic order, equality and free growth can be achieved through the establishment of modern factory type small-scale industries or labour intensive industries. Gandhi was not in the favour of modern-industrialisation or heavy industrialisation, instead he gave much more importance to rural industrialisation, which is also a key component in idea of ‘Trusteeship’. The harmonic relationship between labour and capital is possible only in the non-mechanical or human friendly mechanical type of industrial world.

In the Theory of Trusteeship, Gandhi wanted to establish a non-mechanical relationship between labour and capital class. Unlike Karl Marx, he did not want to destroy capitalism or bourgeoisie. With the help of the feeling of trust, he wanted to transform the evil nature of capitalism into a good one. In high capital intensive type of firms, it is very difficult to harmonise the relationship between capital and labour due to ‘alienation’; a term coined by Marx. Gandhian idea of Trusteeship tried to resolve the problem of alienation through non-violent means. It is also noticeable that in highly technological industry, this alienation process starts due to the exploitation of labour by the capitalist class.

In this context, Gupta (1996) has a similar kind of view. He asserts that ‘while the capitalists tried to get maximum work from the employees, paying them only as much as they had to, the workers hit upon all sorts of tricks to put in as little effort as they could get away with’. Satisfaction of both classes, labour as well as capital, have an important place in Gandhian philosophy. In the existing system of capitalist order due to greed and profit orientation, capitalists do not satisfy and workers due to exploitative nature of their owners do not feel satisfied (Gandhi, 1921).

Gandhi knew very well that for the running an institution like a trust, it is very important to manage it in a proper way without the involvement of any kind of violence and extremism. In the Gandhian framework of just society, Industrialists are friends of workers instead of owners. The management of firm or mill should be in a non-violent or co-operative environment to avoid the evil circumstances, and emphasis on cooperation, rather than conflict between labour and capital” (Dasgupta, *op.cit.*).

Another aspect of Gandhian Theory of Trusteeship relates to economic inequality in the area of labour-capital conflict. Concentration of wealth in the fewer sections, mainly capitalist, aggravates these inequalities and are the root cause of violence. Addressing the problem of capital-labour conflict and its relationship with economic inequality, Gandhi asserted that “economic equality is master key to non-violent independence. Working for economic equality means abolishing the eternal conflict between capital and labour... It means the leveling down of the few rich in whose hands is concentrated

the bulk of nation's wealth on the one hand, and the leveling up of the semi-starved naked millions on the other" (IGNOU Material, *op.cit.*).

Co-operative management of industrial units is an integral part of Gandhian Trusteeship. Gandhi believed in the decentralised system of management of wealth and property. In the area of labour-capital relations, he was very clear that how to include labourers in management process as well as in the part of production. Cooperative management of profit and wealth means getting rid of the concept of private ownership and exploitive economic system, where alienation occurs due to the distance between capital class and labour class. In the words of Gandhi, "it is vital to the well-being of the industry that workmen should be regarded as equal with the shareholders and that they have, therefore every right to possess an accurate knowledge of transactions of mills" (Gandhi, 1921, *op.cit.*).

Sethi (1978) in his work 'Gandhi Today' has described Trusteeship as 'The Grand Alternative'. Describing as Trusteeship as political instrument to approach the industrial problem and conflict between labour and capital, he said that "Trusteeship is both a bulwark against oppression by State power and against the alienation of worker, just as it provides a temporary role for those capitalists who want to play a responsible social role".

It is reported that the Theory of Trusteeship had excited the attention of a group of socialists who had a long discussion with Gandhi regarding its nature and implications. The result was the writing of a draft. This draft was also amended by Gandhi to strengthen its egalitarian thrust. The final text of the draft was as follows:

- Trusteeship provides a means of transforming the present capitalist order or society into an egalitarian one. It is not critical of capitalism, but gives the present owning class a chance of reforming itself. It is based on the faith that human nature is never beyond redemption.
- It does not recognise any right of private ownership of property except in so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.
- It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.
- Under State-regulated Trusteeship, an individual will thus not be free to hold or use wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interests of society.
- Just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage, even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society. The difference between such minimum incomes should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time, so much so that the tendency would be towards obliteration of the difference.
- Under the Gandhian economic order the character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed (Cited in Parekh, 1989, IGNOU Material, *op.cit.*).

---

## 2.4 TRUSTEESHIP IN PRACTICE

---

Owning property in Gandhian economic system is prohibited and greed towards property and wealth creates violence in social system. Vinoba Bhave, the champion of land reforms in India applied Gandhian theory of Trusteeship in practical world and got success in eradicating property based on economic inequality to some extent. Bhave (1967) felt that "acceptance of Trusteeship ideal will transform our entire thinking in regard to wealth and the relationship between the individual and society".

It is also noticeable that Bhave did not agree with Gandhi on the use of word Trusteeship, he called it *Vishwastvratie* (In the Sanskrit language it is *Vishwashvratie*) it means faith (*Vishwash*) of public on merchant class (*Vanik*). During the period of *Bhoodan Aandolan*, his focus was not only in the area of land reforms but simultaneously he was looking towards solving the problem of social unrest and inequality. To him, Trusteeship as a philosophy of non-possession is a medium which can tackle the issue of social unrest. He said that “if we want to build up a non-violent society, we have to keep non-possession in mind i.e., those who have large property should become it’s trustee in a real sense. Only then will non-violence be realised, otherwise there will be increasing unrest” (Bhave, *ibid.*).

Application of Trusteeship principle as a *Bhoodan-Gramdan* movement can be looked at within the framework of redistribution of resources from rich to poor and between have and have-nots. In Gandhian economic philosophy, any transformation or change is acceptable only when it is based on principle of non-violence. Similarly, Trusteeship principle denies ownership of any kind. If there are many parties in any issue than co-operation should be from every side. Similarly, for the construction of non-violent economic order, Vinoba Bhave sought voluntary cooperation from rich as well as poor. Like Gandhi, he was against the forced cooperation and legalising of the principle of Trusteeship. Voluntarism has a unique place in his ideas. To him, ‘voluntary surrender of the individual ownership of land is the foundation of *Gramdan*’ (Choker, 2011). Eradication of poverty was the main agenda of Vinoba’s *Gramdan* movement. It is Vinoba’s firm belief that surrendering the ownership rights can be an important tool to fight with the chronic or generational poverty.

*Gramdan* as an empirical experiment of Trusteeship Theory could do better in this area and feeling of non-possession should live in the hearts of both excluded and non-excluded sections of society. “If the poor do not surrender their ownership rights first, then who else will? The ownership of the rich will go automatically; the poor will have to give it up voluntarily. It is India’s good fortune that a few rich also come forward to surrender their ownership. But one cannot rely so much on that. Hence, we should gain as much sympathy of the rich as possible, but focus on seeing the poor give up their ownership; that is the best way for the dissolution of ownership” (Deshpande, 2011).

Interpreting Bhave’s idea of abolition of private property in wealth and land with Trusteeship, (Tickers, 1970) has a sound argument. She has stated that “the doctrine of Trusteeship seems to be the source of Vinoba’s call for his altogether abolition of private property in wealth and land. During his pilgrimage on foot for the ‘Gift Land and Village Movement’, he asked people to donate all land and wealth to society.

Dissolution of ownership is justifiable distribution of resources. In Gandhi’s non-violent economic order, property does not belong to any individual, but to the whole society. Entire village community can use the land for welfare and ethical development of village. If there is no master and everybody feels like a servant then there is a very rare chance of birth of violence. This is a perfect Gandhian technique to tackle several land and property related issues.

### Check Your Progress 2

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) What do you understand by Gandhian Theory of Trusteeship?





village should be its own republic with self-reliance in food, clothes and education.

- Satyagraha** : It is a form of non-violent resistance. The word is coined by Gandhi. It means insistence on truth.
- Village Republics** : In Gandhi's view, every village that has attained *Swaraj* is a Republic. A self-sufficient and autonomous village is a Republic.

---

## 2.7 REFERENCES

---

Bhave , V. (1967). *Vinoba Pravachan* . Varanasi, India: Sarv Sewa Sangh Prakashan. 30<sup>th</sup> October.

Bhole, L.M. (2000). *Essays on Gandhian Socio-Economic Thought*, New Delhi, India: Shipra Publications :111-112.

Cholkar, P (2010). *Bhoodan – Gramdan Movement : An Overview*, Anasakti Darshan, June-July :14.

Dasgupta A. (1993). *A History of Indian Economic Thought*, London, U.K : Routledge: 17.

Diwan, R and Lutz, M.(Eds.) (1985). *Essays in Gandhian Economics* . New Delhi, India: Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Gandhi , M.K (1921), *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* . Government of India. New Delhi: Publication Division. Vol.19: 365.

Gandhi, M.K (1921; 1928). *Young India* , February.

Gandhi ,M.K (1945). *Constructive Programme : Its Meaning and Place*, Ahmedabad, India: Navjivan Publishing House, pp. 20-21 .

Goel, S.K. (1993). *Gandhi on Industrial Relations*, New Delhi, India: Shipra Publications.

Gurukkal , R. (2012) ‘Convergence of Marx and Gandhi: A Strategic Need Today’. *Social Scientist* , September–October, 64.

Huq, A.M. ‘The Doctrine of Non-Possession: Its Challenge to an Acquisitive Society’ in Diwan, R and Lutz, M(Eds.). *Op.cit*.

IGNOU Material (2011). Unit 6 .‘Gandhian Perspective’. MPA 011. State Society and Public Administration.

Mazumedar , S (2004). *Socio-Political Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi*. New Delhi , India: Concept Publishing House.

Parekh, B.(1995). *Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*. New Delhi, India: Ajanta.

Parekh, B. (1989). *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*. New Delhi, India: Sage.

Parel, A. J. (Ed.) (1997). *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*, New Delhi, India: Cambridge University Press.

Rao U.R and Prabhu R.K (Eds) (2009). *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House: 137.

Sethi, J.D. (1978). *Gandhi Today*. New Delhi, India: Vikas Publishing House: 148.

Terchek, R. J. (2000). 'Gandhian Autonomy in the Late Modern World' in Anthony J. Parel (Ed.), *Gandhi, Freedom and Self Rule*, New Delhi, India: Vistaar.

Tikekar, I. (1970). *An Analytical Study of Gandhian Thought*, Varanasi: Sarv Seva Sangh Prakashan: 110.

---

## 2.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

---

### Check Your Progress 1

1) Your answer should include the following points:

- Village Republics.
- Self-rule.
- The autonomy of the individual.
- Sense of power among its people.
- Strong and vibrant local communities.
- Cooperation among people
- Self-governing local communities
- Gandhi's dream of *gram swaraj* has been translated into Panchayati Raj.

### Check Your Progress 2

1) Your answer should include the following points:

- Gandhi's Trusteeship is deeply related to his ideas on end of exploitation and inequality.
- Trusteeship plays an important role in establishing a non-exploitative society.
- It has its bases in *Bhagwad Puran* and *Bhagwad Gita*.
- It means non-possession.
- Service and non-selfishness are key concepts in Trusteeship.
- It is a means of transforming the present capitalist order or society into an egalitarian one.
- It does not recognise any right of private ownership of property except in so far as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare.
- It does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.
- Under State-regulated Trusteeship, an individual will thus not be free to hold or use wealth for selfish satisfaction or in disregard of the interests of society.
- In Trusteeship, just as it is proposed to fix a decent minimum living wage,

even so a limit should be fixed for the maximum income that would be allowed to any person in society.

2) Your answer should include the following points:

- Gandhi's Theory of Trusteeship was translated into reality by Vinoba Bhave.
- Bhave called it Trusteeship *Vishwastvratie* . It means faith (*Vishwash*) of public on merchant class (*Vanik*).
- Bhoodan or *Gramdan* Movements of Bhave achieved some degree of Trusteeship.
- Eradication of poverty was the main agenda of Vinoba's *Gramdan* movement.
- In Bhave's views, wealth is not the creation of a single individual.
- He believed in land reforms and distribution of surplus land to the poor.
- Ownership of goods is minimum and largely collective or belonging to community as a whole.



ignou  
THE PEOPLE'S  
UNIVERSITY

