Naivigyan Journal of Multidisciplinary Research **(NJMR)**
Volume 2, Issue 3, July 2026, Pages: 1-8
Original Article | ISSN (O): 3108-1487

The Political Economy of Kautilya: State, Market, and Society

Thomas Mathew*

Associate Professor, PM Govt College Chalakudy - 680722, Kerala, India
*Corresponding Author's Email: thomasthodukayil@gmail.com

Abstract

Kautilya holds a significant position in the development of political and economic thought. His work, *Arthashastra*, written around the fourth century BCE, offers one of the earliest comprehensive studies of governance, public administration, economic management, diplomacy, and statecraft. In contrast to numerous ancient philosophical writings that prioritized ethical principles, *Arthashastra* adopts a practical and institutional perspective on political economy. Kautilya believed that economic prosperity served as the basis for state power and societal stability. The government was tasked with the duties of regulating markets, managing public resources, maintaining law and order, and enhancing public welfare. This paper explores Kautilya's political economy through the interrelated aspects of the state, market, and society.

Keywords: Kautilya, Arthashastra, Political Economy, State, Public Finance, Economic Development

Introduction

The study of political economy seeks to understand the relationship between political institutions, economic systems, and social structures. Modern political economy is often associated with thinkers such as Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Max Weber, and John Maynard Keynes. But there emerged important contributions centuries earlier in non-Western intellectual traditions too. Kautilya is regarded as one of the most remarkable political and economic thinkers of ancient India. His book *Arthashastra* is a comprehensive treatise on governance, statecraft, administration, diplomacy, military strategy, and economic management. Kautilya served as the chief advisor to Chandragupta Maurya and played a significant role in the establishment and consolidation of the Mauryan Empire. His ideas reflect a deep understanding of the relationship between political power, economic prosperity, and social stability (Bisht, 2019; Thapar, 2012)

The concept of political economy refers to the interaction between the state, economic institutions, and society. In Kautilya's thought, these three elements are mutually dependent. He believed that the strength of a state depended largely on its economic resources and that political authority could only be sustained through effective economic management. According to Kautilya, wealth (artha) was the foundation of all state activities. It enabled rulers to maintain administration, ensure security, promote public welfare, and achieve political objectives. Consequently, the *Arthashastra* places considerable emphasis on economic policies, revenue administration, taxation, trade regulation, agriculture, labour management, and public finance (Bhat, 2023).

One of the most distinctive features of Kautilya's political economy is his conception of the state as an active participant in economic life. Unlike the modern idea of a minimal state that limits its role in economic affairs, Kautilya advocated extensive state involvement in production, distribution, and regulation. He assigned the government responsibility for maintaining market stability, preventing economic exploitation, supervising trade, managing public resources, and protecting consumers. At the same time, he recognised the importance of private enterprise and commercial activity as sources of wealth and economic growth. This combination of state intervention and market activity reveals a pragmatic approach that sought to balance economic efficiency with social welfare (Kumar, 2005).

Kautilya also emphasised the welfare of society as a central objective of governance. He argued that the prosperity and happiness of the people were essential for the stability and legitimacy of the state. The ruler was expected to protect citizens from poverty, famine, corruption, and external threats while creating conditions conducive to economic development. His recommendations regarding public welfare, disaster relief, infrastructure development, and administrative accountability demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the social dimensions of economic policy (Singh, 2017). The significance of Kautilya's ideas extends beyond their historical context. His emphasis on efficient governance, fiscal responsibility, and welfare-oriented policies offers valuable insights for modern policymakers and scholars. This study examines Kautilya's political economy through the interconnected dimensions of state, market, and society, highlighting both its historical significance and its continuing relevance in contemporary political and economic discourse.

Materials and Methods

The present study adopts a qualitative and descriptive research methodology to examine Kautilya's political economy with special reference to the relationship between the state, market, and society. Since the study focuses on understanding and interpreting historical ideas, concepts, and institutions rather than testing empirical hypotheses, a descriptive research design is considered most appropriate. The objective is to provide a systematic analysis of Kautilya's economic and political thought as presented in the *Arthashastra* and to assess its relevance in the contemporary context. The study is primarily based on secondary sources of data.

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the concept of political economy, which examines the relationship between political institutions, economic systems, and society. Kautilya's political economy is founded on the principle that economic prosperity is the basis of political stability and social welfare. He considered *artha* (wealth and material well-being) as an essential objective of governance because the strength of the state depended upon its economic resources. According to Kautilya, a prosperous economy generates revenue for the state, supports administrative functions, strengthens military capabilities, and improves the welfare of the people. Therefore, economic management was regarded as a fundamental responsibility of the ruler (Mishra, 2012).

This study uses Kautilya's integrated approach to state, market, and society as the theoretical foundation for analysing his political economy. The framework highlights the mutual dependence between governance, economic development, and social welfare, demonstrating how Kautilya envisioned a balanced system in which political authority, market activity, and societal well-being worked together to achieve stability and prosperity. His ideas provide a useful lens through which contemporary issues of governance, development, and economic regulation can be understood and evaluated (Chousalkar, 2004).

Results and Discussions

Kautilya's concept of the state represents one of the earliest and most comprehensive theories of governance in ancient India. Kautilya viewed the state as the central institution responsible for maintaining order, ensuring security, promoting economic prosperity, and safeguarding the welfare of its people. His understanding of the state was highly practical and administrative, emphasising effective governance rather than abstract philosophical ideals. Unlike many ancient thinkers who focused primarily on the moral or divine basis of kingship, Kautilya approached the state from the perspective of political realism and public administration. For him, the strength and stability of a kingdom depended on the efficiency of its institutions and the prosperity of its subjects (Boesche, 2002).

A key feature of Kautilya's theory of the state is the Saptanga theory, also known as the Theory of Seven Elements of the State. According to this theory, a state consists of seven interdependent components: the king (*Swamin*), ministers (*Amatya*), territory and population (*Janapada*), fortified capital (*Durga*), treasury (*Kosha*), army (*Danda*), and allies (*Mitra*). Kautilya believed that these elements collectively determined the strength and effectiveness of a state. If any one of these components became weak, the stability of the entire political system would be threatened. Among these elements, the treasury was considered particularly important because it provided the financial resources necessary for administration, defence, public works, and welfare activities (Kamal, 2022).

The king occupied a central position within the state structure and was expected to act as a wise, disciplined, and capable ruler. Kautilya emphasised that the ruler's primary duty was to protect and promote the welfare of the people. The legitimacy of the ruler depended not merely on authority or power but on his ability to ensure prosperity, justice, and security for the population. A successful king governed efficiently, maintained law and order, and worked for the collective good of society. Kautilya also advocated a highly organised and centralised administrative system. He recognised that effective governance required competent ministers, trained officials, and a well-structured bureaucracy. Various departments were established to oversee taxation, agriculture, trade, mining, forests, defence, and public works. Administrative officials were expected to perform their duties honestly and efficiently (Kishor, 2021).

Another important aspect of Kautilya's concept of the state is its active role in economic affairs. He rejected the notion that the state should remain passive in matters of production and distribution. Instead, he argued that the government should regulate markets, supervise trade, promote agriculture, manage natural resources, and support economic development. The state was responsible for creating conditions that encouraged wealth generation while preventing exploitation and economic instability. Kautilya believed that economic prosperity was the foundation of political power, and therefore economic management was one of the most important functions of the state.

Security was also a fundamental responsibility of the state. Kautilya stressed the importance of maintaining a strong military and an effective intelligence network to protect the kingdom from internal rebellions and external threats. He regarded national security and economic prosperity as closely connected, arguing that a secure state could focus on development, while economic strength provided the resources necessary for defence. His emphasis on strategic planning and state security reflects the practical orientation of his political thought (Rangarajan, 1992).

Kautilya's concept of the state presents a holistic and pragmatic model of governance that integrates political authority, economic management, administrative efficiency, and social welfare.

Through the Saptanga Theory, he provided a detailed framework for understanding the structure and functions of the state. His vision of a strong, welfare-oriented, and economically active state highlights the importance of effective institutions, responsible leadership, and public welfare. The principles articulated in the *Arthashastra* continue to hold relevance in contemporary discussions on governance, state capacity, economic development, and public administration (Saad & Wenxiang, 2003).

Public finance and taxation constitute one of the most significant aspects of Kautilya's political economy. In the *Arthashastra*, Kautilya presents a detailed framework for revenue collection, financial administration, budgeting, and expenditure management, demonstrating a sophisticated understanding of economic governance. He regarded a strong treasury as the foundation of an effective state and emphasised that financial stability was essential for maintaining administration, defence, public welfare, and economic development. According to Kautilya, the prosperity of the state depended largely on its ability to generate and manage revenue efficiently while ensuring that taxation did not become a burden on the people (Trautmann, 2012).

Taxation was the primary source of state revenue in Kautilya's economic system. However, he did not support excessive taxation. Instead, he emphasised moderation and fairness in tax collection. Kautilya famously compared taxation to a bee collecting honey from flowers without damaging them. This analogy illustrates his belief that taxes should be collected in a manner that does not discourage production, trade, or economic activity. Excessive taxation, according to Kautilya, could lead to public dissatisfaction, economic decline, and political instability. Therefore, the state should maintain a balance between its financial needs and the welfare of its subjects (Sen R. K., 1990).

Kautilya's ideas on public finance and taxation reveal a highly developed understanding of fiscal policy and economic administration. His emphasis on moderate taxation, diversified revenue sources, efficient financial management, and public accountability reflects principles that remain relevant in modern public finance. By linking taxation with economic prosperity and social welfare, Kautilya developed a balanced approach to fiscal governance that continues to offer valuable insights for contemporary policymakers and scholars of political economy (Mathur, 2008).

In Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, the market occupies a vital place within the broader structure of political economy. He recognised trade, commerce, and artisanal production as essential contributors to economic prosperity and state revenue. However, unlike modern laissez-faire economic thought, Kautilya did not view markets as self-regulating systems. Instead, he emphasised the need for continuous state supervision to ensure fairness, prevent exploitation, and maintain economic stability. His approach reflects a regulated market system in which economic freedom operates under the guidance and control of a strong administrative authority (Sen A., 2002).

Kautilya understood that markets could generate wealth only when supported by proper institutions and regulatory mechanisms. He therefore assigned the state the responsibility of overseeing commercial activities and ensuring that trade was conducted in an orderly and transparent manner. The state regulated key aspects of economic exchange, including pricing, weights and measures, quality control, and trade practices. Standardisation was considered essential to prevent fraud and ensure consumer trust. Officials were appointed to inspect goods, monitor marketplaces, and enforce regulations related to trade and commerce (Kautilya, 2021).

Kautilya's views on market and economic regulation reveal a balanced and pragmatic approach. He neither advocated unrestricted market freedom nor complete state monopoly over economic activity. Instead, he proposed a system in which the state actively regulated markets to promote fairness, prevent exploitation, and ensure stability. His ideas anticipate many modern regulatory practices, including consumer protection laws, competition policy, quality control systems, and price stabilisation measures. Thus, Kautilya's framework remains highly relevant in understanding the role of regulation in achieving efficient and equitable economic outcomes (Sharma, 2002).

Diplomacy and trade were closely linked in Kautilya's political economy. He viewed foreign relations as an extension of economic policy, where alliances, treaties, and negotiations often had commercial implications. Trade agreements were used to strengthen political ties, while economic leverage could be used to achieve diplomatic objectives. This integration of commerce and diplomacy reflects Kautilya's pragmatic and strategic approach to international relations (Ali, 2006).

Kautilya's perspective on trade, commerce, and international relations demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the economic and political dimensions of exchange. He recognised trade as a source of wealth, state power, and diplomatic influence, while also emphasising the need for regulation, security, and strategic control. His ideas reveal an early form of economic diplomacy in which commerce and foreign policy were closely interconnected. These principles remain relevant in contemporary discussions on globalisation, international trade policy, and economic security (Sihag, 2005).

A comparative analysis of Kautilya's political economy with modern economic thought reveals both striking similarities and fundamental differences in their understanding of the role of the state, markets, and society. Kautilya's *Arthashastra* presents a highly structured and interventionist model of governance in which the state plays a central role in regulating economic activity, managing resources, and ensuring social welfare. In contrast, modern economic theories encompass a wide spectrum, ranging from classical liberalism, which advocates minimal state intervention, to Keynesian and developmental approaches that support active state involvement in economic management (Regmi, 2025).

When compared with classical liberal economists such as Adam Smith, a clear distinction emerges. Smith emphasized the efficiency of free markets guided by the "invisible hand, (Smith, 2017, p. 32)" arguing that limited government intervention would lead to optimal economic outcomes. Kautilya, however, did not believe that markets were self-correcting. He viewed the state as essential for regulating prices, preventing monopolies, controlling hoarding, and ensuring fair trade practices. While Smith trusted market forces to regulate themselves, Kautilya relied on administrative oversight and institutional control to maintain economic balance (Sihag, 2005).

In contrast, Kautilya's ideas show greater similarity with Keynesian economics, which supports active state intervention to stabilise markets and manage economic fluctuations. Like Keynes, Kautilya recognised that economies are vulnerable to crises such as famine, scarcity, and market disruptions. He advocated state action in the form of public works, food distribution, and resource management during emergencies. This reflects an early understanding of counter-cyclical economic intervention, where the state steps in to stabilise the economy during periods of distress (Regmi, 2025).

Kautilya's framework also shares important parallels with modern developmental state theory, as seen in countries like Japan, South Korea, and Singapore. These states actively guide economic development through strategic planning, industrial policy, and investment in key sectors. Similarly, Kautilya supported state control over strategic industries such as mining, salt production, and defence-related manufacturing, while allowing private enterprise to operate in other sectors. This mixed economic model highlights a balance between state ownership and market participation aimed at achieving long-term economic growth (Chakraborty & Dutta, 2021).

In comparison with socialist economic systems, Kautilya's model differs significantly in its approach to private property and enterprise. While socialism advocates extensive or complete state ownership of the means of production, Kautilya permitted private ownership and encouraged individual participation in agriculture, trade, and crafts. However, unlike pure capitalist systems, he placed strict regulatory controls on economic activity to prevent exploitation and ensure public welfare. This positions his thought closer to a regulated mixed economy rather than any extreme economic ideology (Bhavsar, 2023).

Another important comparative dimension is governance and public administration. Modern public finance systems emphasise transparency, accountability, and institutional checks and balances. Kautilya also stressed accountability and introduced detailed mechanisms for auditing, monitoring officials, and preventing corruption. His recognition of bureaucratic inefficiency and misuse of public funds aligns closely with contemporary concerns in governance and public sector management (Skare, 2013).

Overall, the comparative analysis shows that Kautilya's political economy cannot be easily categorised within modern ideological frameworks. Instead, it represents a pragmatic and flexible system that integrates elements of state intervention, market functioning, and welfare orientation. His model anticipates several features of modern mixed economies and developmental states while maintaining a distinct emphasis on centralised authority and administrative control. This makes Kautilya's thought both historically significant and analytically relevant for understanding the evolution of economic governance. Kautilya's political economy, as articulated in the *Arthashastra*, continues to hold significant relevance in contemporary discussions on governance, economic policy, and development. Although written in an ancient historical context, many of his ideas reflect enduring principles of statecraft, economic management, and public welfare that can be meaningfully related to modern challenges faced by both developing and developed economies.

Conclusion

One of the most important areas of relevance is governance and public administration. Kautilya placed strong emphasis on administrative efficiency, accountability, and strict supervision of officials. He recognised corruption as a major threat to the functioning of the state and proposed detailed mechanisms for auditing, inspection, and punishment of misconduct. In today's context, corruption and bureaucratic inefficiency remain major governance challenges across many countries. His stress on transparency, monitoring systems, and ethical administration aligns closely with modern ideas of good governance, institutional integrity, and public sector reform.

Kautilya's ideas are also relevant in the field of economic development and state intervention. He viewed the state as an active participant in promoting agriculture, infrastructure, and industrial production. This developmental role of the state is reflected in modern economic planning, particularly in emerging economies where governments invest heavily in infrastructure, rural development, and strategic industries. His recognition that economic prosperity is essential for political stability also resonates with contemporary development theory, which links economic growth with governance effectiveness and social progress.

Kautilya's *Arthashastra* presents one of the most systematic and pragmatic visions of political economy in ancient thought. His ideas integrate the functioning of the state, the dynamics of the market, and the welfare of society into a coherent framework aimed at achieving stability, prosperity, and effective governance. Unlike purely ethical or philosophical traditions, Kautilya's approach is grounded in realism, emphasising practical solutions to administrative, economic, and political challenges. Kautilya viewed economic prosperity as the foundation of state power and social order. The state, in his framework, is not a passive institution but an active agent responsible for regulating markets, promoting agriculture, managing public finance, and ensuring social welfare. At the same time, he recognised the importance of private enterprise and trade, advocating a balanced system where market activities operate under state supervision. This demonstrates his preference for a mixed economic model that combines regulation with productivity.

The emphasis on efficient taxation, strong administrative systems, anti-corruption measures, and strategic economic planning reflects an advanced understanding of governance and public finance. The comparative and contemporary analysis of his ideas shows that Kautilya's political economy remains highly relevant in addressing present-day challenges such as corruption, inequality, market instability, and governance inefficiencies. His insights anticipate several features of modern economic systems, including regulatory institutions, welfare states, and developmental governance models. Kautilya's political economy offers a timeless framework that bridges ancient wisdom with modern economic thought. While certain aspects of his system reflect the historical context of his time, the core principles of accountability, efficiency, regulation, and welfare continue to provide valuable guidance for contemporary policymakers. His work stands as a foundational contribution to the history of political economy and remains an enduring source of insight into the relationship between state, market, and society.

References

Ali, S. (2006). Kautilya and the Concept of Good Governance. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 375-380.

Bhat, R. M. (2023). Economic Governance and Piblic Finance in Kautilya's Arthasatra. *International Journal of Social Science,Educational Economics,Agricutural Research and Technology, 2*(7), 211-218.

Bhavsar, P. (2023). Economic Thoughts of Kautilya. *Worldwide International Inter Disciplinary Research*, 32.

Bisht, M. (2019). *Kautilya's Arthasashtra:Philosophy of Strategy.* Delhi: Routledge India.

Boesche, R. (2002). *The First Great Political Realist Kautilya and his Arthasastra.* Newyork: Lexington Books.

Chakraborty, S., & Dutta, D. (2021). The Healthy Integration:Modern Economics and Chanakya's Arthasastra. *BSSS Journal of Commerce, 13*(1), 91-119.

Chousalkar, A. S. (2004). Methodology of Kautilya's Arthasastra. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 55-76.

Kamal, K. (2022). *Kautilya"s Arthasastra:Strategic Cultural roots of India"s Contemporary Statecraft.* London: Routledge.Kautilya. (2021). *Arthasatra.* New Delhi: Prakash Books India Pvt Ltd.

Kishor, N. (2021). Kautilya's Saptanga Theory in Understanding Comprehensive National Power. In Suresh, *Arthasasthra of Kautilya:Relevance in 21st century* (pp. 66-78). Delhi: vij books.

Kumar, A. (2005). The Structure and Principles of Public Organisation in Kautilya's Arthasatra. *The Indian Journalof Political Science*, 463-488.

Mathur, B. (2008). Kautilya-The Art of Governance. *Indian Journal of Public Administration, 54*(4), 785-802.

Mishra, S. (2012). Kautilya's Mandala Theory. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(1), 145-148.

Rangarajan. (1992). *Arthasastra.* Delhi: Penguin Books.

Regmi, K. K. (2025). Bridging the Gap:Kautilya's Arthasastra and Modern Economics. *The Journal of Academic Development, 9*(1), 64-88.

Regmi, K. K. (2025). Bridging the Gap:Kautilya's Arthasastra and Modern Economics. *The Journal of Academic Development, 9*(1), 64-88.

Saad, M., & Wenxiang, L. (2003). National Security in Kautilya's Arthashastra:A Content Analysis. *The Journal of Military History, 67*(1), 9-37.

Sen, A. (2002). *The Argumentative Indian.* Delhi: Penguin Books.

Sen, R. K. (1990). Taxation Principles During Kautilya's Age. *The Indian Economic Journal, 37*(4), 133-138.

Sharma. (2002). *Ancient India:Political Thought and Institutions.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sihag, B. S. (2005). Kautilya on Ethics and Economics. *Humanomics*, 1-28.

Sihag, B. S. (2005). Kautilya on Public Goods and Taxation. *History of Political Economy, 37*(4), 723.

Singh, M. P. (2017). Kautilya:Theory of State. In H. Roy , & M.P.Singh, *Indian Political Thought :Themes and Thinkers* (pp. 50-62). Noida: Pearson.

Skare, M. (2013). The Missing Link:From Kautilya's The Arthasastra to Modern Economics. *Journal of Philosophical Economics, 6*(2), 2-31.

Smith, A. (2017). *The Wealth of Nations.* London: Sheba Blake Publishing.

Thapar, R. (2012). *Asoka and the Decline of Mauryas.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trautmann, T. (2012). *Kautilya and Arthasastra.* Delhi: Motilal Banarssidas.