

Chapter I

State Formation: A Theoretical Overview

The process of state formation as a subject of historical research is not a new one. Anthropologists and historians have propounded certain concepts about the transition of political society from tribalism to a state system and identified certain causative factors in the process of emergence of early states. These causatives are equally important to conceptualize the process of origins of the early Indian states. On the other hand, the medieval Indian state formation is more interesting area of historical inquiry both among the Indian and non-Indian scholars than the early Indian states. But emergences of tribal states in the peripheral regions of India in pre-colonial period are theoretically different from the states of central zones. However, careful historical studies on pre-colonial Northeast India have identified few causative factors in the process of tribal state formation.

1.1. Early State Formation: An Anthropological Approach.

Macro and micro level anthropological studies on the transition of tribalism in multidimensional perspectives have conceptualized this transition either as a 'political evolution' ¹ or as a 'processual development'. The evolution was 'linear' and has been observed as a 'transition from bands to tribe' and from 'chiefdom to state' ² but the preconditions and causatives of transformation were not mono-causal. To Morton H. Fried, it was an evolution of political society 'from egalitarianism to state through the rank and stratified society'. ³ But E.R. Service identified the process as the transition of band society to tribe and from tribe to state through the chiefdom. ⁴ These stages of evolution in reality, however, always was not lineal and did not exist equally.

The cultural anthropologists have identified certain causatives for the societal change and origin of the state from a stateless stage. 'Warfare' has been viewed as an important causative that had a decisive role in the making of a state. ⁵ But 'warfare' always was not a prime mover for political evolution although it reinforces the cohesiveness of centralization of authority of the emerging state and it acts as the mechanism of state formation. ⁶

To R.L.Carneiro warfare was the 'mechanism' that accelerated the process of political evolution 'from autonomous village to the state'. He argued that state formation goes through certain stages in certain conditions. State arises where the availability of agricultural land was restricted and to acquire circumscribed agricultural land caused the war among the autonomous villages. Aggregation of villages by a chief had transformed the villages into a greater political identity and formed the chiefdom. Conquest of chiefdom by another had increased the size of the political units while the number of chiefdom was decreased and eventually unified under the banner of a strong chief who centralized the political power and led to the formation of a state. The individual war heroes then occupied newly formed political offices to decree and enforce laws, collect taxes, organize labour and draft men for war. Second step was the concentration of resource where availability of food was restricted and exploitable area became occupied and competition over cultivable land was increased and warfare became the means of resource concentration. It further accelerated the political integration beyond the village level. Finally, Carneiro argues that social circumscription or population pressure in the central area of the territory pressurized over the land that led the crystallization of larger political units and formation of states.⁷

In case of the secondary states also 'war and state making goes together'. In the European context, Charles Tilly argued that 'internal warfare' made by the local chiefs to establish him as a dominant figure with substantial territory and extraction of the means of war such as --men, arms, food, lodging, transportation etc; had a significant role in the formation of states. Successful extraction activities led to the making of state. As a by product, it created organization in the form of a tax collection agencies, police forces, courts, exchequers, account keeper; then it again led to state making. Again expansion of military organizations as standing army, war industries, supporting bureaucracies, were grew up as a state making process. In the state making process, the managers of states formed alliances with specific social classes. The member of those classes loaned resources and provided technical service or helped to ensure the compliance of the rest of population.⁸

Stratification has been viewed as an essential precondition for the emergence of a state because of stratified group's involvement in 'intra-group' and 'inter-groups'

conflicts⁹ and 'elite formation' for socio-political control of the society. On the other hand 'technology' has been visualized as a major variable of state formation¹⁰. 'Control over irrigation and its management by the managerial groups in pre-industrial agricultural societies' has been identified by Karl Wittfogel as a major causative of early state formation.¹¹ Apart from managerial function, those who had access to good agricultural land accumulated power.¹² Irrigation although strengthens the centralization of authority, it was neither a necessary nor a sufficient cause of state's emergence.¹³ Growth of urban centers and trade, at the same time precipitated the social differentiations and accelerated the growth of social-stratification;¹⁴ an essential prerequisite for state formation.

Formation of managerial groups in the society was another aspect of early state formation. Elman R. Service argues that the government of the state had been originated through the institutionalization of centralized leadership. In the egalitarian societies (bands and tribes) leadership was not permanent but transmitting and accepted because of an individual's charismatic qualities, his role as sensible leader of the society, integrator and mediator in disputes and peacekeeper. Leadership became a regular activity when it became linked with the acquiring and redistribution of commodities. The chiefdom emerged when the office of the leaders came to be regularly filled, typically by inheritance.¹⁵ In the chiefdom, leader's personal power was institutionalized to form a hierarchy of subsidiary offices. The hierarchical authority reduced the kinship structure and this stage was an intermediary to the rise of state from a band society.¹⁶ However, Elman R. Service denies or recognizes minimum role of other forces like warfare, population growth and urbanization in the formation of a state.¹⁷

The Marxists promulgate the theory that the material condition and the mode of production of a society are essential precondition in transforming its political structure and social behavior in a particular ecological environment. Lewis H. Morgan¹⁸ described the probable stages of social evolution and the characteristics of primitive society which was basically 'communistic', lacking commerce and entrepreneurs, private property, classes of rich and poor and a despotic ruler. In fact, a tribal council without a strong leader used to make decision in those societies. The increased production brought about by a technological improvements eventually led to the

generation of surplus and its arbitrary appropriation by a small segment of the society led to the emergence of private property, class system, sociopolitical institutions and state. Changes in natural environment and population size led to the growth of 'Asiatic mode of production' along the river sides of the Orient having managerial bureaucratic institutions for controlling the irrigation system by a despotic ruler in a stable (unchangeable) economy. On the other hand 'in the ancient world' wrote Marx, 'commerce and the development of commercial capital resulted in a slave economy'¹⁹ which enabled the rise of city-states. Frederick Engel had expanded the ideas of Morgan. He held that technological improvement as a means of production had increased surplus which traded increasingly and resulted in the emergence of middlemen, entrepreneurs, private wealth and culminated in the emergence of economic class.²⁰ To him 'state is the product of society at a certain stage of development'²¹. Marxian line of thoughts on the origin of state as a whole, describes the conversion of human being and their labour products into use by wealthy elites and 'coercion' is the mechanism which accelerated the growth of socio-political institutions for appropriation of surplus and mode of production is determinate factor of state emergence and development.

While the state was dependent for its income to the variety of sources such as - taxation, fines, the arbitrary performance of menial services to the state, revenues from trade, booty and tribute extracted from neighbouring people; the rulers have to control the society for which organized bureaucratic apparatus was essential.²² Controlling power of the state was increased with the centralization of ruling authority, enabling the ruling section to appropriate surplus, generated in the territory (for technological development). Efforts of maximization of ruler's influence had created contradiction among the ruled. So legitimization of rule was required.²³

It appears from the foregoing discussions that origin of early states cannot be explained by a particular causative like- warfare, population growth, institutionalization of leadership, material condition with mode of production and environmental circumscription. Or 'no single causative is axiomatic as the prime mover of origins of the state'. Without denying the applicability of the aforesaid causatives it can be assumed that 'various interrelated persuasive factors caused the origin of the state'. Social growth caused by the ecological changes had increased the

'population size' that began the warfare, maximized the size of political units and established chiefdom (from a village) with subsidiary offices. Inequality and exploitation of surplus by a small section had centralized the authority in a changing societal format²⁴ which demands heavy organizational abilities for state's survival and further development.' Thus H.J.M. Claessen has categorically expounded the following points about the early state.²⁵

1. The state has a population sufficient to make possible social stratification and specialization.
2. Residence or birth determines its citizenship in the territory.
3. The government has centralized power to maintain law and order through the use of force and authority.
4. The government has to prevent external threat and internal separatist forces.
5. The population was so stratified that the emergent ruling section (small) and the ruled could be distinguished.
6. Productivity is high enough to ensure regular surplus for the maintenance of state organization.
7. The state had a common ideology on which the legitimacy of the ruling stratum is based.

Like the early state, the secondary states had also certain stages in their formations. A secondary state was originated from a primary state in the same region and the process was not dissimilar from that of the primary state. Barbara J. Price has argued that the 'secondary states' were formed as a result of the expansion of other states, themselves either pristine or secondary.²⁶ She also notes that once the process of formation of state has been initiated 'secondary' states go through the changes similar to those of primary states.²⁷ Similarly H.J.M. Claessen and Peter Skalnik expounded the idea that both primary and secondary states go through gradual and similar developments.²⁸

1.2 Early Indian States.

Studies on early states evident from the archeological explorations while enriched theoretical understanding of the origins of state and its features, India in spite of being an unique area of early civilization is less concerned by the anthropologists although thoughts on state are fairly old in India. To Kautilya (4th century B.C) state is comprised with seven elements namely – a sovereign head (*svamin*), minister (*amatya*), populated territory (*janapada*), fort (*durga*), treasury (*kosa*), coercive power (*danda*) and a friend (*mitra*)²⁹. But it cannot explain the origin of state in the Indian

subcontinent. Romila Thapar, however, has tried to conceptualize the process of early state formation in the first millennium B.C. in the mid-Ganges valley. She thinks that 'it was a transformation of a lineage society into a stratified society with concentration of wealth into a center and not for any single persuasive factors. Peasant-economy, rise of towns and commercial growth had accelerated the social differentiation. Reciprocal relationship between the ruler and ruled was legitimized by a *kshatriya* rule (traditional ruling-caste and wielder of military power)'.³⁰

In fact, the Vedic society was pastoral and less stratified. Differentiation began in such society only in the Later Vedic period. By the 5th century B.C., social differentiation had been established firmly with the extensive use of iron that considerably propelled the production system and contributed to the fortification and urbanization.³¹ So transition of 'pastoral tribal society' in the mid-Ganges plains began in the monolithic- chalcolithic phase but the societal format was changed considerably with the revolution in the production system and led to the formation of state in the region.³² From the 6th century B.C. onwards state-system in India began to develop with more complexity particularly with the confirmation of *varna* (caste) as a marker of social differentiation. Beside the monarchical form of government, republican system is also known in India in the 6th century B.C.³³

First historical empire-state was originated in India in the 4th century B.C. with larger territory and elaborate state machinery under the Mauryan rulers. Decline of the Mauryan Empire led to the rise of small states in India throughout the country. Cholas, Pandyas, Cheras in South India, Kalinga in Eastern India and a number of powers in Northern India had been emerged as states particularly when the 'Central Asian tribes' entered into India in the early centuries of A.D.. However, empire state was revived in India with the rise of the Gupta Empire in the 4th century A.D.. But its decline once again stimulated the formation of smaller states throughout the country. Decentralized force together with regional development led to the formation of small but viable states in Eastern and Northeast India too. Sasanka of Gauda (Bengal) and Vaskarvarman of Kamarupa (Brahmaputra valley) were emerged as independent ruler in the 7th century A.D..

The early states, ancient Indian empires and smaller states have been interpreted with different approaches. The Romanticists have constructed ancient India as a land of

'spirituality, a distant utopia.'³⁴ Utilitarian have viewed the Indian states as 'monarchical institution with a hierarchical bureaucracy with loosely concentrate power' where everyone exercise absolute authority in their own way for which ancient Indian government was barbaric and rude in character.³⁵ They identified the Indian socio- political and economic system dominated by caste and religious ideology. The Nationalists on the other hand, have attempted to interpret the Indian states as unitary and strong state with a centralized bureaucracy, headed by a strong monarch. On the contrary, Imperialist School ³⁶ had developed the concept of *Oriental despotism* having similarity with Marxian model of the 'Asiatic mode of production'. Marx left the pre-modern Indian states in an unchanging position with a strong central coercive power for external warfare and internal exploitation of static village communities having the capability of increasing agrarian surplus with irrigation system .³⁷ However, Marxian notion have been seriously challenged by the recent studies which show that early Indian society was not in a stagnant position but developed systematically.³⁸

Different schools and their studies although recognized the 'system of state' in ancient India with power-centrality, a bureaucracy having capability of surplus extractions, a 'defence system' for protection of the state from the external attacks and other essential characteristics of a state but the process of formation of state is hardly procurable from these studies. However, interesting contributions have been made by several scholars in recent years to conceptualize the process of the early Indian state formation, which viewed the state as the 'culmination of transition of lineage or tribal society' through the social growth where caste system or *Varna* formation was an internal dynamics.³⁹

1.3. Medieval Indian States

The studies on state formation in early Indian context have stressed more on the 'state-system' but process of formation of the medieval Indian states have been examined critically by the historians. In spite of rejection of the 'Asiatic mode of production' as a state-system in Indian context, Marx's influenced concept of 'Indian feudalism' is a major concern for the historians engaged in the studies on medieval Indian state formation after the 1950's. ⁴⁰ 'Indian feudalism' model has identified the early medieval states as the 'decentralized' and 'fragmented' entities, originated from earlier centralized state due to the feudalisation of society and economy. The major

cause of feudalisation of early medieval Indian state was the ever-increasing number of (rent- free) lands, granted to the Brahmins and religious institutions since the early centuries A.D. and later to the government officials⁴¹. Freedom from taxation with special prerogatives of the grantees led to the emergence of intermediaries aggravated by the urban decay, decline of interregional trade and the paucity of coins in the 'post-Gupta period'.⁴² Structural change in the economy was resulted to the political fragmentation of centralized bureaucratic state and led to the rise of feudal components, designated as '*samanta*'⁴³. The *Samantas* since the 6th century A.D. had propelled the destabilization of the economic and political centrality of the former centralized state and led the formation of 'decentralized state system'⁴⁴.

While applicability of feudalism is basically confined to the studies of medieval North Indian states, South India had witnessed a different type of state formation process in the early medieval and pre-colonial times. 'Segmentary state' concept has been applied to the studies of the South Indian states. This concept has been brought from Aidan Southall's study on Alur society in Africa⁴⁵. Burton Stein, being influenced by Southhall has visualized the medieval state formation in South India as the 'continuum of governance ... formation' between the 'tribal stateless form of government' and a patrimonial state'⁴⁶. Segmentary state concept has been further extended to the studies on the Rajput states⁴⁷.

The concept of segmentary state is based on certain premises. Multiple locations of political domains having internally differentiated social structure, autonomous administrative capabilities and coercive means had formed the political structure of the segmentary state. The political domains were stratified and ranked, occupationally diverse and varied culturally even ecologically, which displayed complimentary opposition. The political power and sovereignty are differentiated in such a way that autonomy enjoyed by these political centers but sovereignty wielded by a king. Variations in sizes and capacity of these domains were arranged pyramidally with central, intermediate and peripheral zones in the segmentary state system in the Chola times⁴⁸. In spite of several attacks and methodological criticism⁴⁹, segmentary state concept continues as a 'state model' for the study of the medieval South Indian states.

Major medieval India empires such as the Delhi Sultanate and the Mughal Empire, were formed through the continuous warfare, formation of new administrative pattern and ideologies. In spite of voluminous and monumental researches⁵⁰ and conceptualizations, these states are often designed as patrimonial bureaucratic state.⁵¹ Similarly conventional notion of Indian states places the state as a 'unitary, centrally organized and territorially defined kingdom with a bureaucracy'.⁵² But the process of state formation is less concerned than the state system.

1.4. State Formation in the Peripheral Region.

Extension of statehood into the tribal hinterland and state formation from tribalism in the peripheral regions have their 'structural nearness' with the aforesaid models of medieval Indian state formation. But their applicability are doubtful to the process of tribal state formation. Because pre-colonial Indian states have been analyzed either as a 'given entity' or 'fragmented identity' (from a given centralized state). While 'Oriental despotism' is static, segmentary states are confined to the South Indian states and patrimonial bureaucratic states were controlled by the strong royal family with an well organized bureaucracy; transformation of tribal society of Northeast India, Eastern India or remote periphery of the Indian subcontinent in pre-colonial period can not be described as the consequence of the decentralization of economic and political structure of the state. Certain researches on the formation of states from tribal stages, however, have attempted to conceptualize the process of transformation. James Haitzman,⁵³ B.D. Chattopadhyaya,⁵⁴ Surajit Sinha,⁵⁵ Hermann Kulke,⁵⁶ Amalendu Guha,⁵⁷ Sofia A. Maretina⁵⁸ and many other scholars⁵⁹ have identified few stages and causative factors in the process of tribal state formation. Such stages were -- peasantization of the tribals or transformation of tribal economy⁶⁰, surplus generation through technological upliftment,⁶¹ and its extraction by the state by coercive means and warfare, building trading networks,⁶² extension of caste-based social hierarchy,⁶³ centralization of political power, state patronage to the caste-culture and religious institutions⁶⁴, legitimation of political power by social means⁶⁵. Expansion of political power from the nuclear area (center of the origin) to the extended territories in spite of the formation of a core political region, was failed to transform 'mono-

center state' to a provincialized state system. The tribal states were comparatively small in size and were govern by chiefs who assisted by an advisory council. These states were permanently settled in a particular geographical region and the main purpose of the existence of these states was to maintain internal law and order and waging aggressive and defensive wars. These states were homogenized by a common culture, religion, language and economic interest.

1.4.1.Precolonial Northeast Indian States.

Emergence of states from tribalism in the 16th century in the multiethnic peripheral regions of Northeast India is identical theoretically with the models of the early state formation developed by the anthropologist. The Northeast Indian tribes such as--Ahom, Kachari, Chutia Meitei, Dimasha, Jayantia, Koch, etc., adopted different variables of state formation, already developed in the region which stimulated other causatives of state formation. Adoption of advanced techniques and technologies in the production system had transformed the subsistence economy of the tribes into a surplus generating economy. Appropriation of surplus, centralization of political power and its legitimization through the adoption of the exogenous (non-tribal) culture (caste-culture) were gone together. So the researches on pre-colonial Northeast Indian states with anthro-historical perspective have identified few internal dynamics of state formation.

Most elaborate and well documented case study of Northeast Indian tribal state is the Ahom kingdom (A.D.13th to early 19th century). The Ahom tribe originally migrated from 'Muang Mao' (original homeland) under the leadership of Shukhapha (1228-1268 A.D) and landed in the wide valley of Upper Assam early in the 13th century while they were in the secondary stage of socio-political evolution with stratified society having political experience and tradition of Muang polity (proto-state/chiefdom). The Tai-Ahoms in their *muang* polity were small in size and territory and ruled by a *muang* chief called *chao* (lord) ⁶⁶They were scattered in villages and fragmented into household units and were acquainted with wet-rice cultivation. The settled rice cultivation with the capacity of surplus generation under a common polity had begun the state formation process. Since the 18th century A.D. the Ahom ruling family began to legitimize its rule over ethnically diverse 'ruled' including Hindu and non-Hindu population, through the adoption of exogenous culture. The king adopted

the deified Hindu title like *svargadeo* and the kingship was detribalized gradually⁶⁷. New offices and institutions were introduced and by the 17th century the political process was completed⁶⁸. Theoretically, the Ahom state was emerged due to the unequal access to the resources and through the useful association of the people or social group having benefits from central control.⁶⁹ Warfare, conquest and hydraulic culture⁷⁰ were related factors. As a whole, the Ahom state emerged as a despotic state, economically viable supported by hydraulic culture, with military adventurism and political centrality, legitimized by cultural tools of feudalistic cult;⁷¹ through a long process of transition of the tribalism.

The Kachari state was the transformation of early settled⁷² village communities (clan) of the 13th century into a state system with the hierarchical social development⁷³ by the 16th century. The Kacharis adopted the Hinduism for legitimizing their rule beside the synchronic maintenance of tribal religious culture.⁷⁴ The structure of polity was monarchical⁷⁵ but the villages were autonomous, highly influenced by the ecological set up.

One unique case of evolutionary state is the formation of the Meitei state in Manipur which emerged without exogenous influences. Uniclan villages had initiated the process of the indigenous chieftaincy formation and 'head of the major clans' had achieved the power of social and political control.⁷⁶ Inter-clan feuds for controlling more lands led to the formation of tribal militia and other service relationships. Eventually the Meitei clan had overpowered other clans due to its favourable geo-political location and accentuated the political authority of the 'clan chief' which had been formerly diffused in the clan by adding a kingship. In the second stage, the king (Lainingthou) approached the village level priests, administrative head of the chieftaincies, and with their support he centralized the political authority. In the final stage, the Meitei state come into contact with the contemporary Northeast Indian states and inspite of immense socio-cultural influence from the Hinduism and the *Vaishnavism*, it maintained its primordality.

Like the Meitei, the Jayantia state also has been identified as an evolutionary state. In the beginning, the Jayantia tribe was guided by the clan leadership (*U-Langdoh*). But inter-clan feuds and regular raids initiated the unification of different village settlements. In that stage, sacred and secular duties of the *Langdoh* were

bifurcated between *Lungdoh* and *Doloi*. Secular duties and nominal political authority of the *Dolois* with the formation of village council led the Jayantias to form a proto-state stage. External influence led to the formation of the confederacies among the *Dolois* but no *Doloi* came forward to take absolute leadership like a *Raja* (king of traditional Indian politics). Rather, the king was elected. Hence, the king was ' *kin shyim munroo* ' or the slave king. The *Dolois* were independent in their *elaka* (*Raid* or division) but had responsibility to pay nominal tribute to the king during the time of ritual ceremonies. Gradually a council of minister was created in the Jayantia polity. Divine myth of the origin the *shyim* was attached. As a whole the Jayantiya state completed its formation through the evolutionary process from family to clan village to *doloiship* to *shyimship* and finally exogenous influence⁷⁷ modified the indigenous structure of the state.

State formation in Mizoram was comparatively a later political development. The Mizos (tribe) were fragmented into few mutually conflicting tribal groups having segmentary chieftaincy (petty state) prior to the 18th century. Warfare and elected Kingship (which transformed into a hereditary kingship) completed the process of state formation⁷⁸ in present Mizoram in the 18th century A.D..

The Chutia tribe of upper Assam being *hinduized*⁷⁹ assumed non-tribal socio-political symbols in the 12th century and after subjugating neighbouring area had established a kingdom in the present Shibsagar and Lakhimpur districts of Assam. Like other tribal states of Northeast India, 'warfare' was a major internal dynamics for the Chutia state formation. By the 16th century they emerged as a political power with considerable strength⁸⁰. Similarly, Laur⁸¹ and Tripura kingdom were also came into existence with sufficient strength and viable economic structure. The exogenous caste-culture patronized by the Tripura state for legitimization of King's rule over the tribe and non-tribes, hypothetical⁸² genealogy of the king was prepared to show the king's traditional right of governance.

1.4.2. Process of Tribal State Formation in Northeast India

A brief survey of the pre-colonial Northeast Indian tribal states shows the basic form of sociopolitical evolution from lineage or clan based villages to state system through the intermediaries like 'proto state' and 'chiefdom' etc. Their transition to state

system from tribalism reveals the following basic requisites and processual developments of a state in pre-colonial Northeastern India:

1. Tribal society with lineage or clan based villages, settled or migratory (nomadic) which were socially cohesive.
2. Intra-clan feuds or inter-tribal conflicts for more fresh land had precipitated the formation of broader socio-political units for providing leadership.
3. 'Warfare' under the 'leadership of the tribal chief' for collection of booties had strengthened the economic base of the emerging state. Successful warfare enhanced the power and position of the chief and led to the formation of a tribal-peasant militia and also had given a shape of semi-territory.
4. Technological acculturation and adoption of ecologically suitable tools in production systems of the settled tribal villages resulted into the generation of surplus.
5. Surplus appropriation either through ritual ceremonies or introducing elaborate bureaucracy for regularization of revenue concentration of surplus met the basic economic needs for the emergence of a state.
6. Ruling authority of the king (chief) became hereditary with the addition of a fictitious divine connection that legitimized his rule. Adoption of exogenous (caste-culture) cultural ideologies of hierarchical domination and subordination and its diffusion to the tribe by the state began the process of cultural change. Synchronic maintenance of primordial culture had opened the routes of cultural synthesis and 'localization of adopted culture' to make it adaptive for the tribes. It further legitimizes the transition of tribal chiefship to kingship.
7. Status of the state was dependent on the level of supporting economy with market networks having a common currency, specialization in crafts; militarily organized territorial defence, the maintenance of internal law and order, institutionalization of administrative machinery, and redistribution of concentrated surplus to the ruled through building of universally beneficial institutions and works etc.

Transitional stages, however, were always not identical. But internal dynamics of state formation were interlinked. Socio-cultural change was slow while political development was comparatively faster.

With the theoretical background mentioned above we'll examine the process of state formation of the Koch tribe. The Koches had their tribal societal format and mode

of production and their transition is identical with other tribal states of Northeast India which would be evident in the subsequent chapters of the work.

Notes and References

1. Morton H. Fried: *The Evolution of Political Society: An Essay in Political Anthropology*, (New York, Random House, 1967).
2. K.V. Flanery: The Cultural Evolution of Civilization. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematic*. 3(1972), pp.401-404; Ted C. Lewellen: *Political Anthropology: An Introduction*, (South Hadley, Bergin & Garvey, 1983), pp.18-38.
3. Morton H.Fried: *op. cit.*, pp. 27- 242.
4. Elman R. Service: *Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective*, (New York, Random House, 1962).
5. R.L.Carneiro: A Theory of Origin of State. *Science* 169(1970), p.734.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, pp.734-338..
8. Charles Tilly: War Making and State Making as Organized Crime, in Peter B.Evan.D. Ruechemeyer and Theda Skocpol (eds): *Bringing the State Back* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985), p.183.
9. Elman R. Service: Classical and Modern Theories of the Origins of Government, in Ronald Cohen and Elman R. Service (eds): *Origins of the State: The Anthropology of Political Evolution*, (Philadelphia, Institute for the study of Human Issues, 1978), pp.21-32.
10. J.H. Steward: *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution* (Urbana, University of Illiones Press, 1955).
11. Karl Wittfogel: *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963).
12. Ramila Thaper: *From Lineage to State: Social Formations in the Mid-First Millennium B.C. in the Ganga Valley*, (Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1984), p.7.

13. Eva Hunt and Robert C. Hunt: Irrigation, Conflict and Politics: A Mexican Case, in Ronald Cohen and Elman R. Service (eds): *Origins of State* (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 68-123.
14. R. McC Adams: *The Evolution of Urban Society*, (New York, Aldine Publishing Co., 1966).
15. Henry T. Write: Recent Research on the Origin of the State, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 6(1977), pp. 379-397.
16. Elman R. Service: *Origin of the State and Civilization: The Process of Cultural Evolution*. (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1975), pp.290-308.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 266-289.
18. Lewis H. Morgan: *Ancient Society or Researches in the Line of Human Progress from Savagery Through Barbarism to Civilization*. (Mac Millan & Co., 1877), reprint ed., (Cambridge, 1964).
19. Karl Marx: *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, edited by T.B. Bottomore and Rubal Maximillan, reprint ed., (New York, Penguin Books, 1982), pp. 124-25.
20. Frederick Engles: *The Origin of the Family Private Property and the State*, (1st published, Zurich, 1884), reprint ed., (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1983).
21. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
22. H.J.M. Claessen: The Internal Dynamics of Early State, *Current Anthropology* 25(1984), pp. 265-79.
23. *Ibid.*, p.368.
24. Societal format means the numbers of people living in a particular territory and to the spatial distribution of the population over its surface
25. H.J.M. Claessen and Peter Skalnik (eds): *The Early State*, (The Hague, Mouton Publishers, 1978), pp.586-89.
26. Barbara J. Price: Secondary State Formation: An Explanatory Model, in Ronald Cohen and Elman.R. Service (eds): *Origins of the State*, p.179.
27. *Ibid.*, pp.161-186; also Ronald Cohen: Introduction, in Ronald Cohen and Elman R. Service: *Origins of the States*, p.12.
28. H.J.M. Claessen and Peter Skalnik: *The Early State*, pp. 533-650.

29. For details about the concept of state of Kautilya and the useful reading of the *Arthashastra*, see the following translations of the *Arthashastra*, R. Shyamasastry (ed and tr.): *Kautilya Arthashastra*, 5th ed., (Mysore, 1956); R.P. Kangle: *The Kautilya Arthashastra*, reprint ed., (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1997); L.N. Rangarajan (ed and tr.): *The Arthashastra*, (Penguin Books, 1972).
30. Romila Thapar: *From Lineage to State: Social Formation in the Mid First Millennium B.C in the Ganga Valley*, (Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1984), pp.155-73.
31. R.S. Sharma: *The State and Varna Formation in the Mid Ganga Plains: An Anthropoarchaeological View*, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Manohar, 2001).
32. *Ibid.*
33. Anant Sadashiv Altekar: *State and Government in Ancient India*, reprint ed., (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1997), pp.109-138.
34. The Romanticists like Mounstuart Elphinstone (*History of Hindu and Muhamedan India*), Grant Duff (*A History of Maharattas (2vols)*, 1825, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Associated Publishing House, 1971) and James Tod (*Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan or The Central and Western Rajpoot States of India (2 vols., vol. I, 1829, vol. II, 1832)*, reprint ed., two volumes in one, (London, Rutledge and Kegan Poul Ltd., 1950) had taken favourable view on Indian History and showed a more sympathetic understanding to the problems of India.
35. James Mill and his followers had developed the utilitarian view on Indian history. James Mill: *History of British India (2Vols.)*, 1806, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Associated Publishing House, 1972).
36. The Imperialist School had the sole purpose to glorify British rule in India. W.W. Hunter (*A History of British India, (2vols)*, London, Longman Green and Company, 1899; *History of the Indian People*, (1903), reprint ed., New Delhi, Cosmo Publications, 1984), V.A. Smith (*The Early History of India: From 600 B.C. to the Muhamedan Conquest*, (Oxford, 1924), revised by S.M. Edwards, 4th ed., (London, Oxford University Press, 1957) and others have represented the concept of 'Indian despotism'.
37. Hermann Kulke (ed): *The State in India 1000-1700*, (Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1995), p.2.

38. Researches of well-known scholars on early Indian society are showing that Indian society was not a stagnant one. For details following works can be followed- R.S. Sharma: *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institution in Ancient India*, 2nd ed., (Delhi, 1968); R.S. Sharma: *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India*, (Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal 1983); R.S.Sharma: *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India*, reprint ed., (Madras, Mac Millan India Ltd., 1992); Romila Thaper: *Ancient Indian Social History*, reprint ed.,(Delhi, Orient Longman,1996) ;D.N. Jha : Social Change in Ancient India. *EPW*, XIV 35(1st September 1979), pp.1499-1500.
39. Romila Thaper: *From Lineage to State*, R.S. Sharma: From Ganapati to Bhupati, *Studies in History* 11.2(1980); R.S. Sharma: *The State and Varna Formation in the Mid-Ganga Plains: An Ethno-archaeological View*, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Manohar, 2001); R.S.Sharma: *Origin of the State in India*, (Bombay, Bombay University, 1989); S.Seneviratne: Kalinga and Andhra: The Process of the Secondary State Formation in India, *IHR* 7.1-2(1980-81), pp. 54-69;and so on.
40. D.D. Kosambi has conceptualized the Indian feudalism in his well-known work, *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, (Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1956). After Kosambi, a series of articles and monographs have been contributed to the studies on Indian Feudalism. Like-R.S. Sharma: Origins of Feudalism in India (c AD 400-650) *J E S H O*, 1 (1957), pp.297-328; R.S. Sharma: Land Grants to Vassals and Officials in Northern India (A.D. 1000-1200), *JESHO*, 4(1961), pp.70-105; R.S.Sharma: *Indian Feudalism: C300-1200*, (Calcutta, Calcutta University, 1965); R.S.Sharma: 'Methods and Problems of the Study of Feudalism in Early Medieval India'. *IHR*. 1(1974), pp.81-84; R.S. Sharma: *Early Medieval Indian Society: A Study in Feudalisation*, (Kolkata, Orient Longman Ltd., 2001); R.S.Sharma: *Material Culture and Social Formation in Ancient India*, reprint ed., (Madras, Mac Milan India Ltd., 1992); D.N. Jha: *Early Indian Feudalism: A Historiographical Critique*, (Presidential Address, Medieval India Section, Indian History Congress, 40th Session. 1979); B.N.S. Yadav: *Society and Culture in North India in the 12th Century*, (.Allahabad, 1973); Harbans Mukhia(ed): *Feudalism Debate*, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Manohar, 2000). Antagonists of Indian Feudalism also contributed to its

- study either to criticize the concept or to synthesize it, Like, D.C Sircar: *Landlordism Confused with Feudalism*, in D.C. Sircar (ed): *Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India*: (Calcutta, 1966); B.D. Chattopadhyaya: *Trade and Urban Center in Early Medieval India. IHR 1(1974)*, pp.203-09; Harbans Mukhia: *Was their feudalism in Indian History? JPS.8 (1981)*, pp. 273-310;also reprinted in Harbans Mukhia (Ed): *Feudalism Debate*, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Manohar, 2000), pp.34-81; D.N.Jha(ed): *The Feudal Order, State Society and Ideology in Early Medieval India*, (New Delhi, Manohar, 2000).
41. R.S. Sharma: *Indian Feudalism*, pp.1-23.
 42. Urban decay, decline of interregional trade and paucity of coins are controversial issues in regards to the decentralization of political authority and feudalisation. Certain studies categorically have nullified these causatives. Like- B.D. Chattopadhyaya: *Coins and Currency System in South India: C 225 AD – 1300 AD*. (Ph.D. Thesis Cambridge, 1969); D.C. Sircar: *Early Indian Numismatic and Epigraphical Studies*, (Calcutta, 1970); M.R. Tarafdar: *Trade and Economy in Early Medieval Bengal. IHR 4(1978)*, pp.24-286.
 43. R.S. Sharma: *Indian Feudalism*, pp.23-30.
 44. B.N.S. Yadav: *Society and Culture in North India in the 12th Century*, (Allahabad, 1973), pp.136-157.
 45. Aidan Southhall: *Alur Society: A Study in Process and Types of Domination*, (Cambridge, 1956).
 46. Burton Stein: *The Segmentary State in South Indian History*, in R.G. Fox (ed) *Realm and Religion in Traditional India*, (New Delhi, 1977); Burton Stein: *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*, (Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1980.); Burton Stein: *State Formation and Economy Reconsidered, MAS 19.1 (1985)*, pp-387-413; Burton Stein: *The Segmentary State and Interim Reflections*, in J.M.Pochepepass and H. Stern (eds): *From Kingship to State: The Political in the Anthropology and History of the Indian World* (Paris,1991),pp.217-288; also reprinted in Hermann Kulke (ed) :*The State in India 1000-1700*,pp. 134-161.
 47. R.G. Fox (ed): *Realm and Religion in Traditional India*, (New Delhi, 1977); R.G.Fox: *King, Clan,Raja and Rule: State Hinterland Relation in Pre-Industrial*

India (Barkley, University of California Press, 1971). Burton Stein in his article, *The Segmentary State in South Indian History*, (1977) had applied his concept of the segmentary state primarily to the Chola state. Later it has been extended to Vigaya Nagar (Burton Stein: *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India* 1980).

48. Burton Stein: *Segmentary State: Interim Reflections*, in Hermann Kulke (ed): *The State in India 1000-1700*, pp. 137-139.
49. R.S. Sharma: *The Segmentary State and the Indian Experience*, *IHR. XVI* (1989-90), pp.80-108.
50. Delhi Sultanate and the Mughal Empire were interesting subject of historical writing since the colonial days. Several works have been contributed to these states. Following works are worth mentioning-- W.H. Moreland: *Agrarian System of Moselem India*. (Cambridge, 1929); Ibn Hasan: *The Central Structure of the Mughal Empire* (London, 1936), reprint ed., (New Delhi, Munshiam Manoharlal, 1980); K.M. Ashraff: *Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan*, 2nd ed. (New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1970); I.H. Quraeshi: *Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi*, 5th revised ed., (New Delhi, 1971); K.A.Nizami (ed); *Politics and Society During the Early Medieval Period. Collected Papers of Professor Muhammad Habib*, 2 vols., (New Delhi, 1974-81); Muhammad Habib and K.A. Nizami: *A Comprehensive History of India*, vol.5, *The Delhi Sultanat* (New Delhi, People Publishing House, 1970); Jadunath Sarkar: *Mughal Administration*, reprint ed., (Calcutta, Orient Longman Ltd., 1972); Satish Chandra: *Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court 1707-1740*, reprint ed., (New Delhi, People Publishing House, 1972.); Irfan Habib: *Agrarian System of Mughal India*, revised ed., (Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2000); Tapan Ray Choudhury and Irfan Habib(eds): *The Cambridge Economic History of India* , vol.1, (Cambridge ,1982) ; R.C.Majumdar (Gen.ed.): *History and Culture of People of India*, Vol. VI, 2nd ed..(Bombay, Bharatiya Vidhya Bhavan, 1967) and Vol.VII: *Mughal Empire*, reprint ed., (Bombay, Bharatiya Vidhya Bhavan, 1984); A.L.Srivastav: *Akbar the Great*, 2nd ed., (Agra, Shivalal Agarwal, 1972); A.L.Srivastav: *Mughal Empire 1526-1803*, 8th ed., (Agra, Shivalal Agarwal, 1977), Jagadish Narayan Sarkar: *Mughal Polity*, (Delhi,

- Idarah-I-Adabiyat, 1984); Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (eds): *The Mughal State*, (New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1998); John F. Richards: *The Mughal Empire*, (New Delhi, Cambridge University Press, 1993); and so on.
51. M. Athar Ali: *Towards an Interpretation of Mughal Empire*. (Presidential Address, Medieval India Section, Indian History Congress. Muzaffarpur, 1972), later published in revised form in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1978), pp.38-49; also reprinted in Hermann Kulke (ed): *The State in India*, pp. 278-303; Stephen P. Blake: The Patrimonial Bureaucratic Empire of the Mughals. *JAS*, 39(1979), pp.77-94; Frank Perlin: State Formation Reconsidered, *MAS*, 19.3(1985). Douglas E. Streusand has denied the applicability of the concept of the patrimonial bureaucratic state, segmentary state and Wittfogel's 'Oriental despotic state' to the formation of the Mughal empire. To him, 'Mughal Empire was a hybrid, Islamic in the centre, non-Islamic in the provinces. Mughal government was an imperial center supported by a shifting structure of the segments. Douglas E. Streusand: *The Formation of the Mughal Empire* (Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 181.
 52. No particular name can be suggested for the conventional notion of Indian states. Multi-versal approaches have been adopted to conceptualize the nature of traditional state in India. Mention may be made of the following works: Anant Sadashiv Altekar: *The Rastrakutas and Their Times*. (Poona, Oriental Book Agency, 1935); Anant Sadashiv Altekar: *State and Government in Ancient India*, reprint ed., (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1997); R.K. Mookherji: *Local Government in Ancient India*, reprint ed., (Delhi, 1958); R.C. Majumder: *History of Medieval Bengal*, (Calcutta, G. Bharadwaj & Co., 1973); D.C. Sircar: *Political and Administrative System of Ancient and Medieval India* (Delhi, 1974), etc.
 53. James Heitzman: State Formation in South India 850-1280, *IESHR*, 24(1987), pp.35-61.
 54. B.D. Chattopadhyay: *Political Process and the Structure of Polity in Early Medieval India: Problems of Perspective* (Presidential Address, Ancient Indian

- Section, Indian History Congress. 44th Session, Burdwan, 1983); also, in Hermann Kulke: *The States in India*, pp.195-232.
55. Surajit Sinha: State Formation and Rajput Myth in Tribal Central India, *Man in India*, 42(1962), pp.35-80.
 56. Hermann Kulke: 'The Early and the Imperial Kingdom: A Processural Model of Integrative State Formation in Early Medieval India', in Hermann Kulke (ed): *The State in India*, pp. 233-262.
 57. Amalendu Guha: From Tribalism to Feudalism 600-1750, *IHR*. 1(1974), also, in Amalendu Guha: *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam: Society, Polity and Economy*. (Calcutta, K.P.Bagchi & Company, 1991), pp.82-97.
 58. Sofia A. Maretina: The Kachari State: The Character of Early State like Formation in the Hill Districts of Northeastern India, in H.J.M. Claessen and P. Skalnik (eds): *The Early State*, pp.339-358.
 59. Micro level studies on tribal state formations are not numerous in Eastern Indian context. Mention may be made of the following works: --L.K.Mahapatra: Ex Princely States of Orissa, Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar and Bonai, in Surajit Sinha(ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and North Eastern India*, (Calcutta, K.P.Bagchi & Co., 1987), pp.1-50; K.S. Singh: The Choto Nagpur Raj: Mythology, Structure and Ramification, in Srajit Sinha (ed): *Tribal Polities and State System in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, pp.51-72; Hites Ranjan Sanyal: Mallabhum, in Surajit Sinha: *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Eastern and Northeastern India*, pp.73-142; K.S.Singh : *Tribal Society in India: An Anthropo-historical Perspective*, (Delhi, Manohar ,1985) pp.27-52. In case of North India D.N.Jha's study on the Chamba society is also an interesting one. D.N.Jha: *The State Formation in a Peripheral Region: The Case of Early Medieval Chamba*, in D.N.Jha(ed): *The Feudal Order, State Society and Ideology in early Medieval India*, (New Delhi, Manohar, 2000).
 60. Surajit Sinha (ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern Northeastern India*, (Calcutta, P.Bagchi & Co.,1987),pp. i-xxvi.
 61. *Ibid.*, also K.S. Singh : *Tribal Society in India* ,pp.53-69.

62. Surajit Sinha: *Tribal polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, p.i.
63. Hermann Kulke has defined ^{the} process of extensions of hierarchy of the caste society in the tribal society as *kshatriyization*. Hermann. Kulke: *Kshatriyaization and Social Change: A Study in Orissa Setting*, in S.Devdass Pillai (ed): *Aspects of Changing India: Studies in Honour of Prof. G.S.Ghurye* (Bombay, 1976), pp.398-409. To Surajit Sinha it was *Rajputaization*.
64. Hermann Kulke: *Early State Formation and Royal Legitimation in Tribal Areas of Eastern India*, in Rupert R. Moser and Mahun K. Gautam (eds) : *Aspects of Tribal life in South Asia: Strategy and Survival*. (Bern, 1978), pp.29-37.
65. Hermann Kulke: *Kings and Cults: State Formation and Legitimation in India and Southeast Asia*, reprint ed., (New Delhi, Manohar, 2001), pp.93-113.
66. J.N.Phukan: *The Formation and Growth of Tai-Muang State*, *JNEICSSR*. 7.1 (April. 1983), p.2.
67. Amalendu Guha: *The Ahom Political System: An Inquiry into State Formation in Medieval Assam 1228-1800*, in Surajit Sinha(ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, p.154.
68. Amalendu Guha: *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam: Society, Polity and Economy*, pp. 89-94.
69. Ramesh Buragohain: *Presidential Address, (North East India History Association , XXI th Session, Manipur University, Imphal, 2000)*, pp.5-6.
70. Hydraulic culture of upper Assam and the Brahmaputra valley was, however, not identical with Wittfogel's hydraulic hypothesis (*Oriental Despotism*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1957, p.18) of voluntaristic state formation. Wittfogel sees the origin of state in following way-'In certain arid and semi arid areas of the world where village farmers had to struggle to support themselves by means of small-scale irrigation, a time arrived when they saw that it would be to the advantage of all concerned to set aside their individual autonomy and merge their villages into a single large political unit capable of carrying out irrigation on a broad scale. The body of officials they created to devise and administer such extensive irrigation works brought the state into being. 'R.L.Carneiro: *A Theory of Origin of State, Science, 169(1970)*, p.734.

71. Romesh Buragohain: *loc. cit.*, pp.6-7; also Amalendu Guha: *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam*, pp.82-97.
72. R.M.Nath: *Background of Assamese Culture* (Shillong, 1949), p.72.
73. Sofia A. Maritina: *loc. cit.* p.445.
74. J.B Bhattacharjee: Dimasa State Formation in Cachar, in Surajit Sinha (ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, p.205.
75. *Ibid.*
76. R.K.Saha: State Formation Among the Meitei of Manipur, in Surajit Sinha (ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, p.236.
77. B.Pakem: State Formation in Pre-colonial Jayantia, in Surajit Sinha(ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, pp.256-258; J.B.Bhattachrjee: The Pre-Colonial Political Structure of Barak Valley, in Milton S.Sangma (ed): *Essays on North-East India*, (New Delhi, Indus Publishing Company, 1994), pp.68-69.
78. B.B.Goswami: Mizos in the Context of State Formation, in Surajit Sinha(ed): *Tribal Polities and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and Northeastern India*, pp.307-327.
79. K.L.Barua: *Early History of Kamarupa : From the Earliest Times to the end of the Sixteenth Century*, (Shillong , 1933), p.272
80. N.N.Acharyya: *The History of Medieval Assam*, reprint ed., (Delhi, Omsons Publications, 1984), pp.232-238.
81. J.B.Bhattacharjee: *Pre-Colonial Structure of Barak Valley*, p69.
82. Kailash Chandra Singha: *Rajamala Ba Tripurar Itihas*, reprint ed., (Agartala, Akshar Publications, 1405 B.S.), p.15.