



Moral Values Reflected in Kautilya's Arthashastra

Dr A. Asani Kashaemei^{1*}

^{1*} Assistant Professor, Department of English, Don Bosco College (Autonomous) Maram, Manipur.
(asani@dbcmaram.ac.in)

Corresponding Author: Dr A. Asani Kashaemei (asani@dbcmaram.ac.in)

Received Date: **22-05-2026** | Revised Date: **30-07-2026** | Accepted Date: **11-09-2026** | Published Date: **29-09-2026**

ABSTRACT

The Arthashastra, authored by Kautilya in the fourth century BCE, serves as a seminal treatise that unites political realism with a deep commitment to moral governance. This study explores Kautilya's ethical framework, which integrates dharma (righteousness), public welfare, and pragmatic statecraft, thereby establishing the state as a moral institution dedicated to social well-being. Central to this vision is rajdharma, the ethical duty of leadership, which demands integrity, accountability, and service to the common good. The Arthashastra prescribes virtues such as honesty, loyalty, and social responsibility for rulers and officials while instituting mechanisms to combat corruption and ensure administrative transparency. It further extends moral concern to vulnerable social groups, advocating for welfare policies and regulated social practices that balance order and compassion. While rooted in a patriarchal context, Kautilya's gender ethic reflects both protection for women and pragmatic regulation, revealing tensions between traditional norms and governance needs. This moral-political synthesis, where ethical leadership coexists with necessary political realism, continues to inform contemporary discussions on governance, accountability, and social Justice. The lasting significance of Kautilya's Arthashastra lies in its articulation of a governance model that reconciles moral idealism with state necessity, offering valuable insights for modern political ethics and leadership in complex societies.

Keywords: Kautilya, Arthashastra, Vyasanas, Sucittva, Satya

Introduction

The Arthashastra of Kautilya, also known as Chanakya or Vishnugupta, stands as one of the most comprehensive and sophisticated treatises on statecraft, economics, and moral philosophy in ancient Indian thought. Composed around the fourth century BCE, this seminal work presents a multidimensional framework of governance that harmonises pragmatic political strategy with ethical and moral obligation. Far from being a mere manual of political expediency, the Arthashastra reflects a deep moral philosophy rooted in the Dharmashastra tradition, which posits that righteousness (dharma), Justice, and public welfare constitute the moral foundations of legitimate rule. In this sense, Kautilya's political theory conceptualises the state not merely as an instrument of coercive power but as a moral and social institution fundamentally dedicated to the well-being and security of its citizens.

Modern interpretations of Kautilya often mischaracterise his political realism as moral cynicism, focusing narrowly on his advocacy of espionage, deception, and at times ruthless statecraft. However, such readings overlook the ethical context within which Kautilya situates political action. His philosophy integrates moral principles with administrative necessity, permitting the use of seemingly harsh measures only when they serve the greater ethical goal of safeguarding the kingdom and maintaining social order. Thus, rather than opposing moral behaviour to pragmatic governance, Kautilya redefines morality in functional terms, aligning it with the collective good. His synthesis of dharma and artha—righteous duty and material well-being—demonstrates an early articulation of moral pragmatism, in which the ruler's ethical responsibility ensures the endurance of both political authority and social harmony.

Central to Kautilya's ethical vision is the cultivation of virtues such as discipline (dhama), honesty (satya), loyalty (nistha), and social responsibility (samaja-dharma). The Arthashastra prescribes these values not only for rulers but for all functionaries of the state, ministers, judges, and public servants, whose integrity forms the moral backbone of effective governance. Administrative efficiency, in Kautilya's view, cannot be divorced from ethical accountability. Even in judicial and punitive affairs, his approach blends pragmatism with compassion, seeking proportional Justice that preserves social stability while reflecting concern for human dignity and equity.

Beyond political administration, the Arthashastra extends its moral framework to issues of social welfare and gender ethics, offering insights that transcend its historical context. Although embedded within a patriarchal order, Kautilya advocates for the social protection and economic participation of women, especially widows, the elderly, and pregnant women. His insistence on moral regulation, rather than exploitation, in occupations such as prostitution illustrates his broader concern with moral discipline, societal order, and human dignity at all levels of society. This comprehensive ethical outlook underscores Kautilya's vision of a state in which social Justice and moral values are integral to administrative efficacy.

Ultimately, Kautilya's Arthashastra articulates a vision of governance informed by a dynamic balance between moral idealism and political realism. It envisions a ruler guided not by personal ambition but by the pursuit of Justice, compassion, and the common good. His belief that a state's true strength lies in the moral character of its leaders and the ethical foundation of its institutions resonates profoundly with contemporary debates on political morality and governance. As modern societies continue to grapple with moral dilemmas in public life and policy, revisiting Kautilya's integration of ethics and statecraft offers valuable insight into how leadership grounded in dharma can sustain social order, legitimacy, and collective welfare.

In this context, the present study examines the moral and ethical dimensions of Kautilya's Arthashastra, situating it within the broader intellectual tradition of ancient Indian political thought. Drawing on the interpretations of Rangarajan (1992), Pandey (2015), and Boesche (2003), among others, it explores how Kautilya's fusion of dharma and artha continues to inform discussions of political ethics, state legitimacy, and governance in both classical and modern frameworks.

Methodology

This study examines the moral precepts expressed in Kautilya's Arthashastra using both descriptive and analytical research approaches. The descriptive technique is used to provide a concise, methodical explanation of Kautilya's views on social organisation, ethics, and government as they appear in the text. It aims to describe how the political and administrative structure of ancient India incorporates ideas like dharma (righteousness), fairness, honesty, and public welfare. The research seeks to situate Kautilya's ethical philosophy within the broader philosophical and cultural traditions of his era, particularly those rooted in the Dharmashastra legacy, by outlining its fundamental concepts.

The analytical approach is used in addition to description to assess Kautilya's moral philosophy's applicability, meaning, and ramifications. His opinions on gender roles, ethics, and leadership are thoroughly examined, including their relation to contemporary moral and political discourse. The analytical method enables the researcher to evaluate Kautilya's practical harmony between political realism and moral idealism, as well as investigate how his moral precepts can influence modern administration, social policy, and governance.

By combining descriptive and analytical viewpoints, this work offers a thorough comprehension of the moral aspects of Kautilya's Arthashastra. In addition to examining the theoretical foundations of Kautilya's moral philosophy, it also analyses its lasting relevance in light of contemporary political ethics, leadership responsibility, and the advancement of social welfare.

Concept of Moral Values

Moral values constitute the foundational principles that enable individuals to distinguish between right and wrong, Justice and injustice, and good and evil. They form the ethical basis of human behaviour, perception, and interaction within society (Frankena, 1973). Rather than being abstract notions, moral values operate as concrete normative standards that shape personal character, promote social harmony, and enhance collective well-being. These values underlie ethical living by fostering behaviours rooted in integrity, Justice, empathy, and mutual respect, both in private and public life (Schwartz, 2012).

Philosophically, moral values embody an internalised sense of virtue and duty that governs interpersonal relationships and sustains social cohesion (Taylor, 1989). They function as an ethical compass, guiding moral reasoning and collective life by influencing cultural and institutional behaviour. Universal moral principles such as honesty, integrity, compassion, fairness, responsibility, tolerance, and respect are widely regarded as indispensable for peaceful coexistence and human progress (Rokeach, 1973). As products of collective conscience, moral standards are deeply embedded in theological, philosophical, and cultural traditions (MacIntyre, 1981). The formation of moral reasoning and ethical habits is shaped through education, family upbringing, and social experience. Thus, moral principles are both individual and communal constructs that define ethical identity and uphold the moral fabric of society. Ultimately, the cultivation of moral awareness is vital for producing responsible citizens, fostering social trust, and ensuring that human actions contribute to the collective good (Durkheim, 1953).

The Importance of Moral Values

Moral values are central to both personal development and social stability. On an individual level, they act as an internalized ethical system that guides judgment, directs conduct, and shapes moral character (Kohlberg, 1981). Through socialization within families, schools, religious institutions, and cultural contexts, individuals acquire moral dispositions that help them discern right from wrong, moderate self-interest, and act with fairness and empathy toward others (Bandura, 1991). The internalisation of virtues such as honesty, accountability, and compassion strengthens moral agency, the capacity to make responsible ethical decisions and accept accountability for one's actions (Rest, 1986).

At the societal level, shared moral norms underpin institutional legitimacy and social cohesion. Common ethical standards reduce uncertainty in interpersonal relations and enhance cooperation

by establishing expectations of trustworthy behaviour (Fukuyama, 1995). Societies grounded in values such as Justice, reciprocity, and respect for others tend to generate higher levels of social capital, networks of trust and mutual responsibility that sustain civic institutions, markets, and democracy (Putnam, 2000). Conversely, the weakening of shared moral values often results in institutional corruption, social cynicism, and systemic fragility (Sen, 2009).

In governance and law, moral values form the normative foundation for rights, duties, and public policies. Legal systems derive part of their legitimacy from alignment with widely held moral principles that reflect collective ethical understanding (Rawls, 1999). Values such as Justice, fairness, and respect for human dignity influence the formulation of laws and administrative systems, while ethical leadership strengthens institutional credibility through integrity and commitment to the common good (Beauchamp, 2001).

Moreover, moral values serve as catalysts for constructive social change and peaceful conflict resolution. Shared ethical frameworks enable parties to resolve disputes through dialogue and restorative practices rather than coercion or violence (Habermas, 1996). Social movements advocating equality, rights, and Justice often invoke universal moral principles to mobilise support and legitimise their agendas (Nussbaum, 2011).

Political Realism, Ethical Leadership, and Moral Agency in the Arthashastra

Kautilya's Arthashastra represents one of the earliest and most comprehensive treatises on statecraft, ethics, and governance within ancient India. Its ethical framework integrates the principles of dharma (righteousness), nistha (loyalty), and satya (honesty), which collectively guide the moral conduct of rulers, ministers, and citizens. According to Kangle (1963), dharma in Kautilya's philosophy transcends the domain of individual morality, serving as the binding principle that upholds both governance and social order. This moral foundation ensures that political authority remains accountable to ethical ideals rather than arbitrary power. In this context, loyalty and honesty, denoted as nistha and satya, respectively, become indispensable virtues for administrative stability and the maintenance of public trust (Sharma, 1996).

The Arthashastra establishes institutional mechanisms to ensure integrity, imposing rigorous ethical checks and condemning corruption as a direct threat to political stability. Administrative roles are framed within systems of accountability and surveillance to deter misconduct (Boesche, 2003). However, while the text permits the use of espionage or coercion during crises, such measures are bound by moral constraints aimed at safeguarding the common good rather than fulfilling personal ambition. This tension between pragmatic governance and moral restraint illustrates Kautilya's sophisticated understanding of realpolitik within an ethical paradigm.

Kautilya also envisions governance as a moral institution tasked with the welfare of the people. The Arthashastra explicitly mandates the protection and support of vulnerable groups, including widows, pregnant women, and the elderly (Rangarajan, 1992). This approach to governance reflects a commitment to social Justice and compassion that complements the text's ethical principles. The ruler, depicted as the guardian of his subjects, bears the responsibility to enact policies that foster social harmony and economic equity. Taxes, market regulation, and legal protection are identified as the principal instruments through which Justice and welfare can be actualised (Pandey, 2015).

Moreover, Kautilya advocates proportionality and fairness in the administration of punishment, emphasizing the balance between deterrence and compassion. Even in professions considered socially contentious, such as prostitution or the liquor trade, the emphasis is not on prohibition but on regulation to ensure hygienic and honest practices (Sihag, 2014). This pragmatic ethic affirms a socially grounded vision of governance, where moral governance aligns with administrative efficiency. Ultimately, the Arthashastra integrates ethics with statecraft, presenting a coherent model of governance that aspires to reconcile moral duty with political necessity.

Arthashastra presents a sophisticated blend of political realism and ethical leadership, reflecting a nuanced understanding of governance that balances moral principles with the exigencies of statecraft. Political realism, as formulated by Kautilya, recognises that rulers referred to as princes

or kings may engage in covert, coercive, or deceptive actions to preserve state security and ensure political survival. These actions, while seemingly at odds with moral precepts, are recognised as circumscribed exceptions permissible only when they align with the broader objective of dharma and the welfare of the populace (Bajpai, 2001). Such measures are not to serve personal ambition but are constrained within a moral framework that prioritises the longevity and stability of the state.

Integral to Kautilya's thought is a stern admonishment against corruption, accompanied by an emphasis on accountability and transparency in governance. These ideals resonate closely with modern democratic notions of good governance and public administration, underscoring the enduring relevance of Kautilya's political philosophy (Sharma, 1996). The legitimacy of the king's authority, as articulated in the Arthashastra, is fundamentally anchored in his capacity to serve the public good, melding ethical leadership with pragmatic wisdom to sustain state order and societal welfare (Boesche, 2003).

Beyond the ruler, moral agency in the Arthashastra extends robustly to citizens, emphasising the internalisation of ethical values such as honesty, responsibility, and compassion through education and socialisation processes. Kautilya envisages these moral dispositions as essential for shaping individuals capable of sound moral judgment and public-spirited service. This cultivation of virtue serves as the foundation for societal trust and institutional legitimacy, which are critical for economic exchange, political cooperation, and social cohesion. In this way, the Arthashastra situates morality not only within the elite echelons of power but also in the fabric of the broader citizenry, thereby reinforcing a collective ethical ethos vital to the functioning of the polity.

Gender Roles and Protections in the Arthashastra

The Arthashastra by Kautilya stands as a foundational work in ancient Indian political thought, projecting a distinctly patriarchal worldview while simultaneously introducing pragmatic protections for women. The text locates women predominantly within familial and domestic roles, reinforcing the gender norms prevalent in its historical milieu. Yet, this clear endorsement of patriarchal structures is tempered by a nuanced ethic of protection for vulnerable groups, especially widows, pregnant women, and the elderly. For example, provisions within the Arthashastra exempt such women from certain taxes and penalties, indicating a recognition of their social and economic disadvantages and marking an early form of state-sponsored social welfare (Rangarajan, 1992).

Unlike contemporary approaches that might valorise female emancipation, Kautilya's policies were designed to safeguard the social order. The Arthashastra acknowledges women's economic functions beyond domesticity, allowing them participation in regulated trades and specific roles in state service, albeit with rigorous oversight and restrictions that mirrored concerns about maintaining social propriety (Singh, 2010). This focus on regulation rather than empowerment reflects the text's utilitarian philosophy: social stability is prioritised, while ethics are aligned with practical governance considerations.

Of particular significance is the treatment of contentious or stigmatised occupations such as prostitution. Rather than condemning such professions outright, Kautilya approaches them as economic realities subject to state management. The Arthashastra mandates hygienic practices and honest administration in these trades, enforcing regulation for public welfare rather than pursuing moral censure (Pandey, 2015). This pragmatic ethic permeates the entire framework, emphasising order, protection, and utilitarian governance over idealised moral obligations.

While the Arthashastra remains firmly patriarchal, its legislative protections and regulatory frameworks for women evidence a sophisticated engagement with gender, one that seeks to balance prevailing social norms with practical welfare measures. This approach positions Kautilya's treatise as a text both of its time and ahead of it in its recognition and management of gendered vulnerabilities within the complex apparatus of ancient Indian statecraft.

Despite these protections, the Arthashastra circumscribes women's autonomy within a framework that reinforces social hierarchies and patriarchal control. Women's roles extend into economic

activities and state service, but these are heavily regulated, reflecting the state's interest in maintaining social order rather than promoting gender equality (Singh, 2010). Feminist critiques highlight that this regulation reaffirms traditional gender roles, limiting women's freedom and autonomy. This dualism, the protective yet controlling stance on gender, illustrates Kautilya's balancing act between preserving patriarchal norms and addressing the practical needs of governance. While the text's gender ethic may appear limiting from a contemporary perspective, its welfare policies for marginalised women and its recognition of their roles in economic and social structures stand as early examples of state responsibility towards gendered vulnerabilities. This historical tension foreshadows continuing debates on gender Justice and the extent of state intervention in promoting equity and protection

Kautilya's Moral Legacy in Modern Governance

Kautilya's Arthashastra presents a profound synthesis of moral philosophy and pragmatic statecraft that continues to influence contemporary political thought, especially within South Asia. Central to Kautilya's framework is the concept of *rajdharm*, or the duty of kingship, which conceptualises leadership as an ethical service to the public rather than the pursuit of personal power. This notion is closely aligned with modern constitutional values that emphasise integrity, accountability, and the prioritisation of public welfare in governance (Pandey, 2015). Kautilya's articulation of *rajdharm* underscores the importance of rulers conducting themselves with transparency and moral responsibility, reinforcing the principle that political authority is legitimate only when exercised in the service of the common good.

A key aspect of Kautilya's legacy lies in his political realism, a nuanced acceptance that governance requires balancing ethical norms with the practical necessities of statecraft. While he acknowledged that rulers might engage in covert actions, espionage, or coercion, these tactics are permissible only when confined within a strict ethical framework geared towards safeguarding state security and public welfare (Bajpai, 2001). This concern for moral principles alongside political exigency offers valuable lessons for managing complex contemporary political environments, where ethical leadership must contend with pressing security challenges and *realpolitik* considerations.

Furthermore, Kautilya's welfare-oriented approach anticipates modern social policy agendas focused on social Justice and inclusion. His emphasis on protecting vulnerable populations, regulating economic activities for the public benefit, and pursuing legal fairness positions his model of statecraft as one in which governance is not merely about power but also about the equitable distribution of resources and opportunities (Pandey, 2015). The integration of welfare and Justice in his political philosophy underscores the enduring relevance of his insights to contemporary debates on the state's role in promoting inclusive development and social equity.

Arthashastra offers a rich moral legacy that bridges ancient governance with modern constitutional ideals. Its synthesis of *rajdharm*, political realism, and welfare priorities continues to resonate as a timeless guide for ethical leadership and effective governance in complex political landscapes.

References

1. Bajpai, K. (2001). *Political Ideas in Ancient India*. Motilal Banarsidass.
2. Beauchamp, T. L. (2001). *Philosophical Ethics: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
3. Boesche, R. (2003). Kautilya's Arthashastra on War and Diplomacy in Ancient India. *The Journal of Military History*, 67(1), 9–37.
4. Durkheim, É. (1953). *The Division of Labour in Society* (G. Simpson, Trans.). Free Press.
5. Frankena, W. K. (1973). *Ethics* (2nd ed.). Prentice-Hall.
6. Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Free Press.
7. Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (W. Rehg, Trans.). MIT Press.
8. Kangle, R. P. (1963). *The Kautiliya Arthasastra, Part II: An English Translation with Critical*

- and Explanatory Notes. Motilal Banarsidass.
9. Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on Moral Development, Vol. 1: The Philosophy of Moral Development*. Harper & Row.
 10. MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (2nd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.
 11. Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Harvard University Press.
 12. Pandey, S. (2015). Revisiting the Arthashastra: Statecraft, Economic Policy, and Governance. *Journal of Indian Heritage Studies*, 8(2), 45–60.
 13. Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.
 14. Rangarajan, L. N. (1992). *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*. Penguin Books.
 15. Rawls, J. (1999). *A Theory of Justice* (Revised ed.). Harvard University Press.
 16. Rest, J. R. (1986). *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*. Praeger.
 17. Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. Free Press.
 18. Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 11–26.
 19. Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
 20. Sharma, R. S. (1996). *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*. Motilal Banarsidass.
 21. Sihag, B. S. (2014). Kautilya on Ethics, Economics and Governance. *Humanomics*, 30(1), 16–31.
 22. Singh, U. (2010). *A History of Ancient and Early Medieval India: From the Stone Age to the 12th Century*. Pearson Education.
 23. Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Harvard University Press.
 24. Das, B., & Mahjebeen, J. (2026). Campus (in)clusivity: A qualitative analysis of queer students' lived experiences in academic spaces of Assam, India. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 14, 103263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.103263>
 25. Ellena, R., & Nongkynrih, K. A. (2018). Changing gender roles and relations in food provisioning among matrilineal Khasi and patrilineal Chakhesang Indigenous rural people of North-East India. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 13(Suppl. 3), e12560. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12560>
 26. Gardiner, J. K. (Ed.). (2002). *Masculinity studies and feminist theory*. Columbia University Press.
 27. Kharshiing, K. D. (2024). How matrilineal are the Khasis in Northeast India? A critical discourse analysis of gender and identity. *Human Arenas*, 8(3), 725–740. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-024-00422-5>
 28. Kupers, T. A. (2005). Toxic masculinity as a barrier to mental health treatment in prison. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 61(6), 713–724. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20105>
 29. Longkoi, K. T. (2024). Is Naga society egalitarian and democratic? The gender questions on customary law and its practices in Nagaland. *History and Sociology of South Asia*, 18(1), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/22308075231201907>
 30. Longkumer, B. (2023). Assessing the role and identity of Indigenous women in Northeast India. *The Ecumenical Review*, 75(5), 507–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/erev.12827>
 31. McDuié-Ra, D. (2012). Leaving the militarized frontier: Migration and tribal masculinity in Delhi. *Men and Masculinities*, 15(2), 112–131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X11430128>
 32. McDuié-Ra, D. (2012). Violence against women in the militarized Indian frontier: Beyond “Indian culture” in the experiences of ethnic minority women. *Violence Against Women*, 18(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212443114>
 33. McDuié-Ra, D. (2013). Being a tribal man from the North-East: Migration, morality, and masculinity. *South Asian History and Culture*, 4(2), 250–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19472498.2013.768867>

33. Morrell, R. (1998). Of boys and men: Masculinity and gender in Southern African studies. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 24(4).
34. Nongbri, T. (2000). Khasi women and matriliney: Transformations in gender relations. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 4(3), 359–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097185240000400302>
35. Pittman, F. S. (1993). *Man enough: Fathers, sons, and the search for masculinity*. Putnam.
36. Roy, K. (2010). *The power of gender and the gender of power: Explorations in early Indian history*. Oxford University Press.
37. Thapar, R. (2010). *Shakuntala: Texts, readings, histories*. Women Unlimited.
38. Wedgwood, N. (2009). Connell's theory of masculinity: Its origins and influences on the study of gender. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 18(4), 329–339.
39. Yanthan, E. C. (2023). Gendered practice of Naga customary laws: A critical analysis. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 36(8), 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jesbs/2023/v36i81246>