

Tallinn University of Technology

Faculty of Social Science

Ragnar Nurkse School of Innovation and Governance

Chair of Governance

KOEUTH Samuth

**Public Administration in Ancient Cambodia during the
Reign of Jayavarman VII:
*Towards Principles of Buddhist Public Administration***

Thesis submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c. Wolfgang Drechsler

Tallinn

2016

TABLE OF CONTENT

<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</i>	<i>II</i>
<i>DECLARATION</i>	<i>III</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	<i>IV</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM UNDER JAYAVARMAN VII	5
2.1 Jayavarman VII in History.....	5
2.2 Administrative Structure of the Empire.....	6
2.3 Civil Service	12
III. BUDDHIST KINGSHIP AS THE GUIDANCE FOR JAYAVARMAN VII’S PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.....	17
3.1 The Concept of Buddhist Kingship and its Regulatory Ethics and Virtue on Public Administration	17
3.2. Jayavarman VII Herein.....	33
3.3 Substantial Impacts on his Administration	36
IV. CONCLUSION.....	42
V. REFERENCES	44

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work would not have been possible without the support, advice and encouragement from the following institution and individuals. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the AREaS+ program of Erasmus Mundus Action 2, funded by the European Commission, for its financial support of the full Technology Governance Master's program at Tallinn University of Technology's Ragnar Nurkse School of Innovation and Governance. I am also thankful to my advisor, Professor Wolfgang Drechsler, both for his supervision of this thesis, without which it could not have been conceived and completed in time, and for his promotion and encouragement of my studies, and to my fellow MA students and faculty at the Ragnar Nurkse School, including, especially, Department Head Dr. Veiko Lember and Research Director Professor Rainer Kattel. I would also like to pay my deepest respects to my parents and honest love to my wife, Khin Dany, for their continuous encouragement.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this master's thesis, and it has not been presented to any other universities for examinations. This master's thesis has been funded by the European Commission, and this publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

KOEUTH Samuth

Date:.....

The master's thesis meets the established requirements

Supervisor Professor Dr. Dr.h.c. Wolfgang Drechsler

Date:.....

Accepted for examination(date) 2016

Board of examiners of Technology Governance master's thesis

Professor. Dr. Robert Krimmer

ABSTRACT

This paper is not a historical criticism of the ancient Khmer epigraphs but an attempt to accumulate the various references regarding to the principles of Buddhist public administration (PA) that were adopted into the government of king Jayavarman VII. The method of this thesis is constructed based on the conventional literature of Buddhist cannon and on the existing literatures of the government of Jayavarman VII to identify the major principles of Buddhist PA and analyze whether, and if so, how these principles shaped the PA system and policy of his government. Through critical investigation, the results revealed that the Buddhist cannon indicate major administrative principles, including *Seven Conditions of Welfare*, *Ten Virtues for ruler*, *The Practice of Four Sublime States for Harmonious Society*, and *The Avoidance of Four Wrong Courses of Action*, for the rulers and public servants to righteously perform their public duty. The thesis also found out that these principles were fully adopted to righteously guide the administrative reform in the government of king Jayavarman VII, and through the total application of Dhamma in administration, the huge success of his reign, from the public policy point of view, comes from the following factors: 1) the righteous administrative policies, guided by the Buddha's Dhamma, are gentle and motivational; 2) these righteous policies were implemented by perfect persons, viz. the king himself, the Buddhist ministers, and the Buddhist queen, who knew more about the Buddhist virtue; and 3) the king's leadership, under the influence of Buddha's Dhamma, had transformed to be more compassionated and strongly committed for the 'selfless public service' to bring the wellbeing to the citizens. This accomplishment, therefore, characterized Jayavarman VII as the great Buddhist ruler who by example effectively applied the Buddhist administrative principles into his government.

Keywords: Buddhist Public Administration, Non-Western Public Administration, Kingship, Dhamma, Compassion, and Selfless Public Service.



King Jayavarman VII
Source: National Museum of Cambodia

I. INTRODUCTION

Public Administration as a scholarly discipline is just about a hundred years old, whereas public administration as an activity can be traced back to the earliest periods of human history, since men started living in organized society (Nasrullah 2005, 197). In the Western context, for instance, there are many significant references to the practice of public administration in classic texts, such as in Aristotle's *Politics*, Machiavelli's *The Prince* and German Cameralism; whereas the Confucian meritocracy of Imperial China and Hindu polity and Buddhist social-political concepts of India have their root in the millennia of practice in the Eastern context. However, since the development of global academic Public Administration, scholars have been giving almost all of their attention to the Western model, tending to neglect the Eastern one. In contrast, in his studies of Non-Western Public Administration (NWPA), with special focus on the Confucian, Islamic and Buddhist models, Drechsler has emphasized that the study of Eastern Public Administration models is practically and academically important, as some key non-Western paradigms are not only important theoretically, but also carry strong practical relevance today for the optimization of the administration in the respective parts of the world (Drechsler 2013, 3).

By now, there are some alternative administration models that have been suggested to apply to the various regions of the Hindu-Buddhist states of Southeast Asia. This includes the eminent anthropologist Clifford Geertz's notion of the "theatre state" that he used to interpret the case of 19th-century (and later) Bali. According to Geertz, Negara was, in Weber's now-standard sense of the terms, neither a bureaucratic, nor a feudal, nor a patrimonial state, nor a functionally differentiated, systematically graded administrative structure, à la Confucian China or Imperial Rome, nor a system of contractual law propped up by domanial organization, service tenancy and the chivalric ethic, à la Northern Europe in the Middle Ages or Japan before Meiji, nor a distended and militarily developed household *oikos*, à la Islam under the Umayyads or Persia under Darius, but rather an organized spectacles designed to dramatize the symbolic power of Balinese society (Geertz 1980, 62, 121). Under the "theatre state" model, society is governed by rituals and symbols rather than by force.

In addition to Geertz's "theatre state", Bakker lists some other alternative models that have been suggested to apply to these regions. These include Wittfogel's hydraulic society, which stresses the important role of divine kingship in irrigation projects; Marx's Asiatic Mode of Production, which refers to the distinct formation of village communities for extracting surpluses from the peasantry; and Weber's European Feudal, Bureaucratic and Patrimonial-Prebendal State Model, which uses administrative tools for the coercive execution of policy. Bakker himself believes that Weber's ideal type of Patrimonial-Prebendalism best fits the Indianized states of Southeast Asia (Bakker 1988, 282).

However, what these aforementioned models lack, especially when applied to the classical Buddhist states of Southeast Asia, particularly to the case of ancient Cambodia during the reign of King Jayavarman VII (1181- ca. 1218), is a focus on what guided, by the self-understanding of the time, the public-administration system and policy, and that is the Dhamma. Moreover, the abovementioned models are generally based on assumptions that refer to the state structure during the early period of Indianization in these regions, and thus it requires further academic examination to explore the ideal models that could adequately be applied to the case of the Buddhist states of Southeast Asia.

The purpose of this thesis, however, is to investigate what a specifically Buddhist Public Administration – in Drechsler’s sense (2013) – could look like, which is appealing as one of the three possible paradigms, even though today there are not many, if any, cases deserving the designation (Drechsler 2016). By doing so, it seems intuitively promising to turn to the historic state practice of the Khmer Empire that dominated Indochina during the time of its greatest flourishing, and especially to King Jayavarman VII, who, as we will see below, is one of the paradigmatic Buddhist rulers – not only wise and just, but also effective and efficient. Trying to get closer to what Buddhist Public Administration could be, we will therefore look at what it looked like during that time, both objectively *and by its own understanding*. This, in turn, means taking the Buddhist foundations of state and society, and not least the individual, into strong consideration.

By doing so, this thesis will diverge somewhat from classical Public Administration and even Social Science approaches, as we will need to get closer to religious sources and beliefs than usually necessary. However, it is hoped that this approach will make a contribution to what Buddhist Public Administration is and can be by doing so both on Buddhist and social-scientific terms. Therefore, due to the necessity of such further exploration for an adequate PA model, the aims of this thesis can be summarized as follows: 1) To identify the major principles of Buddhist PA in the Buddhist canon; 2) To elucidate and analyze whether and, if so, how these principles shaped the PA system and policy of the government of King Jayavarman VII of the Khmer Empire; 3) To investigate the concrete elements that contributed to the effective implementation of Buddhist PA during that government.

In this framework, this thesis builds on three key questions in order to analyze how the administration system and policy of his reign were linked to the Buddha’s administrative ideals. Those questions are as following:

1. What are the principles of Buddhist PA.
2. How were the principles of Buddhist PA adopted into the government of King Jayavarman VII?

3. From a PA point of view, what factors contributed to the effective implementation of the public administration in his government?

In order to critically address these questions, this thesis is structured as following. After this introductory section, sections II and III, which are the core part of this thesis, identify the major approaches of Buddhist PA in the Buddhist canon and study how these approaches shaped the PA system and policy of the government of King Jayavarman VII. In other words, these sections will analyze how the Buddha's Dhamma was applied to the state administration of the King's government. Moreover, these sections also study the main factors from the PA point of view that contributed to the effective implementation of his public administration.

Finally, section IV concludes and summarizes the findings of this study and then suggests possibilities for applying such a PA system within the government of Buddhist countries today. More importantly, the results will also contribute to the study of NWPA and as sources for further investigation of the history of King Jayavarman VII.

The research will start with a comprehensive review of the conventional literature of Buddhist canons, to identify the administrative principles, and of the historical literatures of King Jayavarman VII, to study how the implementation of his public-administration system and policy linked to the principles of Buddhist public administration. To do that, Buddhist administrative theories, particularly the Buddhist administrative ideals on kingship and Buddhist administrative aspects will be identified, and the public-administration system and policy, which were implemented during the reign of King Jayavarman VII, will be characterized. In addition, the scholarly discussion with contemporary Cambodian and foreign experts on this area will also be carried out in order to ensure that the research findings are *au courant* from both the academic and historical perspectives.

II. PUBLIC-ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM UNDER JAYAVARMAN VII

2.1 Jayavarman VII in History

The historical accounts of the reign of King Jayavarman VII are widely available from the publications of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient, and they mostly consist of the large number of Jayavarman VII's inscriptions, especially those from the Preah Khan, Ta Prohm, Bayon and Say-Fong and others, which were interpreted and studied by many prominent epigraphers. Those historical doyens include M. Aymonier, who translated the inscriptions in his *Le Cambodge* in three volumes in 1900, 1901 and 1904, respectively; M.A. Barth and M.A. Bergaigne, who edited inscriptions in two volumes, *Inscriptions Sanskrite Du Cambodge*; M.L. Finot and G. Coèdes, who published a large number of inscriptions in the *Bulletin de L'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient* and especially the *Collection Du Textes et Documents Sur L'Indochina* and *Inscriptions Du Cambodge* by G. Coèdes; R.C. Majumdar, who undertook the publication of the *Inscriptions of Kambuja* in 1953; and M.K. Sharan, who published the *Studies in Sanskrit Inscriptions of Ancient Cambodia* in 1974. Furthermore, there are other studies on the king's reign, especially from Lawrence Palmer Briggs, *The Ancient Khmer Empire* (1951), from Majumdar, *Kambuja-Desa or An Ancient Hindu Colony in Cambodia* (1944), from G. Coèdes, *Angkor: An Introduction* (1966) and *Indianized States of Southeast Asia* (1968), and the famous ancient source of Zhou Daguan, *A Record of Cambodia: The Land and Its People*, written during his stay at Angkor in the late 13th century (trans. 1992). These also provide vast and sufficient references to study the implementation of public administration during the reign of King Jayavarman VII.

In these resourceful accounts, Jayavarman VII is presented as “the great and supreme Buddhist ruler” (Coedes 1966, 108) and “Southeast Asia's greatest ruler” (Kulke 2014, 1), who ruled Cambodia from 1181-circa 1218 in the form of *Buddharaja* (Briggs 1951, 229). His administrative system and policy are said to have been influenced enormously by the Buddha's Dhamma, which turned him into the compassionate ruler who saw the sufferings of his subjects as more important than his own (Chatterji 1928, 221). Based on his great

compassion and his Dhamma policy, according to Kulke (2014, 1-18), the Khmer empire under his government reached its apex. The following parts will give an overview of the administrative system and policy of his government and analyze his administrative behavior accordingly.

2.2 Administrative Structure of the Empire

First, it should be noted that the state organization in ancient Khmer Empire could not be separated from religion, and the public administrative system per se was based on the religious ideology. In this respect, we are told that during the reign of King Jayavarman VII, the kingdom was strongly influenced by Mahayana Buddhist doctrine, and the king considered himself to be the *Buddharaja*, ‘the living Buddha’ to govern the state (Briggs 1951, 229). And thus *Saivite Devaraja*, which blessed the Hindu polity, was replaced by the cult of *Buddharaja*, which honored the Buddhist polity, and the devotion of Buddhist teachings was widespread across the kingdom. But Briggs (1951, 229) also acknowledges that the worship of Sivaism did not completely disappear during the reign of King Jayavarman VII, and the Brahmanic worship was still practiced, especially at the national level. Thus the chief priest or royal *hotar* or *purohita*¹, “the royal official in the Brahmanic ideology”, still continued to play a role at court (Coedes 1968, 173). Related to this point, the Buddhist Jataka tell us very little about the political activities of the Brahmanic priests in the Buddhist government, and in his search for the role of *purohita* in the Buddhist Jatakas, Ganguly (1958, 121) pointed out that they (the *purohita*) basically have the function of sacrificer and magician. In this regard, it may be noted that the presence of a Brahmanic *purohita* can even be seen in the reign of the current Buddhist king, Norodom Sihamoni of Cambodia, especially in his role as the sacrificing priest for the royal ceremonies. But they have no role in administrative and juridical matters. Thus it can be

¹ The information on the existence of *Purohita* in the reign of King Jayavarman VII was found by Coedes in the Angkor Thom inscription in which it says that the Brahman scholar from Burma, whose name was Hrishikesa, has learnt that Cambodia was full of eminent experts on the Veda, and he came to manifest his knowledge. King Jayavarman VII made him his chief priest and conferred on him the title of *Jayamahapradhana* (Coedes 1968, 173).

stated that even though there was a Brahmanic *purohita* in the reign of King Jayavarman VII, the state administration of his reign was not influenced by Hindu ideology, as stated, e.g., in the *Arthashastra* of Kautilya, *Dhammasastra* or *Manusmṛti* “*Code of Manu*”. Instead, as we will see, the public-administration system and policy in his government, after his conversion to *Buddharaja*, were knowingly dominated and righteously guided by the Buddhist polity on kinship.

Before we will thoroughly study how the Buddha’s administrative ideals influenced the administrative system and policy in the government of King Jayavarman VII, we shall first examine the geographical division of the administration of his empire.

To study how the administrative level in the reign of King Jayavarman VII was organized, it is necessary to understand the social organization in the Buddhist conception. According to the Buddhist texts, especially in the Anguttara Nikaya and the Jatakas, the territorial organization is often described as fourfold, namely villages (*gāmā*), market towns (*nigama*), countryside (*janapada*), and city (*nagara*) (Gokhale 1969, 734). These levels of administration were conceptualized based on the cosmological theory of Buddhist galactic polity or the theory of *Mandol* in the Khmer language, which represented the traditional social-political organization of Buddhist-Hindu states of Southeast Asia. This concept had been promoted by many scholars, such as Geertz in his *Theatre State*, Tambiah in his *The Galactic Polity in Southeast Asia*, Heine-Geldern in his *Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia* and Paul Mus in his *Thousand-Armed Kannon: A Mystery or a Problem?* and so on. Based on their studies, they reached the conclusion that the religious-political center of Angkor in Cambodia, Negara in Bali and Pagan in Burma represented the *Mandala* form of core-peripheral power, which constituted the centralized political state that brought plural communities into a unified pattern (Tambiah 1976, 102-131, Heine-Geldern 1942, 15-30, Geertz 1980, 126, Mus 1935, 1-33).

In ancient Cambodia, particularly during the reign of King Jayavarman VII, George Coedes pointed out that the temple of *Bayon*, situated in the middle of the microcosm of the royal city, represented the focus of all the local sanctuaries and centralized the “double power,

secular and divine” which each of the sanctuaries of the *Jayabuddhamahanatha* represented in the distant provinces (Coedes 1963, 100). Based on this argument, it is clear that the administrative system of his reign was organized relatively under the concept of cosmology, which principally implied a galactic polity for administration. This cosmological structure was constructed on the basis of the center-oriented model in which the capital (the temple of Bayon) was represented as the Mount *Meru*, and it was considered to be the center of the kingdom, surrounded by the cycle of the provinces and vassal townships. In this concentric cycle, the king could employ his royal power and direct control from the center to the provinces.

From the inscriptions of King Jayavarman VII, more precisely, the administrative structure of his empire could be categorized to have three main divisions, viz. the central unit, the smaller unit (the provincial level, which includes the subordinate states), and the smallest unit (the village level), respectively. We shall study those three administrative levels carefully in the following.

A. Central Unit Administration

Like Asoka’s government of ancient India, the administration at the central level in the reign of King Jayavarman VII was executed by the king, and he governed as the head of state in the form of centralized government. He had the highest authority of the state to lead the army in war and to run the administration of justice and exercise of the power of punishment to maintain peace and security. The supreme authority of the king in the matters of either executing the punishment or making the judgment in this sense could also be noted until the thirteenth century, shortly after his reign. This is clearly stated in Zhou Dagan’s note that “each day the king held audience twice, and the disputes of the people, even insignificant, always go to the sovereign” (cited in Briggs 1951, 249). This frequent audience assembly reflects the conditions of social welfare, which I will explain later, that the king should conduct for his statecraft. Furthermore, as can be seen from his military campaign against Champa, King Jayavarman VII also served as the head of the military, and based on his military strategy and victory over Champa, he was considered a mighty

and victorious warrior as well as an organizer, builder and public benefactor (Briggs 1951, 215). Moreover, the king also has another duty to appoint the provincial governors, and this claim is referred to in the resourceful account from Briggs (1951, 209), who acknowledged that the king had appointed his son as the governor to rule in Louvo.

The king was surrounded by royal advisors and other ministers, whose names occurred in the inscriptions, to support the king to run the administration. In this regard, Briggs (1951, 209) pointed out that the chief Buddhist ministers of Jayavarman VII appear to have been the *guru* and the sons of the king. In the Ta Prohm inscription, for instance, the king erected his royal *guru* as the *Jaya Mangalartha*, whom the king showered with gifts and honors (Briggs 1951, 229). The definition of *guru* is “Teacher”, and he had many important roles to run the administration in the reign of King Jayavarman VII. The role of the *guru* is not only teacher, but also advisor, councilor and architect. Since he makes an important contribution to the success of the king’s reign, I shall discuss his role in greater detail in the next section of this thesis.

Therefore, it can be briefly stated that at the central level of administration, King Jayavarman VII governed as head of the administrative empire with the sovereign authority in matters of law-implementing, law-making, making judgments and even in the matter of military operation and appointment of provincial governors. He has a huge responsibility for the safety, security and the well-being of his kingdom, and he was assisted and advised on administrative matters by his Buddhist ministers, mainly the *guru*, who was preeminent in Buddha’s teachings.

B. Smaller Unit Administration or Provincial Level Administration

The whole country was divided into a number of provincial units and the townships of vassal states. The geographical construction and socio-political organization, based on this conception, were conceived as the cosmological design which was characterized as the center-oriented authority of the sovereign monarch. These administrative levels were represented as the center-periphery of the concentric capital, which were more or less independent. From the source on the images of *Jayabuddhamahanatha*, which represented

the sovereignty of King Jayavarman VII himself, we are told that these images were sent to twenty-three towns in the kingdom (Coedes 1951, 100). Among the twenty-three towns or provinces, however, the available inscriptions provide us only few names of those provinces and cities; including *Louvo* or Lavodayapura (“modern Lopburi”), Svarnapura, Sambukapattana, Sri Jayarajapuri (“modern Ratburi”), and Jayasimha (“surely the shrine Prasat Muang Sing”), and all of these provinces are in the Thai territory today (Briggs 1951, 209, Coedes 1963, 99-100). On the Eastern part of the country, moreover, the Champa inscriptions show that the capital of Champa from 1203 to 1220 was also truly the province of Cambodia (Coedes 1963, 102). On the Southern part of the country, Aymonier said that in 1195 Jayavarman VII seems to have subjugated some little states in the Malay Peninsula which had formerly been simply his allies (cited in Sharan 1986, 210). On the Northern part, an inscription dated 1186 at Say Fong, located on the Mekong close to Vientiane, also indicated its farthest extension, and Hall claims that Pagan (Burma) was also a dependency of Cambodia in the reign of King Jayavarman VII (Hall 1970, 117). Furthermore, another source from Zhou Daguan, who visited Cambodia in the 13th century, when the kingdom was already in decline, shows that Cambodia at that time was divided into more than ninety provinces, but he could name only the following provinces: Chen-p’u, Ch’a-nan, Pa-chien, Mo-jang, Pa-hsieh, P’u-mai, Chih-kun, Mu-tsin-po, Lai-kan-k’eng, Pa-ssu-li (Daguan 1992, 63). With regard to Daguan’s account, Briggs translated that these ninety provinces were the vassal or subordinate governments (Briggs 1951, 249).

Even though there are no concrete sources to tell us the explicit number of provinces, it is clear that the country was divided into a number of provinces and vassal states for administration. Each of these provinces was ruled and administered by the governors, who were appointed directly by the king. These governors were responsible for day-to-day provincial administration and were expected to consult continuously with the king on the important matters. In this regard, in his research on the galactic polity of Buddhism and Hinduism in Southeast Asia, Tambiah (2013, 510) pointed out that the capital provinces were ruled by the king’s sons as almost independent kingdoms and governed along the same lines as the capital. However, among the four or five sons of King Jayavarman VII,

whose names appeared in the inscriptions, it was not clearly mentioned that they held this position. According to the sources from Briggs (1951, 209) and Coedes (1964, 180), it can be noted that only prince Indravarman was appointed Governor of Louvo; the others princes, such as Crown Prince Suryakumara, “the author of the Ta Prohm inscription”, Prince Virakumara, “the author of the Preah Khan inscription”, and Srindrakumara, “whose status, surrounded by those of four companions in arms, is placed in the central chapel of Banteay Chmar” were not mentioned with certainty regarding their appointment as provincial governors.

From the available sources, it can be observed that the provincial governors were appointed both from the members of the king’s family and from outside of the royal family, as well. In Champa, for instance, after the victory, King Jayavarman VII divided Champa into two portions and placed his own brother-in-law, Surya Jayavarmadeva prince, as the king of the Northern part with Vijaya as a capital, while Vidyananda Suryavarmandeva, the victorious general, became the king of the Southern portion with his capital at Panduranga (Majumdar 1944, 129, Sharan 1986, 208).

So, it can be understood that in the reign of King Jayavarman VII, the whole country was divided into a number of provinces and subordinate states in the four cardinal positions to represent a lesser administrative level of the central one. These smaller units were ruled by the governors with some forms of autonomy, and these provincial governors were appointed by the king from both within and outside the royal family.

C. Smallest-Unit Administration or Village-Level Administration

The inscriptions of King Jayavarman VII provide us the explicit information on the arrangement of resources and persons to support the temple administration, but they inform us very little about the local administrators or village chiefs, especially on how they (the local administrators) were recruited. However, we learnt from Zhou Daguan that each village has its temple, or at least a pagoda, and each village, no matter how small it may be, has a local mandarin, called Mai Srok, “headman of a village or district” (Daguan 1992, 65). Based on his statement, it can be noted that there are two administrative powers which

were instituted to administrate the local level. First, the spiritual or moral power which was exercised by the pagoda to advise to the local state administration and, second, the authoritative power which was executed by Mai Srok to give authoritative orders. Even though Zhou Dagan did not clearly speak about the important function of the pagoda in the local administration, Gokhale (1969, 737-738) pointed out that the early Buddhists created the apotheosis of the state by starting with the hypothesis of the separation between the ānā (state) and Dhamma (Buddhism), in which the state is subordinated to the Dhamma, and the *Sangha* (Monk order), whose role it is to consent and advise the state, is organized to reach down to the smaller villages through the monastery.

This level of administration had some forms of self-local government in which people in the villages were employed for the maintenance of the temples, and the villages per se were given for the defraying of its expense. For instance, the Sanskrit inscription at Preah Khan informs us that there were 5324 villages with a total of 97,840 people of both sexes who were subjected to paying tax for supplying the sacred service and for the maintenance of the personals (Coedes 1963, 97).

With regard to the village headmen, moreover, there are no available sources on whether they were elected by the people in the village or were appointed by the state. But, in the Buddhist text, we are told that the headman of local government in the early Buddhist period was hired by the village collectively to supervise the affairs of the community (Davids 1903, 45-46). So, it seems that the village administration, in some aspects, is practically free from central control. However, we have learnt earlier from the Preah Khan inscription and the Ta Prohm inscriptions that the people in the villages were assigned to pay tax for sustaining the administration, and thus it can be understood that whether the village headman was independently recruited by the people in the community or not, there was hardly any distinction between the central and the local administration.

2.3 Civil Service

We have learnt briefly earlier that there were some names of officials and ministers in the inscriptions of King Jayavarman VII, and the record of Zhou Dagan (1992, 9) also reveals

that in this country there is a hierarchy of ministers, generals, astronomers and other functionaries; and for the most parts princes are selected as office-holders; if not of princely rank they offer their daughters as royal concubines. This reflects what I have mentioned earlier, when citing Briggs and Coedes, that the king's princes and relatives were appointed in the higher positions of the government. And a precise example can be drawn from one of his princes, named Indravarman, who was appointed as the governor of *Louvo*, and his own brother-in-law Surya Jayavarmadeva was appointed to rule in the Northern part of Champa. By this definition, one can say that the appointment of royal officials in the reign of King Jayavarman VII was based on aristocratic oligarchy, since the royal family members or relatives were appointed in the higher government positions. However, this assessment is not evidence-based, nor does it reflect his reign historically because only one among the five princes of the king that I found in the inscriptions was clearly mentioned to hold a higher position.

On the other hand, high-ranking positions were also granted to other officials, who were not royal family members. And a good example can be drawn from the case of refugee Cham Prince, named Vidyanandana, who was promoted to the rank of *Yuvaraja*. The information of that Prince was narrated clearly in the Mison pillar inscription as follow:

Prince Vidyanandana went to Cambodia in 1182 in the prime of his youth. The king of Cambodia (that is Jayavarman VII who had ascended the throne the previous year) seeing that he earned the thirty-three marks of a predestined man, took him to his heart and taught him all the princely sciences and feats of arms. At the time he lived in Cambodia there was a village in that kingdom called Malyang, populated by a group of bad men who revolted against the king. The king seeing that this Prince was very accomplished in the arts of war, gave him the responsibility of leading the Cambodian troops to capture the city of Malyang. He carried out everything according to the wish of the king of Cambodia. The king, seeing his worth, conferred on him the title of *Yuvaraja* and gave him all the benefits and all the rewards which Cambodia could offer (Coedes 1963, 89).

From this inscription, it can be noted that the prince was appreciated and promoted to the

rank of *Yuvaraja*, based on his accomplishment and especially the personal characteristic, or the 33 Marks of the Predestined Man², and these marks, as mentioned in the *Lakkhana Sutta* of Digha Nikaya, represent the quality of a Great Man. In the *Sutta*, Buddha said “these marks are peculiar to a Great Man, and for the man who possesses them, only two careers are open, viz. if he lives the household life, he will become a monarch, a wheel-turning monarch of the law, a righteous lord of the right, a conqueror of the four quarters, an owner of the seven treasures, who has established the security of his realm; but if he goes forth from the household life into homelessness, he will become an *Arahant*, a fully-enlightened Buddha, who has drawn back the veil from the world” (trans. Walshe 1987, 441; Davids 1921, 137). These “*Marks of the Great Man*” are deserved as the retribution for goodness and virtue, committed in previous existences according to the Buddhist belief. So, through this recruitment method, it basically means that King Jayavarman VII wished to select his higher government officials who, according to the *Marks of a Great Man*, possessed the superior ability and virtue to effectively govern the contemporary realm with righteousness.

The same rank was also granted to Prince *Angasaraja* of *Turai Vijaya*, who had been raised at the court of Jayavarman VII and promoted by the king himself in 1201 to the rank of *Yuvaraja* (Sharan 1986, 209). Although Sharan did not mention clearly what the promotion of this prince was based on, it can strongly be estimated that the “Marks of the Great Man”-

² The inscription says thirty-three marks, but the *Lakkhana Sutta* of Digha Nikaya says the marks of a Great Man are thirty-two, namely 1) He has feet with level tread; 2) On the soles of his feet are wheels with a thousand spokes, complete with felloe and hub; 3) He has projecting heels; 4) He has long fingers and toes; 5) He has soft and tender hands and feet; 6) His hands and feet are net-like; 7) He has high-raised ankles; 8) His legs are like an antelope’s; 9) Standing and without bending, he can touch and rub his knees with either hand; 10) His male organs are enclosed in a sheath; 11) His complexion is bright, the colour of gold; 12) His skin is delicate and so smooth that no dust can adhere to his body; 13) His body-hairs are separate, one to each pore; 14) His body-hairs grow upwards, each one bluish-black like collyrium, curling in rings to the right; 15) His body is divinely straight; 16) He has the seven convex surfaces; 17) The front part of his body is like a lion’s; 18) There is no hollow between his shoulders; 19) He is proportioned like a banyan-tree: the height of his body is the same as the span of his outstretched arms, and conversely; 20) His bust is evenly rounded; 21) He has a perfect sense of taste; 22) He has jaws like a lion’s; 23) He has forty teeth; 24) His teeth are even; 25) There are no spaces between his teeth; 26) His canine teeth are very bright; 27) His tongue is very long; 28) He has a Brahma-like voice, like that of the *karavika*-bird; 29) His eyes are deep blue; 30) He has eyelashes like a cow’s; 31) The hair between his eyes is white and soft like cotton-down; and 32) His head is like a royal turban. (*Lakkhana Sutta: The Mmarks of the Great Man*, in *Digha Nikaya*, Vol. IV, Part III, 137-139, edited by T.W. Rhys Davids, 1910).

based recruitment method might also be applied to him as well as to other higher royal officials in his reign.

With regard to the appointment of officials in the public service, it should be noted that during the reign of King Jayavaraman VII, women played a much more important role in society and public service than other places of the world, and Chinese visitors, especially Zhou Dagan, were shocked at women's liberated role in this country. Women were noted for their intellectual services and activities for the society. A concrete example can be drawn particularly from chief Queen *Indradevi*, who in her knowledge surpassed "the knowledge of philosophers" and was acclaimed as the principle teacher of the scriptures to three convents at a Buddhist monastery (Coedes 1964, 172; Chatterji 1928, 220). Her merit of Buddhist queenship contributed remarkably to the success of the king's reign, and I will place great emphasis on her contribution in the next part of this paper, especially in the substantial element that contributed to the success of the king's administration.

Another remarkable particularity of civil service in the reign of King Jayavarman VII is that the civil servants were employed on a clearly and highly statistical basis. In this regard, it can be acknowledged that the civil service of his reign had indicated the clear number of villages, people, and objects, which were attributed to sustain the public administration. From the details of the Ta Prohm stele inscription, for instance, Coedes (1963, 96) stated that, "the temple owned 3,140 villages and that its service required 79,365 people, of whom 18 were great priests, 2,740 officiates, 2,202 assistants, and 615 dancers." With regard to the detailed information on his hospital staff, on the other hand, the inscription tells us that there were two doctors, each assisted by a man and two women, two store-keepers with the job of giving out medicine, two cooks having the responsibility for the fuel and water as well as for cleaning the temple, two servitors to prepare the offerings for Buddha, fourteen hospital attendants, six women to heat the water and to grind the medicines, and two women to pound the rice (Coedes 1963, 103).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the appointment of officials in the government of King Jayavarman VII was historically peculiar since the selection method of higher government

officials, whether from royal or non-royal members, was based on the “Marks of the Great Man”, which represented the quality and virtue of a wheel-turning monarch. On the other hand, the role of women in society and in the public service was also remarkable, and the public service per se was constructed on a highly statistical basis.

III. BUDDHIST KINGSHIP AS GUIDANCE FOR JAYAVARMAN VII'S PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

By devotion to Mahayana Buddhism, King Jayavarman VII governed his kingdom in the form of *Buddharaja*, “living Buddha”, the counterpart to *Bodhisattva*, placing the interests and needs of the citizens into his heart. His administrative behavior of great commitment and compassion offers an interesting perception on the Buddhist public- administration model as Buddha’s Dhamma was introduced as the guidance for the administrative system and policy in his government. Yet, in this part, before we explain how his administrative system and policy were influenced by the Buddha’s Dhamma, it is necessary to study the Buddhist conception on kingship.

3.1. The Concept of Buddhist Kingship and Its Regulatory Ethics and Virtue on Public Administration

Max Weber (1958, 206) argued in his book *The Religion of India* that “Buddhism is a specifically unpolitical and anti-political status religion, more precisely, a religious technology of wandering and of intellectually-schooled mendicant monks”. However, this is something of a cliché, proved invalid, e.g., by the Buddhist canon of *Anguttara-Nikaya* (*Book of the Gradual Sayings or More-Numbered Suttas*). In fact, the *Anguttara-Nikaya*, in its chapter on “The Rajah: The onward roll of the wheel”, shows that the wheel of *Dhamma* can be turned both by the Buddha for the human’s spiritual liberation in the *lokuttara* and by the king or *Chakravartin* (the Wheel-turning Monarch) for the security and prosperity in the *lokiya* (*Anguttara-Nikaya*, Vol. 3, translated by Hare 1934, 113-125).

With regard to the Dhamma for *Lokiya*, more specifically, the *Agganna Sutta*, *Mahasudassana Sutta*, *Mahaparinibbana Sutta*, *Cakkavatti-Sihanada Sutta* of *Digha Nikaya* and *Uluka Jataka* reveals numerous Buddhist conceptions on the origin of the state, the qualities of kingship and other social and political thoughts. The administrative and political concepts in those *Suttas* and *Jataka* had been studied and analyzed by many

Buddhist scholars.

B.G. Gokhale, who has published many articles on aspects of the Buddhist political concept, emphasized especially in his comprehensive papers on “Early Buddhist Kingship” and “The Early Buddhist View of the State” (1966, 22; 1969, 736-738) that the state is created due to a demand for the rule of morality, whereas the Dhamma was applied as the spiritual power for the guidance of the rulers, and he highlighted two main principles of early Buddhist kingship as follows:

1. A high morality as the guiding spirit behind the state; and
2. The theory of two equally important ideals of a *Chakkravarti*, the leader of the temporal realm, and the *Bodhisattva*, pre-eminent in the spiritual domain.

Although Gokhale had presented a critical analysis on the Buddhist political concept, he did not deal with the actual adoption of these concepts, especially on how these concepts had practically influenced the government of Buddhist kings.

S.J. Tambiah (1976, 32-53), in his comprehensive book on the Buddhist political concept of “*World Conqueror and World Renouncer*”, had conceptualized the early Buddhist kingship into two models:

1. The Concept of the “Righteous King” (Dhammiko Dhammaraja); and
2. The Concept of the “Universal King” (*Chakkravartin*).

Moreover, in his response to his own question, “Are there manuals for statecraft addressed to Buddhist kings?”, Tambiah (1976, 51-52) claimed that the universal cosmic law (Dhamma) is the fountainhead of kingship, raising up the magnificent world ruler as the sovereign regulator and the ground of society. However, he did not directly and clearly outline the regulatory basis on the rule of statecraft because either the Dhamma or the universal cosmic law that he had mentioned can also be found in Hindu and Jain polity. So, his answer provides an ambiguous perception on the virtue and ethics of the righteous king that requires further investigation on this part.

Then Uma Chakravarti (1996, 150-176) analyzed the role of the king in the early Buddhism

in her book *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*, and based on her analysis, she classified the early Buddhist kingship into three:

1. *The general ideas on kingship*, in which she considered the seven symbols of sovereignty as the constituent elements of kingship;
2. *The contemporary kingship*, in which she acknowledged that the king at the time of Buddha had a legitimate and despotic or arbitrary exercise of power; and
3. *The ideal kingship*, in which she accepted that *Chakkravarti* and *Dhammiko Dhammaraja* were a good model of Buddhist kingship.

Again, even though she admitted that the ideal kingship of *Chakkravarti* and *Dhammiko Dhammaraja*, who conquer by righteousness without the uses of force, is clearly contrasted to the tyrannical and despotic kings, who rule by absolute exercise of power, the seven precious gems that she considered the constituent elements to enhance the king's prestige are not providing the sufficient characteristics to justify the ideal model of Buddhist kingship.

In fact, the Buddhist canons are not blueprints for the manual on ethics, virtues, power and regulations for the temporal rulers, but they only provide numerous references reflecting the ethical morality of the ruler. Thus, in this part, I shall begin with the in-depth survey on various Buddhist canons to identify the origin of the administrative concept and then conceptualize the administrative model of Buddhist kingship of both the *Chakkravarti* and *Dhammiko Dhammaraja* into a single model of administration, because based on the various canons, whether the king is called the *Chakkravarti* or the *Dhammiko Dhammaraja*, it is the Buddhist king (*Buddharaja*) who rules righteously in the manner of Buddha. Then the administrative ethics and virtues of the rulers are outlined accordingly.

A. The Origin of the Administrative Concept in the Buddhist Canons

In the Buddhist canons, Buddha had clearly mentioned the origin of state, political order and human kingship, particularly in the *Agganna Sutta (On Knowledge of Beginnings)* of *Digha Nikaya*. In this *Sutta*, it says that in the very beginning, human beings were

altogether perfect as there were no thieves, no lying, no cheating, no corruption and so on. With such an idealized phenomenon, there was no need for the state to function as a regulatory agency. But later on, we are told that human behavior started to become worsen, untruthful and violent, and the state declined into anarchy. As the people declined more and more from their state of purity, the origin of the kingship was established. This myth is similar to the illustration in the *Mahabharata* of Brahmanic polity. However, when the *Mahabharata* of Brahmanism says that the ruler of the world was created by Brahma to govern this anarchical society (Banerjea 1916, 35), Agganna Sutta of Buddhism emphasizes that there were three models of kingship that emerged in that society system in the following stages:

‘The People’s Choice’ is the meaning of *Maha-Sammata*, which is the first regular title to be introduced. ‘Lord Of The Fields’ is the meaning of *Khattiya*, the second such title. And ‘He Gladdens Others With Dhamma’ is the meaning of *Raja*, the third title to be introduced (*Digha Nikaya: Agganna Sutta*, translated by Maurice Walshe 1987, 413).

First, worrying about the problems in the anarchical society, men gathered to discuss this situation and decided to select one among them to enforce justice in the society. The one who was selected, at this stage, was called *Maha-Sammata*, the “People’s Choice or Great Elect” because he was chosen by the assembly of the people to enforce laws and orders for the society system. He was granted the power to punish those who deserved to be punished. The one who was elected to rule is the best among men in term of his personal charisma, and he is remunerated by the payment of one-sixth of the tax in exchange for his labors towards the establishment of law and order, justice, harmony and the protection of social welfare (Gokhale 1966, 16). This form of legitimacy represents the idea of social contract in which the just exercise of sovereign power of the king is implied to guarantee the organized society as well as the efficient public services in exchange for the payment of the taxes by the people.

Second, he was called the *khattiya*, meaning the “Lord of the rice field”, who had the sovereign power in the division of land and the protection of land ownership. His royal

power was regarded as achieved through the fulfillment of the good *khamma* in his path births, not belonging to any particular castes. Buddha, in this aspect, claimed that the *Khattiya* is declared to be highest in accordance with the Dhamma, and not otherwise, because Dhamma is the best thing for people in this life and the next as well (*Digha Nikaya: Agganna Sutta*, translated by Maurice Walshe 1987, 414).

Third, he was called the *Raja*, who ruled or delighted others with Dhamma and even justice. This is the model of the good king, and the king in this respect is proclaimed supremely by the virtue of Dhamma. This model is contrary to the ideal type of the *patrimonialism* of the pre-colonial period that Max Weber described in his book *Economy and Society*. Whereas the patrimonial ruler controls all the political legitimacy and the instruments of powers to broaden the range of his arbitrary power (Weber 1978, 1006), the *Raja* governs the state in the form of *Buddharaja*, *Chakravartin* or *Dhammiko Dhammaraja*, who rules in the Buddha's image of the world in accordance with the Wheel of the Law, applying the Buddhist virtues of non-violence and compassion into the administration. In this stage, it can be observed that the Dhamma is now introduced as a basic constituent of the state and as the guiding principle for the just ruling or efficient administration.

Therefore, according to the *Agganna Sutta*, the factors that led to the origin of the administrative concept could be identified as the following:

1. The need for the constituent authority to enforce laws and orders in the anarchical society;
2. The demand for contractual relation between the king and the people to guarantee the private property; and
3. The demand for Dhamma to guide the administration for the maintenance of social justice and morality.

The social and administrative ideas, which were outlined in the *Agganna Sutta*, moreover, provide the new model of administration to the existing Hindu administrative model, which stresses the importance of the king based on the *vanna* (caste) division. In this regard,

Ghoshal (1959, 62) acknowledged that the social and political ideas contained in the Agganna Sutta present a dramatic and vigorous form of an open challenge of the Vedic dogma of the Divine creation of the social order.

B. Chakravartin (Wheel-turning Monarch) and Dhamiko Dhammaraja (Righteous Ruler) as the single model of Buddharaja (Buddhist King)

It is clearly stated in the “Book of Gradual Saying or *Anguttara Nikaya*”, volume 3, in its chapter on *The Rajah (or wheel turning monarch)* that there is a parallel quality and characteristic between Chakravartin and Buddha, and this interesting comparison is quoted as follows:

Monks, endowed in five ways, a rajah, rolling the wheel (of state), rolls on the wheel by Dhamma, and that wheel may not be rolled back by the hand of any hostile son of man. In what five ways?

Herein, monks, the rajah, rolling the wheel of state, knows good, knows Dhamma, knows measures, knows times, and knows assembled men.

... Monks, endowed with these five ways, the rajah, the wheel roller, the Dhamma man, the Dhamma rajah, relies just on Dhamma, honors Dhamma, reveres Dhamma, esteems Dhamma; with Dhamma as standard, with Dhamma as his banner, with Dhamma as his mandate, he sets a Dhamma watch and bar and ward for folk within his realm.

... Even so, monks, endowed in five ways, the Tathagata, arahant, fully enlightened, rolls on by Dhamma the unsurpassed Dhamma wheel; and that wheel may not be rolled back by recluse, godly man, deva, Māra, Brahma, or by any in the world. In what five ways?

Herein, monks, the Tathagata, arahant, fully enlightened, knows good; knows Dhamma; knows measure; knows assembled men.

... Even so, Monk, the Tathagata, arahant, fully enlightened, a Dhamma man, a Dhamma rajah, relies just on Dhamma, honours Dhamma, reveres Dhamma, esteems Dhamma; with Dhamma as his standard, with Dhamma as his banner, with Dhamma as his mandate, he sets a Dhamma watch and bar and ward for monks, saying: Follow ye such a practice in deed, not that other; follow ye such a practice in word, not that other, follow ye such a practice in thought, not that other, follow ye such a livelihood,

not that other, seek ye such a town or village, not that other (*Anguttrara Nikaya*, Vol. 3, 113-115, translated by Hare 1934).

According to this passage, it can be understood that the Chakravartin or the wheel-turning monarch endows with five ways, namely knowing good (*attaññu*), knowing Dhamma (*dhammaññu*), knowing measures (*mattaññu*), knowing times (*kālaññu*), and knowing assembled men (*parisaññu*), and he rules by the Dhamma, taking the Dhamma as his standard, banner and authority, providing the righteous protection, shelter and guard for the people in his court. This wheel, if without the righteous provisions, cannot be turned back by any hostile human beings. In the same way, Buddha endows with those five ways and turns the wheel of the Dhamma, honoring, respecting and venerating the Dhamma, taking the Dhamma as his standard, banner, and authority, providing righteous protection, shelter and guard in regard to bodily action, verbal action and mental action. This wheel, if without the righteous provisions, cannot be turned back by any Brahmin, Deva, Māra, or by anyone in the world. So, in this context, there are parallel characteristics and qualities between Chakravartin and Buddha, but the difference is only in the point that whereas Buddha turns the wheel of Dhamma in the *Lokuttara* (supra mundane world), the Chakravartin turns the wheel of Dhamma in the political world or *Lokiya* (world).

In this regard, Mus makes clear that “the Buddha is Mahapurusha par excellence; yet his real role in the cosmological process is to reveal it, not to be part of it. But this makes all the more revealing the fact that various kings should appear as a projection of the same incomparable perfection. In their most exalted capacity as Mahapurusa, they maintain, in human affairs, as much of the law as is in them and in the corresponding circumstances, amidst the general degradation of things. Mount Meru’s massive presence, stabilizing the world, is explicitly likened to the throne and power of the Chakravartin, who makes the wheel of righteousness to revolve round that center. His rule thus appears, in the Buddhist image of the world, as a moral and ‘ordinating’ service of the Community – a fit substitute for the Vedic Sacrifice and sacrificial power (brahman)”, (Mus 1935, 30).

Based on his argument, the Chakravartin represents the Buddhist socio-political ideal (Dhamma) of the just ruler who maintains the human affairs in his subjects. His sovereign

proceeded through the continents at each of the four cardinal directions in the cosmological pattern in which Mount Meru is the central and strategic position for the monarch to rule the universe.

He was born with seven great treasures, viz., 1) the treasure of the Wheel of the Sola disc; 2) the treasure of the elephant; 3) the treasure of the horse; 4) the treasure of the precious jewel; 5) the treasure of the queenship; 6) the treasure of the retinue of attendants (the householder); and 7) the treasure of the prince or general (the councilor) (Alabaster 1871, 181). These seven precious gems occur simultaneously with the Chakravarin, and they are the symbol of the sovereignty in the Buddhist philosophy which represent the constituent elements of kingship (Chakravarti 1996, 157). These constituent elements, according to Chakravarti (1996, 157), can be reduced to three basis ideas: (1) the dominion or territory represented by the treasure of the wheel; (2) the means of control over the dominion represented by the treasures of the elephant, the horse, and the precious jewel; and (3) the basis of control over the dominion represented by the queenship, householder, and the councilor.

He has almost all the characteristics of a Bodhisattva, like the *Marks of the Great Man*, and he is the *Dhammiko Dhammaraja*, who is devoted to Dhamma, which is declared as the ruler of the rulers, the highest in the world (Gokhale 1966, 18-20). So, based on this argument, it can be acknowledged that the Buddhist conception on *Chakravartin* and *Dhammiko Dhammaraja* rests solely on the principles of Dhamma, which encloses the king's code of righteousness for the administration. These codes and norms, in this respect, build on the total application of Buddha's Dhamma in the administration that in theory insisted on the principles of nonviolence (*ahimsa*), non-injury and compassion (*karuna*), and the *ten virtues of kingship* and so on, are of paramount importance for the Buddhist king (*Buddharaja*) to establish the ideal kingdom. And the ideal kingdom, according to the Buddhist concept, is described as the territory which is without thorns and untroubled, and men are happy and joyous, living in homes with open doors and playing peacefully with children in their laps (Gokhale 1969, 735).

Furthermore, the *Jakata*, Vol. 5, no. 521 on the *Tesakuna Jataka* also presents the *five powers* that the Buddhist king should possess in order to perform his duties. And those five powers are quoted as follows:

Amidst the great ones of the earth a fivefold power we see;
Of these the power of limbs is, sure, the last in its degree,
And power of wealth, O mighty lord, the next is said to be.
The power of counsel third in rank of these, O king, I name;
The power of caste without a doubt is reckoned fourth in fame,
And all of these a man that's wise most certainly will claim (The *Jakata*, Vol. 5, no. 521, 63, translated and edited by Cowell 1905).

This passage illustrates that the five powers are the basis of Buddhist kingship to govern his realm, and those powers are straightforwardly ascribed as 1) the strength of arms; 2) the strength of wealth; 3) the strength of ministers; 4) the prestige of high birth; 5) and the last is the strength in intuition. Through these five powers, the king can control the sovereignty and can tax the people within the territory in order to support his government officials, and these powers also enable the king to maintain his mighty and armed forces.

In this regard, Gokhale (1966, 18) also acknowledged that the power to rule the sovereignty, or the sovereign power, is a condition of pre-eminence in power relationships which carries along with it certain well-defined obligations which are the duties of the office of kingship, and it is not merely a physical or a material power for it is invariably associated with a spiritual power or a “charisma” of kingship. The spiritual power, in the Buddhist perspective, is not involved in any performances of mystical sacrifices because the Buddhists, with their antipathy to sacrificial ritual involving slaughter, naturally cannot be expected to base the charisma of their ideal king on his performance of sacrifices, and a text denounces a king performing Vedic sacrifices as guilty of tormenting himself as well as others (Gokhale 1966, 18). This charisma is associated with the insignia of kingship, such as the slippers, sword, diadem, fan, throne, the white umbrella, and even with the place where he was born, the place where he was crowned and the place where he wins his most significant victory, which are declared as “memorable” spots (Gokhale 1966, 19).

Thus, the Buddhist view is that the spiritual power or charismatic power does not come from divinity or any sort of sacrifices, rather it comes from the great achievements and prestigious endowments of his good *Karma*.

C. Buddhist Regulatory Ethics and Virtues on Administration

As part of the above endowments, the Buddhist rulers should also rule over his subjects justly, in accordance with the Buddhist regulatory ethics of administration, and hence the administrative policies should be formulated fundamentally, based on the Buddha's Dhamma. In this respect, it should be noticed that the Buddhist Dhamma policy is generally associated with the principle of non-violence (*Ahimsa*), non-injury, loving kindness (*metta*), sympathetic joy (*mudita*), compassion (*karuna*), charity and donorship (*dana*) as a supreme virtues of conduct of all beings (Tambiah 1976, 42, 58). And what it means by principle, in the Buddhist perspective, is accepted as the soft policy that does not bind and take away your freedom as the binding rules and regulations do. It emphasizes the positive aspect of self-motivation or willingness to choose one's own course of action. Furthermore, the Dhamma-based administrative policy also requires that the ideal king should clean his mind of all traces of avarice (*lobha*), ill will (*dosa*) and intellectual error (*moha*), and strive to cultivate the virtue, to rule without the aid of force and weapons (Jakata, Vol. 5, no. 521, 61, trans. by Cowell 1905).

This mental purification would enable the Buddhist kings to establish the righteous laws, regulations, and policies for the interests of his subjects. When the kings or the rulers are righteous, their ministers or cabinets are also righteous, and that righteousness would eventually influence the whole realm. It is stated in the *Book of Gradual Sayings*:

But monks, when rajahs are righteous, the ministers of rajah also are righteous. When ministers are righteous, brahmins and householders also are righteous. Thus townsfolk and villagers are righteous. This being so, moon and sun go right in their courses. This being so, constellations and stars do likewise; days and nights, months and fortnights, seasons and years go on their courses regularly; winds blow regularly and in due season. Thus the devas are not annoyed and the sky-deva bestows sufficient rain. Rains falling seasonably, the

crops ripen in due season. Monks, when crops ripen in due season, men who live on crops are long-lived, well-favoured, strong and free from sickness (*The Book of Gradual Sayings*, Vol. II, no. 24, 85, translated by F.L. Woodward 1973).

In addition, the king should also perform the seven principles of welfare which are important for the king's role in his statecraft. These seven rules of welfare are mentioned in the *Mahaparinibbana Sutta* of *Digha Nikaya* (trans. by Walshe 1987, 231), and they are summarized as follows:

1. Hold regular and frequent assemblies or meetings;
2. Meet in concord, rise in concord and carry on his business in harmony;
3. Do not authorize what has not been authorized already, and do not abolish what has been authorized, but proceed according to what has been authorized by the rules of training;
4. Honor, respect, revere and salute the elders;
5. Abstain from detaining by force or kidnapping women and girls of the clan;
6. Honor, respect, revere and salute the shrines at home and abroad, do not withdraw the proper provision which is made for the safety of the *Arahants*;
7. Provide the rightful protection, defense and support for the *Arahants* so that *Arahants* from a distance may enter the realm and live in peace.

Of these, the frequent assembly is an important condition in the principle of public administration because it provides an opportunity to the members of the assembly to offer the best advice to the king, and it is deliberately conducted upon state affairs of all kinds, including issues of executive, judicial and military. Such meetings are for the purpose of making decisions on the interests of the state, especially political decisions, the appointment of public servants and even the election of the king. And the election process by this means can be tracked back to the election of the first king "*Maha Sammata (the great elect)*", as stated in the *Agganna Sutta* mentioned earlier. Apart from *Agganna Sutta*, this election process can also be seen in the *Uluka Jataka*, Vol. II, in which we are told that the birds, seeing that the beasts and the fish had their own king, had assembled upon a flat

rock to choose the king who had the quality of being *young, wise and bright*, and after the controversial debate, they decided to elect a golden Goose as the king (Jataka, Vol. II, trans. by Cowell 1895, 242-243). So, the first principle of welfare puts an interesting perception on the framework of Buddhist public administration because individuals who are chosen to become the ruler or a public servant are based on the quality and virtue, and they should win the approval of the people. Thus the question whether the king's son is automatically elected to the throne is theoretically and definitely impossible in the Buddhist conception.

Moreover, these seven principles of welfare are also necessary for ensuring the success of the community because they would provide not only the qualities of public spirit, harmony and conformity, but also those of obedience to the elders, protection of women, and performance of religious rites. These principles are key to promote the human rights as well as to generate an efficient system of good administration. Through performing these seven principles in the statecraft, the state may be expected to prosper and not decline (*Digha Nikaya*, trans. by Walshe 1987, 231).

Besides, Jataka, Vol. 5 also reveals the *Dasa Raja Dhamma* (Ten Virtues of the King), which are the fundamental ethics, virtues and regulations of the kings, and those virtues are rigidly quoted as follows: "Almsgiving, justice, penitence, meek spirit, temper mild, peace, mercy, patience, charity, with morals undefiled" (Jataka, Vol. 5, No. 534, 200). These *Ten Principles* are fundamentally and functionally moral so that the rulers and public officials should uphold serving the public interests, and they are now straightforwardly explained in greater detail as follows:

1) *Dānam (Generosity)*:

The first principle, based on the virtue of *generosity*, demands that the king or government should contribute generously to the well-being of the citizens, providing for the basic needs of the people, sharing knowledge and useful advice and even forgiving those who deserve forgiveness. The policy based on this principle concentrates on the responsible administration in serving the public interests, and the government should provide an effective delivery of public

service and social welfare to the citizens.

2) *Sīlam (Morality)*:

The second principle, based on the virtue of *morality*, demands that the king or government should possess the moral responsibility and high moral character through upholding and never breaching the religious morals such as the five precepts or eight precepts, the national laws as well as the ethical norms. Endowed with higher prestige in morality, the king would win the respect and trust of the people and lead by good exemplary manner. The policy under this principle emphasizes that the administration and development of the government are performed under the moral integrity.

3) *Pariccāgam (Liberality)*:

The third principle, based on the virtue of *liberality*, demands that the king or government should sacrifice his own personal pleasure, comfort and wealth in order to help other beings to free themselves from sufferings. This duty is greater than the first duty (generosity) as it requires the king to sacrifice everything, including his own life for the benefits of the country. The policy under this principle in short refers to the personal devotion for the selfless public service.

4) *Ajjavam (Honesty)*:

The fourth principle, based on the virtue of *honesty*, demands that the king or government should rule by truth, loyalty, honesty, sincerity and integrity by implying incorruptibility in the discharge of public duties. The policy under this principle concentrates solely on the aspect of transparency, in which the ruler or government should refrain from corruption, deception, and all other forms of dishonesties and fraudulences.

5) *Maddavam (Gentleness)*:

The fifth principle, based on the virtue of *gentleness*, demands that the king or government should be gentle, kind, approachable and open-minded to reasonable advice, avoiding arrogance and defaming others. The policy under this principle requires soft governing behavior, and thus the king or government should lead the country based on loving content, not by means of suppression.

6) *Tapam (Self-control)*:

The sixth principle, based on the virtue of *self-control*, demands that the king or government should be diligent in his duties, leading a simple life and committing self-control through the practice of spiritual discipline. The policy under this principle demands the king to live a simple life, avoiding an extravagant lifestyle.

7) *Akkodham (Non-anger)*:

The seventh principle, based on the virtue of *non-anger*, demands that the king or government should be free from ill will, hatred, anger and revenge. The policy under this principle requires the king to be a compassionate ruler, remaining calm in the midst of confusion or any other circumstances because anger is the cause of misjudging.

8) *Avihimsaṅca (Non-violence)*:

The eight principle, based on the virtue of *non-violence*, demands that the king or government should be a peace lover or peace promoter, avoiding violent actions or aggressive behavior that would harm other beings. The policy under this principle requires the king to promote peace inside his kingdom as well as with neighboring kingdoms.

9) *Khantiṅca (Patience)*:

The ninth principle, based on the virtue of *patience*, demands that the king or government should be patient and tolerant against all suffering and emotions, including greed, hatred and delusion, to serve the public interests. The policy under this principle concentrates on the quality of tolerance and understanding, and thus the ruler or government should accept any form of criticism.

10) *Avirodhanam (up-rightness)*:

The tenth principle, based on the virtue of *up-rightness*, demands that the king or government should be dutifully firm in righteousness and justice by never prejudging or opposing other opinions. Being firm in righteousness and justice, the king should correct someone who has done wrong and reward someone who has done right. The policy under this principle deals with accepting various views in order to uphold the righteousness, and thus the opposition should not be oppressed.

Apart from this, the *Mahasudassana Sutta* (trans. Wales 1987, 287) of Digha Nikaya also presents the *Brahmavahara* (Four Sublime States), which are the ideal way of conduct toward the practice of loving-kindness for the harmonious society, and these sublime states are explained as follows:

1. Metta (loving kindness): The principle based on this sublime state requires that the ruler or government should govern the country with love to all beings around the world.
2. Karuna (compassion): The principle based on this sublime state requires that the ruler or government should run the country with compassion or mercy to help all beings from suffering.
3. Mudita (Empathetic Joy): The principle based on this sublime state requires that the ruler or government should be sympathetic towards the happiness and well-being of the citizens. He (the king or ruler) should find joy in other's good and let his mind, filled with pity and sympathy, pervade the world.
4. Upekkha (Equanimity): The principle based on this sublime state requires that the ruler or government should run the country with equanimity and calmness, balancing the state of mind in the middle of rise and fall, success and failure, honor and blame and so on. The ability to maintain his mind in the state of equanimity or in a sense not of emotional excitation, especially neither in good nor in bad situations, reflects the calmness of his leadership.

Moreover, the Tatiya Agati Sutta of Anguttara Nikaya also explains the four forms of bias (*agati: the wrong course of action*) that the king or ruler should avoid in his ruling mandate. In the implementation of the government policies, corruption and injustice are generally associated with these four biases in the performance of public duty, and therefore the government should try to avoid these *four wrong courses of action* in their fulfillment of the public service. These *four wrong courses of action (agati)* are explained as follows:

1. *Chandagati (Bias caused by desire)*: The administration based on this principle requires that the government should not make judgment based on desire. The judgment through this means will lead to corruption and injustice.

2. *Dosagati (Bias caused by hatred or enmity)*: The administration based on this principle requires that the government should not make judgment based on hatred or enmity or ill-will. The judgment through this means will lead to bad decision.
3. *Mohagati (Bias caused by dilution or stupidity)*: The administration based on this principle requires that the government should not make judgment based on dilution or stupidity. The judgment through this means will lead to wrong judgment.
4. *Bhayagati (Bias caused by fear)*: The administration based on this principle requires that the government should not make judgment based on fear. The judgment through this means will lead to unlawful impunity or an unfair enforcement of law.

Based on the abovementioned Dhamma moralities and ethics, it can be stated that the administrative policies based on the principles of *Principles of Welfare*, *Ten Virtues of the king*, *Four Sublime States*, and *wrong courses of action* are unquestionably intended to bring effectiveness, efficiency and accountability into the administration, where the *Principles of Welfare* and *Ten Virtues of the king* advocate strong commitment on public-service delivery (selfless public service); the *Four Sublime States* primarily put their focus on a sympathetic and harmonious spirit for the well-being of the citizens; and the avoidance of *wrong courses of action* seeks to promote an effective enforcement of law against corruption and impunity in the government system. So, these policies manifests the rule of law and the contemporary concept of good governance which was proposed by World Bank President: in his 1992 article “Governance and Development” Lewis T. Preston reflects fundamentally on the administrative codes which were taught by Buddha more than 2500 years ago.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the model of Buddhist public administration relies heavily on the law of Dhamma, upholding the Dhamma as the dominance of rule of laws to guide the administrative direction for the public duty. This administrative model encloses regulatory principles, virtues and morality, as I have mentioned earlier, which aim at promoting the commitment to serve the interests of the citizen. And since its ultimate commitment is to prioritize the public interest, I would call this model the *Citizen-Oriented Buddhist Public Administration*, in which the principles of great compassion and loving

kindness and so on are of paramount importance to use as policy objectives. These policy objectives, moreover, can only be employed by the person, who has the quality of a great man, whose charisma is constituted by the Dhamma, for the harmony and prosperity of the kingdom. In this line of thinking, only a perfect person or a good king can move the wheel of Dhamma to bring prosperity and harmony to society, and the good king, according to Anguttara Nikaya, is the one whose rule is accompanied by regular seasons, seasonable rain and crops ripening in due season, while catastrophe is the consequence of any error in ritual (trans. Woodward 1973, 84-85).

Moreover, the perspective of this model stresses the important dominance of Dhamma over the rule of law, which in principle limits the potential despotism of the king in his exercising of power. According to Gokhale (1969, 738), this dominance is the spiritual authority to rage against the king who ceases to observe the Dhamma, which results in the loss of his charisma and the restriction of the legitimacy of his authority. And thus, the split of state (*ānā*) and religion (Buddhism) within the public organization, making the state subordinate to the Dhamma, is a balance of force to make the state an instrument of morality (Gokhale 1969, 738).

3.2 Jayavarman VII herein

With regard to Jayavarman VII's kingship, we have learnt from Briggs (1951, 229) that the king was a fervent Mahayana Buddhist, "Buddhism of great vehicle", devoted to Lokeshvara in the form of compassionate Bodhisattva, and he governed the state as an incarnation of the *Buddharaja*. This status was not only a Buddhist substitute for the *Sivaite Devaraja*, but we see another aspect from the statue of the apotheosis of the founding king, whose features are also to be seen on the upper parts of the towers of the *Bayon* temple at Angkor in the form of the *Bodhisattva Lokeshvara Samntamukha*, who faces in all directions (Coedes 1968, 175). The concept of the *Buddharaja*, in this context, comes from the Buddhist trinity, in which his father is represented as Lokeshvara, the compassionate Bodhisattva, as mentioned in the Preah Khan inscription, and his mother is represented as the *Prajnaparamita*, the perfection of wisdom, as mentioned in the Ta Prohm inscription.

The great compassion (father) and the perfection of wisdom (mother) together produced the Buddhahood, which was the king himself, who governed in the cosmic center at the temple of Bayon (Coedes 1963, 97).

As the *Buddhajara*, the king wielded the Buddha's Dhamma of compassion and loving kindness as the fundamental policy to guide his administration. This Dhamma, including the *ten virtues, merits of compassion, principles of kingship*, etc. that I have mentioned earlier, served as the righteous policies that the king exercised for the prosperity, security and welfare of the state. The evidence that proves much of his Dhamma policy can be justified in his well-known statement in the Say-Fong inscription which stated that the bodily pain of his people became a pain of the soul for him (King Jayavarman VII), more painful to him than to the actual individuals, for it is the suffering of the state which makes kings suffer, and not their own pain (Chatterji 1928, 221). This concept states that as the Buddhist king, he was fully responsible for the social welfare and prosperity of the state, and it also illustrates that under the influence of the Dhamma policy of great compassion, the king was full of deep sympathy for the public spirit of his kingdom.

Through the total application of these policies, it can be noted that the numerous road systems for transportation, irrigation systems for agricultural production, rest houses along the roads and hospitals for social welfare were constructed and widely distributed throughout the kingdom. In the temple of Bayon alone, for example, Coedes (1963, 98) described that the massive walls were twelve kilometers on one side and were surrounded by big moats, and outside the wall an ingenious system of irrigation spread fertility to the environs of the capital. Moreover, as can be seen from his inscriptions, 102 hospitals across the country were constructed in order to offer free state healthcare services to the people, and the accessibility of hospitals was made possible by the system of roads (Coedes 1963, 101-102). Additionally, the stele inscription of Preah Khan mentions that 121 houses with fire or rest houses (*Dhammasala*), about fifteen kilometers apart, were constructed along the routes cutting across the kingdom (Coedes 1968, 176). So, by introducing the Dhamma's policy of compassion into the administration, King Jayavarman VII put the interests and needs of the citizens in his heart, and these concerns were responded to in his

social-welfare programs.

Moreover, it is also worth noting that the power of King Jayavarman VII scattered over the kingdom through the images of *Jayabuddhamahanatha*, which were distributed to various towns during his reign. This is clearly mentioned in his inscriptions at Preah Khan as well as at Bayon, which proclaimed that *Jayabuddhamahanatha* had been sent to twenty-three towns in the kingdom (Coedes 1951, 100). The image of *Jayabuddhamahanatha* comes from the prefix *Jaya*, “victory” which was another name for Jayavarman VII himself and which constituted a kind of distinguishing seal on all his works, and the last part continues with the compound term *Buddha-mahanatha*, “Buddha, the great savior or protector”, which applies to none other than King Jayavarman VII, since he could save the kingdom, defeating the Chams (Coedes 1963, 99). This personage then had been explicitly clarified in Woodward’s paper on *The Jayabuddhamahanatha images of Cambodia*, explaining that the term of *Jayabuddhamahanatha* was translated as “Buddha-Great-Load of Victory”, which represented the king himself (Woodward 1994, 108). The images of *Jayabuddhamahanatha*, in this sense, represented his power from the central region of the cosmos to the lower cosmic regions, proclaiming both the political authority of the king and his righteous polity.

Furthermore, the widespread power of *Jayabuddhamahanatha* would also empower the king to gain the universal power which is the central conception of the wheel-turning monarch. The wheel-turning monarch, or *Chakravartin*, rules in accordance with the Dhamma and takes the Dhamma as his righteous polity. Thus, the concept of “the king as the wheel-rolling monarch” builds on the connection between universal power and righteousness.

Through devotion to the Bodhisattva Lokeshvara, on the other hand, the king governed his kingdom as a compassionate ruler who favored sympathy rather than oppression. His great compassion was represented in the soft policy and forgiveness in his government. Such compassionate policy was also applied in the government of King Asoka, who, after converting to Buddhism, had already declared amnesties for prisoners twenty times in the

twenty-sixth year of his reign (Akira 1990, 99). Even though there are no available sources on the amnesty for prisoners in the reign of King Jayavarman VII, as the Buddhist king, this policy might also have been applied because this tradition has been practiced even until the current Cambodian Buddhist king, *Norodom Sihamoni*, especially on certain occasions, such as *the King's Birthday*, *the Khmer New Year* and *the Water Festival*, respectively. Furthermore, the policy based on this great compassion was also applied in the tax policy in the reign of King Jayavarman VII, as we learnt from David J. Steingerg that tax collection from the places where the sick resided was levied or banned (cited in Furuto 2013, 231).

3.3 Substantial Impacts on His Administration

From the public-policy point of view, the impressive development during the reign of King Jayavarman VII, including the construction of extensive road networks across the country accessible for military and trade purposes, the building of enormous irrigation systems supporting agricultural development and the establishment of numerous hospitals and rest houses necessary for increasing social welfare, etc., was consequently contributed to by 1) the righteous policies, based on the Buddha's Dhamma, which were applied to the PA; 2) the competent public servants, namely the *guru* and the Buddhist queen, who were supportive both to the king and the Buddhist government; and 3) the Dhamma-oriented leadership, which characterized his public-administration model as more compassionate and responsible for the interests of his citizens.

In previous parts, I have already described the core regulatory principles, ethics and virtues which are essentially adopted as administrative policies in the Buddhist governments. So, I shall examine thoroughly the role of the *guru*, the merit of Buddhist queenship and the personal leadership of King Jayavarman VII in the following:

A. The Important Role of the Guru

First, it should be noted that the *guru* was always the important preceptor of ancient Cambodian kings, whether he was the God-King or the Buddhist King; there was always a royal *guru* to tutor the kings in various branches of learning in his youthful years. His role

was mandatory in coaching the king regarding religious morality and other sciences and in advising on the important matters of administration. In ancient times of Khmer society, the *guru* also played his role as the architect in guiding the building of temples and other constructions in the kingdom. With regard to the important role of the *guru*, in his quest for the aspects of ancient Indian administration, Ganguly (1958, 231) found that the *Kurudhamma Jataka* of Buddhist literature provided evidence that the king's advisor whose name was *Vinicchayamaccas* was not only empowered to advise the king in the matters of morality, but also discharged in judicial function.

We have learnt from Briggs (1951, 229) and Coedes (1968, 174) that in the empire of King Jayavarman VII, there was the Buddhist *guru*, named *Jayamangalartha*, whom the king showered with gifts and honors. Dr. Sahai mentioned that the *guru* played an important role at the time of Jayavarman VII, especially in educating the royal princes, sacrificing for rain and controlling the administration of some royal foundation lands (cited in Mabbett 1978, 29). This *guru* was the chief Buddhist minister who discharged not only to help the king run the administration, but also to empower the people in matters of morality, especially in advising the king to follow the Buddhist morality.

As the Buddhist minister who has a huge responsibility and duty to guide the administration in the Buddhist government, the *guru* of the king is the most intellectual man, who is a genius in religious doctrine as well as in other sciences. He knows more about the Buddha's Dhamma and is able to advise the king to righteously follow the Dhamma's policies. So, by this definition, the Buddhist government cannot or hardly be run without the important role of the *guru*.

B. The Merit of The Buddhist Queenship

After the death of queen *Jayarajadevi*, the Brahmanic daughter, King Jayavarman VII married her elder sister, the talented *Indradevi*, who had great intelligence in Buddhist scriptures and other Sanskrit matters. Seeing her genius, King Jayavarman VII made *Indradevi* his principle queen (*Aggamahesi*) and named her the distinguished professor of the Buddhist colleges for women in three monastic schools, viz. Nagendratunga, "the first

college of sacred sciences or a Buddhist doctrine”, Tilakottara, and Narendrasrama, “an educational community for women, including those from the elite families” (Sharan 1974, 126; Goonatilake 2000, 86). With regard to these three women colleges, Goonatilake (2000, 86) pointed out in her article on “Rediscovering Cambodian Buddhist Women of the Past” that the inscription at Nagendratunga declares it to be the first college for women on earth.

The education of women in these Buddhist monasteries which was provided by queen *Indradevi* was also a rare historical remark on the important role of women in public service. Her role in these institutions was not only to teach the Buddhist literature to those women, but she also played an important role in training people in *Yogacara* philosophy in those institutions (Sharan 1974, 184).

Upholding good characteristics and great wisdom, *Indradevi* was an influential Buddhist queen, who had turned the king and the king’s government towards Buddha’s teachings. As I have mentioned earlier, the queenship is one among the seven endowments of jewels of the wheel-rolling monarch, or *Chakrapat* in the Khmer language, and she has a strong impact on the success of the king, especially in transforming her husband into a righteous Buddhist king. In this regard, in his search for the merit of Buddhist Queenship, John S. Strong acknowledged that the perfect wife of the ideal king, the *Striratna*, literally a “gem of a women” impresses her husband with her perfect characteristics, beauty and merit, encouraging him to turn towards Buddhism by taking the Buddha’s Dhamma as the king’s polity (Strong 2002, 35-54; Strong 2003, 41-51). In brief, Strong (2003, 51) summarizes three things about the theories of Buddhist queenship as follows, (1) Just as the king, a Buddhist queen is independent; she earns her queenship by virtue of her own merit achieved in her own past life and by her own realization of the truth of the Dhamma; (2) Just as the king, Buddhist queenship is interdependent; she must enjoy a symbiotic relationship with her husband, whose kingship she supports, just as he (the king) supports her queenship; and (3) Just as the king, the Buddhist queen is dependent; she must be a good wife, and she has the wisdom to know what makes a ruler truly great and is able to tell him that. In this regard, Ganguly (1958, 53-54) also makes it clear that the queen in the Buddhist classical account was not the consort of the king, but she could also rise to the

occasion with a display of administrative and martial skills.

So, with such important merit, it can be stated that in her role of intellect, *Indradevi* was contributory to the public service in the government of King Jayavarman VII, especially in the matter of intellectual service to women, and her merit was also essential to guide and advise the king to run his government with righteousness and compassion. Because in the Buddhist perspective, her queenship, representing the essential endowment of the wheel-rolling monarch, is in principle necessary for the Buddhist king.

C. The King's Personal Characteristics of Leadership

Another important factor which also contributed to the success of his administration and made him the most respected king ever are his own personal characteristics of leadership. This prestigious personality personifies his devotional statue of Buddhist kingship, which proves his spiritual leadership in accordance to the Buddhist ideal of the *Law of Karma*, not the *Divine Gift*. According to the law of Karma, the accumulation of merit is rewarded by rebirth into happy conditions and high status, whereas the beggars and criminals are paying their demerit of evil deeds committed in their previous lives. Based on this law, the Buddhist king seems to be more careful of the nature of his actions, and Quaritch Wales presumed that the Buddhist king would probably rule more justly than would a Hindu monarch (Wales 1931, 31). Therefore, such a distinguished personality of leadership does not come from supernatural power, like Weber's charismatic authority; it comes from the good *Karma* or *merit* from his previous life, based on the Buddhist belief in the *Law of Karma* and the righteous policy that he chose for his current leadership, mainly the Buddha's Dhamma of compassion and loving-kindness. As we have learnt earlier either from his famous proclamation or from his Dhamma policies for administration, the king runs his country with great compassion, considering the suffering of his citizens superior to his own. Such a personality of leadership represents his strong commitment for the selfless public service that put the interests and needs of citizens at the heart of the king, and this personality is hardly to be found in the leaderships of other Cambodian kings.

In his article "From Ashoka to Jayavarman VII", Hermann Kulke (2014, 1-18) pointed out

that the state ideology of Angkor was strongly influenced by the inherited Hindu Devaraja cult, as Ashoka's Dhamma policy was by the Brahmanic *Arthashastra of Kautilya*, and after their conversion to Buddhism, the two greatest Buddhist rulers, viz. Ashoka and Jayavarman VII, seem to have turned out to be compassionate rulers, and their states even reached their climax. However, their rule was followed by a decay of their erstwhile great empires after their deaths, and Kulke says that this decay was linked to the reaction against Buddhism. In this regard, Briggs (1951, 239) says that the reign of Jayavarman VII was possibly followed by a violent Sivaite reaction, accompanied by acts of vandalism, and so both Coedes (cited in Briggs 1951, 239) and D.G.E. Hall (1964, 116) made it clear that the Hindu reaction swept away the cult of the *Buddharaja*, and everywhere *Lingas* and other *Sivaite* symbols replaced *Lokesvara*. This explicitly means that the administrative policy (or leadership) had shifted from a compassion-favoring principle to a punishment-oriented rule, and thus the principles of Buddhist leadership, which made the people less an ingredient of the king's magnificence than objects of his compassion, an audience for his merit-making and participants in his redemption (Chandler 2008, 69), died as soon as the leadership changed. After his leadership had gone, no Khmer ruler was able to maintain it in the same manner. So, it can be understood that the Buddha's Dhamma-oriented leadership of King Jayavarman VII is important to run his government successfully, and the absence of similar leadership resulted in the decay of the government.

Through investigation on the government of King Jayavarman VII, substantial impacts come from the fact that first the Buddha's Dhamma had been adopted to intuitively guide the public-administrative system and policy; second the king's leadership, under the influence of Buddha's Dhamma, turned out to be compassionate and strongly committed "selfless public service" for the well-being of the citizens; and third he was surrounded by perfect people, especially the Buddhist *guru*, the intellectual queen and other Buddhist ministers, who knew more about the Buddhist virtue to implement these administrative policies righteously and effectively. By this premise, the effective government of King Jayavarman VII, from the public administration point of view, can be formulated as follows:

Good Policy + Perfect Persons = Effective Government

All in all, through the in-depth survey on the framework of Buddhist public administration from the theoretical basis and on the actual adoption of this model from the practicable fact, the perspectives or characteristics of Buddhist public administration are classified in the following table:

<i>Perspectives of Buddhist Public Administration</i>	
Theoretical Foundation	Kingship theory of Buddharaja, Dhammiko Dhammaraja, and Chakravartin
Role of government	“Citizen-oriented”, the tasks and duties that are carried out in the public institutions are solely aimed at tirelessly serving the citizens (selfless public service).
Mechanisms for achieving policy objectives	The state public institutions and Monasteries
Balance of force	The split of State (ānā) and religion (Buddhism) within the public organization is to limit the potential despotism of the state, and the dominance of Dhamma over the rule of law makes the state the instrument of morality
Approaches to governance	Four Dhamma approaches are recommended: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Seven Conditions of Welfare;</i> 2. <i>Ten Virtues for the Ruler;</i> 3. <i>The Practice of Four Sublime States for Harmonious Society;</i> and 4. <i>The Avoidance of Four Wrong Courses of Actions</i>
Assumed organizational structure	Cosmos-oriented structure
Assumed motivational basis of public servants	Two motivational principles are recommended: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Principle of No Greed (Alobha), which considers the acquisition as the root of sufferings; 2. <i>Law of Karma or Law of Cause and Effect,</i> which stresses the cause of good action, consequently resulting in better conditions.

V. CONCLUSION

With critical investigation in the Buddhist canons, the results can be identified that the model of Buddhist public administration put a strong focus on great compassion and commitment that the rulers and public officials, together with their mental purification of all attachments, should uphold to serve the best interest of the citizens. This model highlights the main principles of the *Seven Conditions of Welfare*, *Ten Virtues for the Ruler*, *The Practice of Four Sublime States for Harmonious Society*, and *The Avoidance of Four Wrong Courses of Actions*, which are necessarily important to adopt as the ethical and regulatory basis for the rulers and public servants to righteously perform their public duty. It is the public-administration model that is ideally committed to mitigate the risk of corruption in the public sector, under the principle of *No Greed (Alobha)*, which considers acquisition as the root of suffering, and to promote motivation in the performance of public duty under the *Law of Karma*, which implies that the individual bad or good action (cause) influences the future of that individual (effect). And the concept that the king, whose rule is accompanied by prosperity or catastrophe, as Anguttara Nikaya said, is clearly measured by the *Law of Karma*. Based on these laws and principles, it can be expected that the rulers or public officials will be motivated by virtue to commit to public interests.

Moreover, the thesis also found that this model was fully adopted to guide the administration reform in the government of King Jayavarman VII, which he shifted from *Saivite-Devaraja* to *Buddharaja*. Under this conscientious reform, Jayavarman VII turned out to be more compassionate and strongly committed to tirelessly serving the interest of his citizens. So, the policy concept of “*the suffering of the citizen is more important than his own*”, which he proclaimed in the Say-Fong Hospital inscriptions to implement the state healthcare program, is undoubtedly connected to the principle of great compassion in the framework of *Citizen-Oriented Buddhist Public Administration*, and it was this principle that made his kingdom prosperous and that made his government well-known even until today.

More importantly, as I argued in this thesis, the Buddhist public-administration model contributed both to the ongoing search for the academic discipline of the NWPA model from an Eastern perspective and to the practical case study which I regard as the sufficient and adequate model to apply not only to the government of King Jayavarman VII, but also to the Buddhist governments of this line. Furthermore, the results of this research can also be used as an asset for further study on the history of King Jayavarman VII.

V. REFERENCES

- Akira, H. 1990. *A History of Indian Buddhism: From Sakyamuni to Early Mahayana*. Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Alabaster, H. 1871. *The Wheel of The Law: Buddhism*. London: Trubner.
- Bakker, J.I.H. 1988, "Patrimonialism, Involution, and the Agrarian Question in Java: A Weberian Analysis of Class Relations and Servile Labour." in J.G.B. Benderand M.T. Larsen (eds). *State and Society: The Emergence and Development of Social Hierarchy and Political Centralization*. London: Routledge, p. 279-296.
- Banerjea, P. 1916. *Public Administration in Ancient India*. London: Macmillan.
- Briggs, L.P. 1951. *The Ancient Khmer Empire*, New Series 41(1), Part I., Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Chakravarti, U. 1996. *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Chandler, D. 2008. *A History of Cambodia*. 4th edn. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Chatterji, B.R. 1928. *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia* Calcutta: Calcutta University Press.
- Coedes, G. 1963. *Angkor: An Introduction* London: Oxford University Press.
- Coedes, G. 1966. *The Making of South East Asia* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coedes, G. 1968. *The Indianized States of South-East Asia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Cowell, E.B. (trans.). 1895, *Jataka Vol. II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cowell, E.B. 1905. *The Jakata or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births: Mahahamsa-Jataka no. 534*, translated from the original Pali text, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daguan, Z. 1992. *The Customs of Cambodia*. 2nd edn. Bangkok: The Siam Society.
- Davids, T.W.R. 1903. *Buddhist India*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Davids, T.W.R. (ed.). 1910. *Digha Nikaya: Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. IV, Part III, London: Oxford University Press.
- Davids, T.W.R. 1921. *Dialogue of the Buddha*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Drechsler, W., 2013, 'Three Paradigms of Governance and Administration: Chinese, Western and Islamic', *Society and Economy*, 35 (3), 1-30.
- Drechsler, W., 2016, 'Public Administration within the Sufficient Economy', *Thai Journal of Public Administration*, 14 (2), 1-10.
- Furuto, S.B.C.L. (ed.). 2013. *Social Welfare in East Asia and the Pacific*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ganguly, D.K. 1958. *Aspects of Ancient Indian Administration*. New Delhi: Sunil Composing.
- Geertz, C. 1980. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ghoshal, U.N. 1959. *A History of Indian Political Ideas: The Ancient Period and the Period of Transition to the Middle Ages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gokhale, B.G. 1966. "Early Buddhist Kingship." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 26(1), 15-22.
- Gokhale, B.G. 1969. "The Early Buddhist View of the State." *Journal of the American*

Oriental Society 89(4), 731-938.

Goonatilake, H. 2000. "Rediscovering Cambodian Buddhist Women of the Past." in K.L. Tsomo (ed.). *Innovative Buddhist Women: Swimming Against the Stream*. Surrey: Curzon Press, p. 84-90.

Hall, D.G.E. 1964. *A History of South East Asia*. 2nd edn. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hare, E.M. 1934. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara Nikaya) or More-Numbered Suttas*, Vol. 3. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

Heine-Geldern, R. 1942. "Conceptions of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia." *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 2(1), 15-30.

Kulke, H. 2014. "From Ashoka to Jayavarman VII: Some Reflections on the Relationship Between Buddhism and the State in India and Southeast Asia." *Indian International Centre, Occasional Publication* 56, 1-18.

Mabbett, I.W. 1978. "Kingship in Angkor." *Journal of Siam Society* 66(2), 1-58.

Majumdar, R.C. 1944a. *Hindu Colonies in the Far East*. Calcutta: N.K Gossian & Co.

Majumdar, R.C. 1944b. *Kambuja-Desa or An Ancient Hindu Colony in Cambodia*. Calcutta: University of Madras Press.

Mus, P. 1935. "Thousand-Armed Kannon: A Mystery or a Problem?" *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Tokyo)* 12, 1-33.

Nasrullah, A.M. 2005. "From Public Administration to New Public Management: An Analysis." *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 3(1), 174-204.

National Museum of Cambodia. 2016. "Collection Stone Objects: Jayavarman VII, National Museum of Cambodia." Available at http://www.cambodiamuseum.info/en_collection/stone_object/jayavaraman.html (last accessed 10 May 2016).

- Sharan, M.K. 1974. *Studies in Sanskrit Inscriptions of Ancient Cambodia, on the Basis of First Three Volumes of Dr. R.C. Majumdar's Edition*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publication.
- Sharan, M.K. 1986. *Political History of Ancient Cambodia*. New Delhi: Vishwavidya Publishers.
- Strong, J.S. 2002. "Asoka's Wives and the Ambiguities of Buddhist Kingship." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 13, 35-54.
- Strong, J.S. 2003. "Towards a Theory of Buddhist Queenship: The Legend of Asanhimitta." In J.C. Holt, N.K. Jacob and S.W. Jonathan (eds). *Constituting Communities: Theravada Buddhism and The Religious Cultures of South and Southeast Asia*. New York: State University of New York Press, p. 35-51.
- Tambiah, S.J. 1976. *World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Wales, H.G.Q. 1931. *Siamese State Ceremonies: Their History and Function*. London: Stephen Austin.
- Walshe, M., (transl.).1987. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Digha Nikaya*. Boston: Wisdom.
- Weber, M. 1958. *The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism*. New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Woodward, F.L. (transl.). 1973. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-Nikaya) or More-Numbered Sutta, Vol. II*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Woodward, H.W. 1994. "The Jayabuddhamahanatha Images of Cambodia." *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 52/53, 105-111.