



Inspiring Excellence

Submitted by:

Name: Sadat Shahriar Arko

ID:22201992

Sec:04

Submitted to: Hafiz Shahrear Faisal,Lecturer,BRAC University

Thesis Statement: This essay intends to present a comparative analysis between Monarchy and Non-monarchy structures using the following points: different bureaucratic systems and structures of political power, political ideologies and the position of women.

Topic Sentence:

1. Monarchy and non-monarchy empires experienced different types of government, from highly centralized monarchies to more decentralized systems.

2. Monarchical empires such as Persia and India placed great importance on centralized authority and the divine rights, while Athens and Rome were renowned for their democracy and balances on their authority.

3. Lastly, Women's roles in monarchical and non-monarchical countries showed great variation. Women of royal and elite status had more power while most women faced strict societal limitations.

Publisher:

1. ON A RECENT ESTIMATE OF THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SYSTEM OF THE MAURYA EMPIRE. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*

2. ADMINISTRATIVE LEGACIES OF THE PERSIAN WORLD-STATE EMPIRE: IMPLICATIONS FOR MODERN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, Part 1. *Public Administration Quarterly*

3. "Philosophy and Democracy." *Political Theory* 9

4. The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime. *The Classical Quarterly*

5. The Status of Women in Ancient Athens. *International Social Science Review*

This essay compares historical monarchies and non-monarchies governments, what they believed about politics and how women were treated. We will look at a few examples monarchies such as Persia, India and non-monarchies like Athens and the Roman empire to see how they ran their societies, what political ideas they stuck to and women's conditions of that time. This essay intends to present a comparative analysis between Monarchy and Non-Monarchy structures through the following points: different bureaucratic systems and structures of political power, political ideologies & position of women.

Monarchy and non-monarchy empires experienced different types of government, from highly centralized monarchies to more decentralized systems. In the past, India and Persia both had monarchical systems, such as India was under the Maurya Empire and Persia was under Xerxes and Darius. These Monarchy systems had centralized government structures and all power came from a single administrator. The Mauryan Empire's founder followed Kautilya's concepts of centralized government and political planning. (Ghoshal, 1959) In the Mauryan Empire every area was ruled by officials. These officials controlled the taxes, made sure that laws were followed and policies were carried out effectively across the entire empire. Kautilya's Arthashastra is a comprehensive structure for government that places an emphasis on economic control, spying, and administrative efficiency. As a result of this centralization, local governments had a lot of freedom and weren't closely watched, which contributed to the possibility of power abuses and corruption. This also made it easier to keep strict control and encourage good management. In the same way, the Persian Empire was a mix of centralized and decentralized government especially under the rule of Darius I and Xerxes. The Persian empire controlled centralized bureaucratic systems under a king and decentralized governance through the local satraps. (Farazmand, 2002) The kingdom was split up into satrapies or provinces. Each satrap was in charge of a province and had a lot of freedom but the King's eye kept an eye on them. This system, which balanced local authority and central management, helped the Persian Empire manage its vast and wide areas. The royal road system and standard currency simplified communication and business. But since the satraps were independent, internal conflict and rebellions happened which put the central government to the test. This system made running the government and keeping the regions together but it also required continual alertness to prevent regional splits. On the other hand, Ancient Athens and the Roman did not have monarchies and

instead had divided governmental structures. Athens was popular for its direct democracy. People were involved in government through meetings and groups such as the Boule and the Ecclesia, where decisions were made by everyone together. In Athens, if they thought the assembly decision was unfair then people asked for another group to review it. This smaller group was randomly chosen.(Walzer, 1981) This strategy encouraged a lot of people to be involved and responsible, but decisions took longer to make because everyone had to agree. Even though Athens claimed to be democratic, women slaves and non-citizens could not vote, which made the political system less open to everyone. Moreover, in Rome, Power was distributed among many institutions, such as the Senate and chosen officials like consuls, so that no individual group could get too much power. Power sharing made politics easier to access. The political system was also greatly biased toward the elite, which limited the power of the classes even though it was supposed to be open to everyone. In my perspective, we are able to see a variety of government structures from the past, ranging from more centralized to less centralized. Both the Mauryan Empire and the Persian Empire had unified power structures but Athens and Rome chose to have structures that were split up. Each structure has merits and demerits. For example, centralization made control easier but also opened the door to abuse, while decentralization provided more freedom but needed extra care to keep things from breaking up. In Athens, direct democracy made participation simpler but excluded other groups. Power sharing in Rome balanced openness with restriction. In general, these methods changed society and government in different ways.

Monarchical empires such as Persia and India placed great importance on centralized authority and the divine rights, while Athens and Rome were renowned for their democracy and balances on their authority. In Ancient Monarchical systems like Persia and India, Political ideas were often based on divine right and the idea that power should be centralized. Under kings like Darius the great, the king was seen as the chosen one, who was the most important God in Zoroastrianism. This divine approval was very important for making the emperor's total rule legal and for setting up a massive government that could keep an eye on a very large and varied empire. People believed the king's instructions were divine and could not be questioned. This provided support for a hierarchical power structure which was essential in order to maintain order and stability throughout a large region of territory. In the same way, the idea of Dharma

was very important to the political philosophy of kingdoms in ancient India. People believed that the monarch or raja, as the protector of Dharma, a moral and spiritual code. The king had to defend his people, maintain peace and the promotion of prosperity within his kingdom. Religious books and traditions saw the monarch as a semi-divine figure whose rule was predetermined and necessary for the well-being of the state. However, non-monarchical societies like Athens and Rome believed in public participation and shared rule. Democracy was important in Athens. They didn't give political authority to a single person, they gave it to the people. Athenians could directly participate in politics by voting on laws and policies. This combined government was supposed to be fair and stop everyone from abusing their power. In the same way, Rome had a complicated system of checks and balances that kept power from getting too concentrated. The Senate, who are rich aristocrats ruled Rome and established laws. (Brunt, 1984) In Rome, Political philosophy put a lot of weight on the Senate, which was made up of chosen officials who had a great deal of authority over the laws and the administration. Although the consuls were selected to be in charge, the power that they had was limited by other judges and the Senate. This encouraged everyone to work together to run the government. People in the Romans believed that active participation and influence were important for the well-being of the state. This was shown by how much they valued social duty. In my opinion, both systems had pros and cons. Monarchies in Persia and India maintained stability with organized authority and supernatural support. But Non-monarchical structures like Athens and Rome emphasize shared governance and public participation which increased fairness but slowed the decision-making. Even though non-monarchical systems had problems, they helped to establish modern democracy and showed the need for power sharing and politics.

Lastly, women's roles in monarchical and non-monarchical governments showed great variation. Women of royal and elite status had more power while most women faced strict societal limitations. In ancient Persia, especially during the Achaemenid Empire, women had very different roles depending on their social class. Women in the royal family and the nobles had a lot of power and luxury. These strong women handled land, properties and money, which gave them financial freedom and social standing. They often played important roles in court politics as regents, advisors or middlemen. So, they indirectly influenced politics and stabilized the monarchy. For example, royal women could use their position and ties to affect succession fights

and international issues. But most Persian women still lived in male-dominated societies. These women mostly worked as housekeepers and were in charge of raising children and running the households. They hardly participated in politics and business due to societal norms that prioritized masculine dominance. Although wealthy women had more power, Persian society as a whole still had traditional gender roles that limited most women's positions and abilities. Also in ancient India, women had different roles depending on the time and place. At the beginning of Vedic period, women were given a higher status than males and were allowed to participate in religious rites, educational activities, and intellectual discussion. Texts like the Rigveda talk about women who were teachers and ages, which shows how highly they were thought of. But by the time the Vedic era came to a close, as well as during the Mauryan and Gupta period, the laws started to become strict. Women's jobs consisted mostly of working from home and they couldn't go out in public because of laws and social norms. Child marriage and sati became common which showed a clear indication that their status was degrading. On the other hand, in ancient Athens, women had very limited roles that were set by strict social rules. They could vote, own land on their own, or get involved in politics directly. According to O'Neal(1993), women of Athens didn't attend school as much; they mostly learned how to take care of their homes. So, Women in Athens were expected to raise children and care for their houses.. This was their main duty. Their schooling was limited and mostly focused on housework skills. They also didn't spend much time with men outside of their close family and mostly lived a quiet life. They mostly talked to relatives and close female friends. But wealthy women might influence indirectly. They were in charge of big families and farms, which need a lot of organizational skills. Through their connections with husbands, fathers and children, these women may influence politics and society. Even though it wasn't known to the public, their advice and views could affect what the men in their lives did and decided. Rich women may cross these lines to have some power, but most Athens women were mothers, which shows how patriarchal the society was. Women had more freedom in Rome than Athens Roman women could own land and receive it. They could also run businesses and had some power in the family and society. Elite women could be involved in public life through male relatives but they were still not allowed to hold official government positions. In Rome, the law and society kept men in power, but women had a lot of freedom, which allowed them to play important roles in family business and social networks.

To sum up, both monarchical and non-monarchical societies had different government, political philosophies and women's roles, reflecting their different socioeconomic structures. Even though royal women were powerful, Persia and India's monarchies established authority under divinely- sanctioned monarchs, building organized bureaucracies and restricting most women's position. In contrast, non-monarchical cultures like Athens and Rome emphasized shared government and civic participation but still limited women's responsibilities. These differences show each system's strengths and faults, shaping their societies and influencing political ideas and gender roles.

Bibliography:

- Ghoshal, U. N. (1959). ON A RECENT ESTIMATE OF THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SYSTEM OF THE MAURYA EMPIRE. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 40(1/4), 63–69. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41688888>
- FARAZMAND, A. (2002). ADMINISTRATIVE LEGACIES OF THE PERSIAN WORLD-STATE EMPIRE: IMPLICATIONS FOR MODERN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, Part 1. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 26(3/4), 280–316. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41288175>
- Walzer, Michael. “Philosophy and Democracy.” *Political Theory* 9, no. 3 (1981): 379–99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/191096>.
- Brunt, P. A. (1984). The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime. *The Classical Quarterly*, 34(2), 423–444. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/638300>
- O’Neal, W. J. (1993). The Status of Women in Ancient Athens. *International Social Science Review*, 68(3), 115–121. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41882108>

