

Kautilya, the Indian Machiavelli; On War and diplomacy in Ancient India

Aabid Majeed Sheikh¹, Saima Rashid²

¹Ph.D. Candidate, Department of International Relations, Selçuk University, Turkey

²Research Assistant, Centre for Islam and Global Affairs, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Turkey.

Abstract— In the contemporary period because of a little fluctuation in the global situation different variations have equally occurred in the acts of diplomacy. Previously the emphasis was actually on hard power as a method of diplomatic preparation. However with establishment of the notion of soft power diplomatic practice became modernized in light of the fact that the idea of soft power gives a contrasting option to the discretionary emissaries to lead conciliatory practice without relating to candy and twig method. Despite India's long history of reflection on interstate relations, Western assessments and theorizations continue to dominate the modern scholarship on India's IR, with Indians mostly reacting to foreign assessments. This paper will elucidate various diplomatic views of Kautilya in the ancient India period that are still appreciated for the Indian and world diplomacy. This paper will also try to shed light on Kautilya's view on spies, agents and interstate relations.

Keywords— Diplomacy, War, Ancient India, Kautilya.

I. INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy according to Livingston Merchant is 'as old as the hills'.¹ Diplomacy likely developed when the primitive men preferred to look for some sort of satisfactory solutions for their disparities instead of fighting. Diplomacy in this way seems by all accounts to be a standard known to and accomplished by all human societies in the contemporary states. Diplomacy and the diplomats have presumed a more prominent weakness and more extensive measurements as time passed by as additionally the events and accomplishments of diplomats. Frequently the brilliance of a diplomat is monitored in Metternich, who as an envoy to Paris in the nineteenth century, accomplished peace amongst France and Austria. Henceforth, it is viewed that a diplomat sets the stage and composes choices before finishing the commendable public task.²

Nevertheless, in the prior years of World War II, Francois-Poncet, the French diplomat to Germany once stated "In fact, I was chiefly an informer and a mailman." This was a surprising case and has a minimal parallel in the archives of diplomacy. The present day conception of diplomacy barely

consents to this sort of a diplomatic role. Diplomacy as we comprehend works through a "maze" of foreign officer, embassies, consulates, and extraordinary missions everywhere throughout the world. It is bilateral and multilateral in character. Its bilateral nature was more obvious in traditional diplomacy. Its multilateral perspectives have developed in current circumstances as a consequence of developing significance of international conference, international organizations, provincial preparations, and combined safety procedures. It might grasp a large number of benefits, from easiest material of part in the relationships amongst two countries to crucial subjects of terrorism plus war. Once it separates risk of warfare, or at minimum a noteworthy catastrophe, is exceptionally tangible.³ It is through diplomacy that states orchestrate alliance or look to 'remove a possible victim of attack' negotiate concerning the level and kind of deadly implements to be kept up, try to coordinate financial approaches or fortify social or cultural ties, add to the advancement of international law or the foundation or improvement of international affairs.

Soft power term was instituted by Joseph Nye amid level headed discussion happening whether United States of

¹ E.A.J. Johnson (ed): The Dimensions of Diplomacy, Delhi, National publishing House, 1967, p. 117

² A.F.K. Organski: World politics, Calcutta, Scientific Book Agency, 1964, p. 339

³ Palmer and Perkins: International Relations, Calcutta, Scientific Book Agency, 1970, p. 84

America weakened in late 1980s or not.⁴ Nye characterized soft power as "capacity to get whatever we need done fascination as opposed to coercion." It emerges therefore of the allure of state's beliefs, values, and strategies.⁵ Nye expressed "when we could inspire the rest to appreciate our standards plus to need whatever we need, we don't need to employ too much on twigs plus candy to change them in our way." Seduction is more compelling than intimidation plus this enchantment stays given by soft power.⁶ Subsequently this one's initiation, soft power has rapidly turned out to be acknowledged by an extensive variety of intellectual people and the statesmen getting to be noticeably inserted completely in the discussion related to worldwide diplomacy. Meanwhile soft power includes aspect of nation's values, goals plus arrangements it can be stated as public diplomacy, summit diplomacy, digital diplomacy and cultural diplomacy and so on all these are distinctive variations of soft power.

Concept of Diplomacy and Interstate Affairs by Kautilya

In India, typical state of affairs was to be separated into countless amounts of monarchies and territories. The up keeping of foreign affairs consequently made an imperative division of civic action of each territory and obviously foreign policy was viewed as an amazingly valuable skill. A portion of the influential monarchs, other than keeping up neighborly associations with leaders of alternate fragments of India, maintained benevolent relationships with monarchs of other nations. Seleukos as an example guided Megasthenes as diplomat to Chandragupta. Asoka's decrees demonstrate that incredible ruler kept up cordial relations not just with Ceylon⁷ and other neighboring nations, additionally with numerous rulers of far off nations. It is inside and out plausible that consistent relations were kept up amongst India plus west amid time of the Maurya Empire.⁸

Kautilya presented far reaching and genuinely entrancing interactions dealing with diplomacy and warfare that included Kautilya's desire to have his sovereign turn into a global vanquisher, Kautilya's examination of that empires are regular partners and that are unavoidable adversaries, Kautilya's eagerness to make agreements and contracts that he knew he will breakdown, Kautilya's policy of silent war against a unsuspecting ruler, endorsement of unidentified representatives who murdered adversary chiefs and propagated disunity amongst them, Kautilya's perspective in using ladies as weaponries of warfare, utilization of religious conviction and illogicalness to reinforce armed forces plus unsettle aggressors, expansion of misinformation, plus compassionate behavior of vanquished officers and subjects. Despite the fact that he suggested an intricate wellbeing in local politics, something which was known as socialized realm, Kautilya demonstrated enthusiasm to protect the overall good of the monarch by brutal methods.

Soon afterwards Alexander's demise in 323 B.C.E., Kautilya started his triumph of India in halting Greek trespassers. By captivating a lot of western part of India from the Greeks and finishing through an arrangement with Seleucus (Alexander the Great's Greek beneficiary to India), He was successful in uniting the majority of the Indian subcontinent. Accordingly, Chandragupta was regarded as the primary ruler who unified India with the help of Kautilya and the first real ruler of Ancient India.⁹ Kautilya remained adviser of Chandragupta, Bindusara his child and his grandchild Ashoka as well. He wrote a very famous book namely *Arthashastra*. Several Indian historians are pleased to consider *Arthashastra* of Kautilya as viable manuscript of tough realism rather than Plato's barren idealism which really molded history. The effort indicated how political world did function besides not all the time expressing how it should function, a book that every now and again revealed to a king what figuring and once in a while fierce apportions he should convey to save the nation and mutual decent. In realm of Global politics it is just normal that countries communicate with one another through discord along with constrain.¹⁰ Some political realists contended that conflict will prevail in global politics

⁴ Changhe, Su. Soft Power, in Andrew Cooper, Jorge Heine & Ramesh Thakur Ed. The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy, Oxford University Press, 1st Edition, 2013, p.544

⁵ Nye, Joseph Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, (New York: Public Affairs, 2004)

⁶ Nye, Joseph Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, (New York: Public Affairs, 2005)

⁷ In the Mahavamsa, Devanampiya Tissa is described as an "aly" of Asoka. There is no doubt that frequent communications took place between the two bangs. Vide Mahavamsa ch-4.

⁸ Rapson, E.J., Ancient India, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1922, p.522

⁹ Arun Bhattacharjee; History of Ancient India (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1979), 143–48, 173; Purushottam Lal Bhargava, Chandragupta Maurya: A Gem of Indian History, 2d rev. ed. (New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 1996), p. 114.

¹⁰ Heinrich Zimmer; Philosophies of India, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967, p.36.

and as a result rule by the strongest will come into being. Kautilya in the bravest of his promises, asserted that person who perceived his knowledge of politics might master the world.¹¹

External Affairs by Kautilya

Kautilya classified foreign rulers in four categories i.e. enemies, friends, mediators and neutrals.¹² Unfriendly and kindhearted leaders were once again separated into two types of categories i.e. natural and artificial. According to Kautilya a ruler and his neighboring ruler are natural adversaries. He further illustrates that if a ruler has a family friend in the name of another ruler, that ruler is thus a natural friend. Kautilya further illustrates in his book that the best type of friend is the one whose friendship has been hereditary from his grandparents and parents.¹³ According to him a wicked friend is the one whose territory is located close to that of the king.

According to Kautilya, practicality was supposed to be the principle thought in foreign policy. If a ruler said Kautilya is feeble than his neighbor, he needed to obtain a calm policy however in the event that he was superior in power than his opponent he was to wage war. At the point while neither of the two is superior to one another, both ought to be nonpartisans. If one king was capable of an overabundance of quality, he needed to get ready to wage a war; however in the event that he was frail, he needed to make a treaty. In the event that the conditions be such to an extent that it was alluring to pound an opponent, however this must be completed with the help of other powers, then the ruler needed to implement a policy of cheating.¹⁴ The institutive actions that are adopted by sovereigns to bring into effect their foreign policy are four i.e.: (i) conciliation (ii) gifts (iii) sowing of dissensions and (iv) punishment. Kautilya asserted that a ruler should keep in mind that no other ruler should become too powerful or too fragile. Thus according to Kautilya the balance of power should be maintained and this balance is very important for the smooth working of monarchs.

Views on Diplomacy

Kautilya supposed that countries operated in their political, financial and military self-interest. He assumed that

diplomacy would be accomplished as far as the self-interest of the nation was obliged on the grounds that each state demonstrations in an approach to expand the supremacy and self-regard. He illustrated that kingdoms were either at war or they were preparing for the war and diplomacy was a kind of tool utilized as a part of this consistent war. He supposed that diplomacy is a progression of moves made by a monarchy to such an extent that it picks up power and in the end vanquishes the country with which strategic ties were made. He moreover thought that agreements ought to be made in such a way that a ruler advantages plus serves the self-interest of the realm. He has also talked about breaching arrangements and making disputes between nations so that one's realm may yield which straightforwardly is comparable to Bismarck's strategies of treaties. Actually Kautilya might be contrasted with Bismarck that both of two considered to a great degree of complex system of accords and relations with no successor in any case. In his words he defined diplomacy as, "A Monarch who understood the factual implication of diplomacy masters the entire world".¹⁵ In order to understand Kautilya concept of diplomacy one has to truly understand his mandala theory, i.e. He illustrates six types of diplomacies. This mandala theory has been explained below and is quite useful these days as well.

Six forms of Diplomacy

Kautilya illustrated on tactics for the strong ruler and the assailant as well as clarified the approaches a powerless ruler needed to take in order to safeguard him plus secure the state. His types of diplomacy furthermore relied upon the kind of the ruler whether the approach was coordinated toward the superior inferior or equal. He characterized dominance or inadequacy principally on three extensions: armed supremacy, financial supremacy and geographic dimension. The six types of foreign policy that were promoted by Kautilya are as follows:

1. *Sandhi*: It implied to compromise that meant the rulers tried to compromise with one another and did not make plans to threatening means. *Sandhis* might be transitory or long-term and it relied upon the environment and comparative supremacies of rulers. *Sandhi* might be of five kinds: *Mitrasandhi*: With an associate on unique terms, *Hiranyasandhi*: Contract in light of exchange of capital, *Bhoomisandhi*: Contract in view of exchange of region,

¹¹ Kautilya, *Arthashastra*, 7.11.34: 358.

¹² Kautilya *Arthashastra*, Book VI, Chapter 2.

¹³ Kautilya *Arthashastra*, Book VIII, Chapter 9.

¹⁴ Kautilya *Arthashastra*, Book VII, Chapter 1.

¹⁵ Kautilya *Arthashastra*, Book I, Chapter 16.

Karmasandhi: Contract for trade of armed forces and *Anavasitasandhi*: Contract to assist inhabit an empty habitation. The different sub-types in this sandhi had been accomplished by statesmen later. Bismarck had utilized *Karmasandhi* with Austria and now Britain's foreign policy had been to keep up *Anavasitasandhi* with the United States of America.

2. *Vigraha*: It implied to threatening vibe shown to neighbor or a state. Kautilya emphatically thought that the States were dependably at war and looked for power henceforth it was important to have unfriendly foreign policy towards few States which were either equivalent in power or inferior in power.
3. *Asana*: It means apathy and Kautilya picked this strategy for nations that were unbiased in his mandala theory of countries. He likewise thought that an unconcerned foreign policy functioned well on account of equivalent power. One may not concur on this point as we had seen in the event of equivalent powers in history, there had been constantly rigidity that either prompted a conflict or a cooperation. Germany saw Britain as an equivalent supremacy and couldn't be uninterested; nor could US be indifferent to Russia amid the cold war.
4. *Dvaidhibhava*: It implied to dual policy that was extremely very much accomplished by Bismarck. Kautilya supported this foreign policy for nations which are larger militarily. Kissinger took after this methodology where he completed agreement with China so that at no time Russia and China could turn out to be nearer in ties than USA and China. Kautilya supported the similar idea inside his Mandala theory.
5. *Samsarya*: This approach of defense is followed where a powerful nation intercedes and protects a feeble nation. Kautilya supported this approach when a powerful nation needs an armor to safeguard itself from an equivalent supremacy it was good to utilize this policy of defense for a third nation and utilized this association to guard in contradiction of the possible adversary. It can be said that

colonization was association where European forces began directing powerless countries in Africa and Asia and in this manner fortifying their position against each other.

6. *Yana*: This strategy was to attack. Kautilya mentioned that peace and steadiness in a nation made the nation even supreme yet not once timid far from assaulting the feeble and unfair ruler. He felt that a treacherous ruler keeps general public in miserable conditions that makes that nation a possible targets as it was powerless because of societal strife.

Therefore Kautilya's foreign policy is framed by his solid confidence in Monarch and the country's ceaseless hunger for supremacy and treasures. His diplomacy strategies are likewise affected by Hindu religion and the social arrangement which molded his reasoning regarding types of foreign policies and their application. He planned the *mandala* idea in war and diplomacy and made mind boggling web of relations yet he didn't anticipate a result for this realm. It was the good fortunes that the descendants of this empire were considerably stronger rulers and extended the realm, else the destiny would have been like what Bismarck confronted in Europe. Kautilya's quality to oversee war and diplomacy can incredibly be respected. His six diplomacy tools and *mandala* concept is still applicable although the countries are presently parted by seas and there intercontinental ballistic rockets contracting geographic impacts on diplomacy. His work can be straightforwardly linked during the De Gaulle times, when there was a fear of Russia attacking the Western Europe and the strategies De Gaulle played were very much comparable as proposed by Kautilya.

Kautilya's reasoning has unquestionably formed the future works but it is to be pondered what occurred to the Indian diplomacy and strategies of the statesmen of India. The policies assumed by Kautilya were at times applied when the Mughals attacked from the center east and later the British vanquished India. The key question here is can *Arthashastra* be applied in vote based systems or is it pertinent just to monarchies. State as a conclusive power and rule of the king was supported by all Plato, Aristotle, Kautilya and Machiavelli. In other words it can be said that art of warfare and diplomacy is still pertinent but one needs to understand that social structures are fluctuating at an alarming rate than

they did in previous eras. Kautilya eventually looked for peace however the methods that he used were warfare and consequently trusted that without a world order in which his realm was centered and one couldn't accomplish peace without diplomacy.¹⁶

Foreign Policy and Diplomacy as Expansion of War

Kautilya being a political realist acknowledged that each country performed to amplify self-interest plus power, in this manner moral standard or commitments had almost no constrain in activities among countries. As it was regarded good to have an ally, the cooperation would keep going as long as it was in that ally's and also one's own specific self-interest, in light of the fact that "an ally looked to the securing of his own interests in case of comparability of cataclysms and in case of the development of the rival's power."¹⁷ Whether one went to war or stayed at peace depended altogether upon the self-interest of or favorable position to, one's kingdom. War and peace were considered exclusively from the perspective of benefit.¹⁸ One kept an ally not in light of cooperative attitude or good commitment, but rather in light of the fact that one was strong and could propel one's own self-interest and additionally the self-interest of the ally, for when one had an armed force; one's ally stayed benevolent, or (even) the rival move towards becoming friendly. Because countries dependably acted in their political, financial, and military self-interest, even under the circumstances of peace could transform unexpectedly into times of war, partners into rivals, and even adversaries into partners. Kautilya most likely accepted that peaceful realms could keep going forever, and that contention among smaller states was more typical in history. As per Kautilya, this rule of foreign policy that countries demonstrate in their political, financial, and armed self-interest was an immortal fact of his investigation of science of politics, or *Arthashastra*. He didn't consider that countries never act in a generous way, to be sure, Kautilya encouraged philanthropic acts that likewise corresponded with one's self-interest yet he believed that one must accept, if assigned with

political or military power, which one's neighbors will ultimately act to their own interests.

Kautilya was in fact most renowned for illustrating the *Mandala* hypothesis or theory, in which close neighbors are measured as adversaries, however any nation on the opposite side of a neighboring nation was viewed as a partner, or, rival. Nations categorized as 1, 3, 5, 7, etc. would likely be companions, while states 2, 4, 6, 8, etc. might presumably be rivals. Kautilya puts this fundamental standard in various diverse ways, yet most basically as, "One with immediately proximate region was the expected adversary."¹⁹

Kautilya accepted that he existed in a space of foreign relations in which one vanquished. Kautilya didn't state to his own self, "get ready for warfare, yet seek after peace," but rather, he stated to himself that "get ready for the warfare, and plan to master." Diplomacy is simply one more weapon utilized as a part of the extended warfare that was dependably either happening or making arrangements. In the wake of examining a ruler's exceptional setup of potential adversaries and partners, Kautilya then strongly computed how the ruler needs to contemplate and perform. The ruler, gifted with peculiar brilliances and those of his material constituents, the seat of good policy, was the eventual winner. Surrounding the ruler on all sides, with region immediately by his was the basically termed as adversary. In a similar way, one with region parted by another region was the principal called the partner.

Mandala hypothesis of Kautilya is actually an argument in light of the principle of balance of power. Kautilya actually is not proposing modern balance of power argument. During the twentieth century period, international relations scholars had safeguarded the principle of balance of power on the grounds that equally armed countries would apparently prevent each other, and in this manner no combat might be the outcome. This argument is discovered seldom in Kautilya: In case that advances of twofold partners of equivalent power were equivalent, there ought to be harmony; if unequal then warfare²⁰ or vanquisher ought to trudge if unrivaled in strength, if not then remain calm.²¹ Although these balance of power thinkers recommended that a country equipped itself with the goal that it might guarantee peace, Kautilya desired his sovereign to arm country so as to discover or make a limitation in the adversary and master to

¹⁶ Bharati Mukherjee; Kautilya's Concept of Diplomacy, New Delhi, Abhinav Publishers, 1998, p.253

¹⁷ Kautilya; *Arthashastra*, 8.1.59: 389.

¹⁸ Kalidas Nag and V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar; "The Diplomatic Theories of Ancient India and the Arthashastra," *Journal of Indian History* 6, no. 1 (1927):15–35.

¹⁹ Kautilya; *Arthashastra*, 6.2.19: 318.

²⁰ Kautilya; *Arthashastra* 7.6.3: 338.

²¹ Kautilya; *Arthashastra*, 9.1.1: 406.

vanquish the world or if nothing else the countries nearest to India. In perusing *Arthashastra*, no ethical observations further than a ruler making the right decision for his own particular individuals are initiated. Or maybe, it was found only what Kautilya viewed as the nature of power. The ruler, he expressed, "should march when by marching he would be able to weaken or exterminate adversary."²² And Kautilya supposed that each other state would act in a like way in light of the fact that "even the equivalent who had accomplished his object has a tendency to be stronger and when increased in power deceitful; success tended to change the psyche."²³ Just as did Thucydides, Kautilya viewed a mandate for negotiations as an indication of weakness, surely a frantic demonstration of a frail country attempting to survive.

Kautilya contended that diplomacy is actually a delicate act of war, a progression of moves made to debilitate an enemy and achieve benefits of interest for oneself, all with an eye toward possible conquest. A country's foreign policy is dependable to be comprised of preparatory activities towards war. In Kautilya's foreign policy, even during a period of diplomacy and negotiated peace, a ruler still should be "striking over and over" in secrecy. Kautilya likewise looked to take a country attempting to stay nonpartisan or indifferent and covertly incite war between that country and a neighboring kingdom, until the neutral country looked for his offer or assistance. At that point Kautilya's king could "put him under his obligations."²⁴ Kautilya himself had no ethical second thoughts about breaking commitments or trust that ally who may do damage or who, however was capable would not help in a depraved position, he ought to annihilate him, when credulously, he went in close vicinity to his reach.²⁵ Because foreign policy was only an augmentation of a country's wars, the objective of foreign policy was not to end wars, yet rather to ward off defeats and to ensure one was fruitful in resulting warfare. For Kautilya, all envoys were potential spies with diplomatic resistance.²⁶ Indeed, he expounded on the most proficient method to battle with the weapon of diplomacy.

Agents, Assassins, and Propaganda

²² Kautilya; *Arthashastra*, 9.1.44: 408.

²³ Kautilya; *Arthashastra*, 7.5.47: 337.

²⁴ Kautilya; *Arthashastra* 7.18.37: 383.

²⁵ Kautilya; *Arthashastra* 7.18.40: 383.

²⁶ Bimal Kanti Majumdar; *The Military System in Ancient India*, Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1960, p. 64.

Kautilya was prepared to utilize any methods for viciousness in battling a combat, in spite of the fact that he needed his ruler to candid his savagery towards authorities of adversary kingdom plus not towards conventional individuals. For instance, Kautilya examined at dimension in what way to utilize toxin, however practically coordinated its utilization at important rival authorities. He exhorted that while providing pure wine to armed generals, the secret agent ought to give them wine blended with toxin when they were in a condition of inebriation."²⁷ Although Kautilya suggested that an armed force placing attack on a fortification attempt to defile the water,²⁸ this degree appears to be intended to make those in the fort surrendered from disease, not to murder everybody in fortress.

Kautilya was ready to utilize any conceivable intends to assassinate a rival king, suffocated him, burn him with fire, choke out him with smoke, or even use as professional killers also utilizing ladies and kids as toxic poison providers.²⁹ The phenomenon of murder, as indicated by Kautilya was that it was very productive, for a professional killer or assassin, single-handed, may have the capacity to accomplish his end with armament, toxic substance and fire. He did the necessary work of an entire armed force or more.³⁰ Apart from assassination, another strategy used to overcome an adversary without complete combat was to organize the rival to squabble and battle among itself. It had as of now been perceived how Kautilya planned to utilize delightful ladies to prompt battles among high officers or authorities. In the event that the guarantee of joy could touch off squabbles, so could the guarantee of power.³¹ Another military strategy that Kautilya adulated was what now is called disinformation or propaganda intended to discourage or startle aggressors. Kautilya was exclusively caring of the strategy of using deception to blandish second or third son and therefore induce him to attempt a revolution against his own family.³² Persuaded that deception could likewise motivate his own groups, Kautilya required agents to declare fictitious triumphs plus made-up conquests of the adversary.³³

²⁷ Kautilya, *Arthashastra*, 12.4.6: 467.

²⁸ Kautilya, *Arthashastra*., 13.4.9: 486.

²⁹ Kautilya, *Arthashastra* 12.4.22–28, 9–10: 468–69.

³⁰ Kautilya, *Arthashastra*., 9.6.54–55: 425.

³¹ *Dharmasutras*, 159.

³² Kautilya, *Arthashastra*, 12.3.15: 466.

³³ Kautilya, *Arthashastra*, 12.4.21: 469; Srivastava, *The Ancient Indian Army*, 89.

Ambassadors and Spies

Unlike the modern practice of stationing representatives, as permanent agents in foreign countries, in antiquated India they were officers, selected for and sent on a unique mission. The purposes of an ambassador was to convey the message accurately as assigned to him, to make or break alliances or treaties or to pronounce war or make peace, to study the geographical position and solid points, military strength and monetary situation of a foreign state and to accumulate the best conceivable information. He was in this way basically worried with the indispensable issues of a foreign, policy of a state. Kautilya classified the ambassadors under three categories that are as follows:

1. *Nihsrstartha*: - a diplomat. This is actually a diplomat blessed with complete controls of the administration of an undertaking and furthermore approved to follow up on his very personal verdict and choice place issue to the interest of the nation.
2. *Mitartha*: - a messenger whose privileges were restricted. His obligations likewise appear to have been lesser since Kautilya and Kamandaka suggest minor credentials for him.
3. *Sasanabara*:- an envoy who is basically a noble envoy. He is allocated with just a single specific duty.

This three-type grouping of ambassadors by Kautilya holds great value even in the contemporary times. It depended on the nation to which the ambassador allocated his obligations and the sorts of tasks which he needs to discharge. In India; the arrangement of secret activities is as ancient as Rigveda. Kautilya stated that it was a perpetual plus noticeable component of a nation and was one of the eight supplements of the armed force. As spies remained the "eyes of the sovereigns" they were to be designated by the sovereign to gather data about the interior matters plus management of his realm and additionally foreign nations. Thus they were dispersed all through his own empire and furthermore foreign nations. Privacy was trademark characteristic that separated them from the messengers. If they were discovered and were identified, the detectives could be mistreated and might be executed by the foreign nations. Detectives were in this way to be so astute as not to be distinguished or recognized by others. A list of people was given by them who could be commended with this dangerous occupation, for example, *Brahmanas*,

siddhas, people fit for doing imitation, acting like visually impaired and stiff of hearing relying upon the circumstance also, be as clever as could be expected under the circumstances. The most essential condition was to look at them carefully before their selection and to employ them so covertly that they couldn't remember each other to maintain a strategic distance from any conspiracy among the spies themselves. The spies assumed critical part in diplomacy. It was through them that the ruler obtained the information of the insider facts and frail purposes of his rival. Detectives were selected to know about conduct of every country's executive. While selecting a spy, no difference of class, dogma or gender was perceived and monarch's spies were drawn from diverse social classes. The King-in-Council was to name these majors in the wake of fulfilling himself totally as to their character and capacity. The spy was anticipated to be exceptionally savvy, quick, canny and productive. Unscrupulous and disobedient spies were to be penalized and the fair ones paid and secured. The spies were restrictive sentences for rehashed incorrect facts.

In Arthashastra, Kautilya mentioned nine types of spies. They were as follows

1. Deceptive pupil.
2. The Hermit.
3. Proprietor.
4. Mercantile Spy.
5. Austere Practicing Severities.
6. Colleague Spies.
7. Fiery Spies.
8. Poisoners.
9. Mendicant Lady.

II. CONCLUSION

To come back to Machiavelli's art of war in the wake of perusing the military works of Kautilya is shocking. It turns out to be promptly clear that Machiavelli is not by any means attempting to disclose to us something new about warfare, since he trusted the antiquated Greeks and Romans knew it all beside such things as ordnance. The *Arthashastra* is surely a perfect work of art of statecraft, diplomacy, and approach and is a case of non-Western writing that ought to be perused as a feature of the "realist" standard. Its remedies are especially significant for foreign policy today. Kautilya's *Arthashastra* is a prescriptive content that lays out guidelines

and standards for effectively running a state and directing global relations. Like Sunzi's Art of War, the *Arthashastra* possesses large amounts of sweeping statements and is not expressive of particular, historical occasions or fights. Along these lines, Kautilya looked to make the content helpful and important in an assortment of circumstances, across eras, a sort of textbook for kings. The *Arthashastra* expresses at critical length on the policies important to secure the objectives of the state. There are a few controlling principles that administer Kautilya's perspectives on foreign policy. The contemporary Indian idea of non-alignment itself might be an impression of Kautilya's guidance for a country to only follow its self-interest and not get bolted into perpetual ill will or fellowship with some other country. After the culmination of the Cold War, India has started to apply a greater amount of the *Arthashastra's* sayings as it has developed in self-assurance and capacity and understood the need of seeking after its own interests, paying little respect to their normative component. Expect this to continue for the foreseeable future. Anticipate that this will proceed for a long time to come.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bhattacharjee, Arun. *History of Ancient India*. New Delhi: Sterling, 1979.
- [2] Bundy, McGeorge. *The dimensions of diplomacy*. Ed. Edgar Augustus Jerome Johnson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1964.
- [3] Cooper, Andrew F., Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur. *The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [4] Kautilya Arthashastra, Book VII, Chapter 1.
- [5] Kautilya Arthashastra, Book VI, Chapter 2.
- [6] Kautilya Arthashastra, Book I, Chapter 16.
- [7] Kautilya Arthashastra, Book VIII, Chapter 9.
- [8] Majumdar, Bimal Kanti. *Military System in Ancient India*. Firma KL Mukhopadhyay, 1960.
- [9] Mukherjee, Bharati. *Kautilya's concept of diplomacy: a new interpretation*. Minerva Associates (Publications), 1976.
- [10] Nag, Kalidas, and VR Ramachandra Dikshitar. "The Diplomatic Theories of Ancient India and the Arthashastra." *Journal of Indian History* 6.1 (1927): 15-35.
- [11] Nye, Joseph S. *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. Public Affairs, 2004.
- [12] Organski, Abramo. *World politics*, Calcutta: Scientific Book Agency, 1964.
- [13] Palmer, Norman Dunbar, and Howard Cecil Perkins. *International relations: the world community in transition*. Calcutta: Scientific Book Agency, 1970.
- [14] Rapson, Edward James. *Cambridge history of India vol 2*. University press, 1922.
- [15] Saletore, Bhasker Anand. *Ancient Indian Political Thought and Institutions*. New York, Asia Publishing House, 1963.
- [16] Zimmer, Heinrich. *Philosophies of India*. Routledge, 2013.