We possess very little information about the interstate relationship during the Vedic period. In those days the Aryas were engaged in subjugating the Non-Aryas and their mutual relations were generally peaceful. However, they began to envy with one another owing to the difference of success achieved by each tribe and, therefore, we sometimes find them fighting among themselves, often taking the help of non-Aryas.

The religion and culture of the later Vedic period placed the ideal of emperorship before the Arya kings. The Aśvamedha sacrifice was to be performed by the one who wished to be the king of kings and the Vaijapeya by the one who wanted to become an emperor. A Viśiṣṭa i.e. a conqueror king was allowed to launch a victory campaign at any time. The Śrauta Smṛtis advised the king to be a conqueror.

Manu says that the king should aspire to get what he does not have, protect what he has and make efforts to increase what has already been achieved. He further says that the king should bring his enemy under control by engaging himself in the conquest of new territories. Vaiśānava also has the same view. According to Kamaṇḍaka, the king who possesses Prakṛti, who is industrious and who always aspires to win is called Viśiṣṭa. In this regard he follows Kaṇṭihka who
advise his conqueror king how to employ the six measures of foreign policy. In the Rāmāyana also, the king has been called Viśthīśu and Jīsīgu. Further, it is said, "Victory in a battle is coveted." At yet another place the king has been described going on a mission of conquering all the directions and challenging all the kings to fight or surrender accepting subordination.

It, however, does not mean that the ancient Indian writers on polity and the Sārtis provoked the ruler to engage himself in unnecessary warfare. The horrors of war were not unknown to them. Therefore, almost all of them point it out to the conqueror that the appeal to arms should be avoided as far as possible. According to the Mahābhārata, the king should fight only for a Dharmaśāstra because other victory would get him a place in hell. Menu says that the king should try to win by means of Śāma, Dīna and Bheda but never by resorting to a conflict. Kṛmandala believes that there is every possibility of both the sides perishing in a battle, defeating the very purpose of it. He advises that the ruler should consider the consumption of resources, extra expenditure, labour, killing and other evils before starting a conflict. In his view, a wise king should never resort to excessive warfare because wealth, kingdom, life and fame stand staked in the scale of war and nobody knows which side will win; therefore, nobody should do such a silly thing, he advises. In the Rāmāyana we read the
devastating effects of a war being explained to the king. According to epic, victory is never sure in a war, it is unpredictable.

The Ramayana reveals that the kings were generally against warfare. For instance, Rama rejected the idea of performing a Rajasuya sacrifice because it meant destruction of many lives. He preferred to perform an Ashwamedha, which demanded subjugation and acceptance of authority of the performer. Another example of such an effort can be seen in Rama's final attempt to make Ravana realise the dangers of war, by sending Angada as a messenger. Fighting for good cause was, however, allowed in the Ramayana period. We find in the case of Lavaña that an expedition could be sent against an evil king even without any provocation and the territory could be annexed to establish a righteous rule.

Such a thinking led to the development of the principles of diplomacy in ancient India. The ancient thinkers knew that war could not be altogether avoided. They, therefore, tried to minimise its chances by advocating a judicious balance of power among different states with which the country was studded. The well known Mandala theory of the Smritis and polity writers is based on this principle.

The Ramayana state, it seems, was not familiar with the Mandala theory in the form it is found in the ancient works. But it was conversant with the basic idea behind the theory i.e. staying powerful against enemies with the help of allies.
Kīmāndaka says, "The king (the lord of the circle), possessing Kośa, Danda, Aṁtyas and Mantrīs and living in Durga should contemplate on a good circle." This is quite similar to what Hammān is described telling Sugrīva after the latter had been installed as king. He said, "Now when you have got the kingdom, fame and increased fortune, the only task left for you is having allies. One who has the time sense in one's dealing with allies and who always behaves in a nice manner increases empire, fame and powers. The king who controls his body, treasure, forces and allies equally enjoys a large kingdom." 19

Though the concept of the Maṇḍala occupied a prominent place in ancient Indian thought, it was fully developed by Kautilya20 and elaborated further by Kīmāndaka.21 In the Arthasastra, the king who is the fountain of the policy is termed as Viśiṣṭa (the conqueror), the king who is the neighbour is Āri (enemy), next to Āri is termed as Mitra, beyond Āri and Mitra are styled as Mitra Mitra and Arī Mitra Mitra. These are the five kings in the front. The kings in the rear are given as Bṛḍiprāha (immediate neighbour), Ākarandha (rearward ally), Bṛḍiprāhasāra (ally of enemy), Ākarandhāsa (ally of ally), Madhyama (indifferent) and Uṣasīna. It is, thus, a Maṇḍala having twelve members, and the conqueror has an enemy, a friend another enemy and another friend alternately. Kīmāndaka describes further how other writers have defined the circle22 but himself agrees with Kautilya that the circle consisted of 12 kings only.
The terms *Viśālā*, *Mitra* and *Aitra* occur frequently in the *Rāmāyana* which clearly indicate also that in the game of politics the other states were referred to as a particular state's ally or enemy. A writer points out to the existence of terms *Madhyastha* and *Māguna* but admits that it is not clear whether they have the same technical sense as has been applied to them in the *Arthaśāstra*. The term *Pārśmierpha*, which Kautīlva applies to indicate the rearward enemy, occurs in the *Rāmāyana*, but the word has been used in the sense of 'a helper'. We are told that Bharata went with Candraketu and lived with him as his helper for one year, before returning to Ayodhya.

The *Rāmāyana* does not define *Ari* and *Mitra* in the same manner as Kautīlva. It never says that the immediate neighbour is *Ari* and that the king beyond *Ari* is the ally and so on. On the other hand we find that all the neighbouring kings of Kosala, namely Pratardana of Kaśi, Janaka of Mithilā, Romapāla of Aṅga, and those of Mālava, Magadha etc. had friendly relations with Ayodhya. The non-allies or *Aris* in the *Rāmāyana* have not been mentioned directly although the king has been given various epithets such as *Hatamitra*, *Nihatmitra* and *Amitrānāp Vahe Baktah*. He has been advised to kill his enemies if he wanted to enjoy the fruits of Dharma, Artha and Kāma, and to be always vigilant against his enemies, never considering them as weak. Further, he
has been enjoined to kill the enemy without showing any mercy because a foolish king who gives any way to the enemy to escape gets killed himself.  

So the Arya or Amîtra is there in the political gamut of the Rāmāyaṇa, but he is not on the fringes of conqueror's territory. The enemies of Ayodhyā were placed quite far off. Therefore we read that Rāma sent his army against Lavaṇa of Madhupurī beyond Kanyakubja and Sānkāṣaya and against the Gandharvas who were beyond the Kekayas.

The lack of enmity among the adjoining states can be attributed to the fact that the kings of the epic period did not believe in waging war for the sake of expansion. They took up fighting only for the sake of Dharma and remained contented with their own territories which were quite large for them to manage. The population was not enough even to populate the areas already under control.

It would thus be clear that the two pre-requisites of a Rāsamandala, namely hostility with some and friendship with others in a particular area, are present in the Rāmāyaṇa also. But these pre-requisites were yet to be analysed in terms of territorial contiguity or otherwise. Even the number of kings required to form the circle has not been referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa. The role of the neutral states in the interstate relations, too, was lost sight of. As such, the Mandala theory as it is found in the Rāmāyaṇa was in a state of infancy.
As said above, the ancient Hindus knew well that wars could not be stopped by mere sermons and, therefore, developed the principles of diplomacy. They advised the king to augment his strength by raising a strong army and by entering into alliances with other kings to deter the greedy one from attempting an attack on him to annex his territory. They knew that a weak king could not survive. Hence they highlighted the importance of alliance and also fabricated a foreign policy having six measures called Śāṅkunyā to enable the king to become strong and face the enemy successfully. This policy has been described by a polity writer as the fruit of the tree of polity. The Rāmāyana is well aware of the importance of the Śāṅkunyā as we shall see below.

The principal aspect of the foreign policy was to become strong by one's own resources and by making allies. one's own resources meant a strong army and a strong defence in the form of strong forts equipped properly to face an attack or a siege for a long time. This was given due consideration. The army was kept well contented and had soldiers who were expert in fighting. The forts were well maintained and the army had a daily inspection. For the maintenance of peace and security the states entered into alliances. Kāmadaka has made an appeal to remove the cause of enmity and to make friendship. In the Rāmāyana, too, the importance of Mitra in avoiding conflicts among the
states has been emphasized, and we have already cited how Hammān encouraged Sugrīva not only to have friendship but also to take all pains to maintain it;\textsuperscript{42} Sītā also particularly enquired of Hammān whether Rāma had made friendship with many kings,\textsuperscript{43} obviously because she knew that Rāvana could not be fought by Rāma alone. The term Mitramātṛa has been used again and again in the epic.\textsuperscript{44} Rāma was very angry with Sugrīva for latter's negligence with regard to performing his duty to help Rāma in the search for Sītā and getting her back to her husband, yet he told Lakṣmana to behave nicely and in a polite manner while making him aware of his duty that he was not doing what he should do for his friend.\textsuperscript{45} In another context, Lakṣmana also said that Sugrīva's friendship was very vital for Rāma.\textsuperscript{46} Referring to the fact that the kings entered into many alliances the Rāmāyana says, "Rāśīno Brahmatrāsā."\textsuperscript{47}

The Rāmāyana describes a few alliances being concluded between various parties such as between (i) Daśaratha and Kekaya king through marriage of latter's daughter, (ii) Daśaratha and Janaka (through marriage again), (iii) Rāma and Sugrīva, (iv) Rāma and Vibhīṣaṇa and (v) Rāvana and Vālī after the former was defeated.\textsuperscript{48} We read also that Romapāda and Pratardana were the allies of Ayodhyā, as also were some other states.\textsuperscript{49}

The epic has prescribed various means to find out the intentions of the other side before concluding an alliance.
According to it, the mind of the other party seeking alliance should be assessed by assigning him a job. Spies should be planted on the would be allies whether near or far. But if a person comes from the side of a wicked one to the side of a noble, it is understandable. In Vālmīki’s view, disguised interrogation should be resorted to sparingly as it can antagonize the friend who comes for a relief. The Rāmāyaṇa concedes that it is difficult to know other’s mind suddenly and, therefore, suggests that the king should try to understand it through observation, manner of speech etc. It is further said that the king should consider Artha and Anartha, and then have friendship on the basis of merit.

On the code of alliance the epic says thus:

(1) Killing of an ally is a sin.
(2) An ally must do his duty towards the other.
(3) An ally should not belie hopes after causing them rise in the mind of a friend who has obliged him. One who does so is the meanest of all men.
(4) One who considers one’s promise worth keeping and fulfils it for the sake of upholding the right is the best of all men.
(5) One who does not make an effort to achieve the end for the other after achieving own is ungrateful and is not eaten by even beasts after death.

The procedure of entering into alliance in the epic period was very simple. The alliance making between Rāma and
Sugrīva has been described in some detail. According to this account, Sugrīva said to Rāma, "I extend my hand. If you are desirous of my friendship, hold my hand in your own and let us be tied by the bond of friendship." Rāma heard this and took happily Sugrīva's hand in his own. Hanumān then kindled fire and they became friends witnessed by the fire-god. The friendship between Rāvana and Nīvatākavasas and Rāvana and Vāli were also executed in the presence of fire. Thus, the advice of Kautilya on ally-making is found to be on the pattern of the epic for he says, "Flinging one's troth or taking an oath is a pact stable in the next world as well as here, a surety or a hostage is of use only in this world depending on strength." He further says, "We have made a part thus kings of old, faithful to their word, made pacts by plighting troth. They touched fire, water, furrow in field, lump of earth from rampart, shoulder of an elephant, back of a horse, box of a chariot, weapon, gem, seeds, fragrant substance ——- while taking the oath, "May these kill or abandon him who may break the oath." In the case of Vibhiṣṇa's friendship with Rāma, there was actually a promise by Vibhiṣṇa who said, "I shall help you in killing the Rakṣasas and winning lahkā as long as I am alive, and I shall join your force." The epic knows only two kinds of neighbouring states around the conqueror, namely Mitra and Amītra, as already discussed. The conqueror was to have such allies who were
firm and exterminate all those who were his enemies. Only then he could hope to achieve the three ends of life, it was firmly believed. With friends he was to employ the two expedients i.e. Śāna and Dāna and with enemies the three, Dāna, Ṛṣeda and Danda.

The Śāṅkhuva policy was formulated as the guiding principles to determine relationship between the states. The six expedients of this policy are given as Sandhi (peace) Vizārah (enmity), Āsana (staying quite), Yana (march), Dvādībhava (dual policy) and Āsāraya (seeking shelter).

In the Rāmāyana, we are told that the kings of the epic period were well aware of the six measures of the policy. We are informed that Kabandha, after assuming a celestial form, told Rāma in the following words the way he could succeed in getting back his wife: "Listen, O Rāghava! how factually you will get back Sītā; there are six expedients in this world by which everything is considered." This is a clear reference to the six-fold policy advised by our polity writers for dealing with other states.

Regarding the application of this policy the Mahābhārata says that the king should make peace with whom it should be made and wage a war against whom it should be waged. The king should make peace with a powerful enemy in consultation with his ministers, when he may find himself weaker. Kantilva advises, "When in decline as compared to the enemy, he should make peace." But if there is equal
advancement in peace and war, he should resort to peace for
in war there are losses, expenses, marches leading away from
come and obstacles. "69 Kumandaka says, "When a king is
attacked by a powerful enemy and does not find any other way,
he should hide time and make peace." 70 According to Manu,
when a king finds that his vehicles and army are weak, he
should make effort to pacify the enemy. 71 In the Rāmāyaṇa it
is said that a king who is weaker than his enemy or just
equal to him should go for peace. 72 Further, it is said that
peace should be made with the enemy who is powerful and
prepared, because there is every likelihood of losing in war
resulting in destruction. 73

Kautīlya enumerates 12 types of peace made by inferior
powers and five other types, namely Mitra-Sandhi, Kiratya-
Sandhi, Bhumi-Sandhi, Karma-Sandhi and Amavasita-Sandhi. 74
Kumandaka has described sixteen types of peace and says that
the peace between Rāma and Sugrīva was of the type of Pratikēra
Sandhi. 75 The Rāmāyaṇa describes many alliances being
executed between its various characters but no name has been
given to these. According to a writer, 76 the peace between
Valī and Rāvaṇa was the Karma-Sandhi of the Arthaśāstra.

The next question is whether one should remain
complacent after resorting to peace, 77 and ignore the activities
of the other side. Kumandaka answers it thus: "Even after
resorting to peace a wise king should not trust (his enemy)
because Indra killed Vṛṣṇi after saying that he would not have enmity again. A similar view is found in the epic expressed by Angada who said, "The wicked ones behave concealing their thoughts and strike at weak points causing a great loss."

Vigraha, the second expedient, is not the actual fighting, it means enmity followed by diplomatic war. Kāmandaka is very much against Vigraha, as we have already explained, and adds, "When both sides get angry, are hot because of anger and desire to do harm to each other, there is Vigraha."

Who should opt for enmity? According to the Mahābhārata, it should be opted by the one who thinks that it should be opted. In Kautilya's view, "The one who is prosperous should have enmity." Kāmandaka opines that the one who desires personal uplift or the one who is tormented by an enemy and has favourable Deśa-Kāla and strength should have it. Manu has to say that when the king knows fully well that his army is fit and suffers from no calamity and that of the enemy is quite the reverse, he should take recourse to quarrel. The causes of enmity according to Kāmandaka are state, women, place, country, abduction of carriages, wealth, pride and honour, besides ill luck, a friend's cause, insult, a kin's calamity, ill will, ill-managed circle of kings and two being involved in the same achievement. In the Rāmāyaṇa it is alluded to that land, gold and beauty are the three causes of enmity. It advises
that a king who is inferior in power to his enemy should never have enmity if he desires his protection,\(^{87}\) that it should be undertaken only when in a stronger position than enemy.\(^{88}\) Valmiki is of the view that if enmity is due to a woman or some other insignificant reason, one should remove the irritant and avoid war. We, therefore, read Vibhishana telling Karna that he should not have enmity with Rama, who was powerful as well as on the path of Dharma, over trivialities.

\(^{87}\) Vama (March) is the third expedient of the policy. The Mahabharata says that march should be undertaken by the conqueror against the enemy who is at war with another and, therefore, heedless and weak. The subjects of the conqueror should be prosperous and loyal; his ministers should be happy and contented; and his troops should be happy, well equipped and capable of overreaching the enemy in material, resources and strategy.\(^{90}\) It should be resorted to by the king after ascertaining the relative strength, weakness, place, time, season for marching, period for raising army, revolt in the rear, losses, expenses, gains, troubles for himself and for the enemy, says Kautilya.\(^{91}\) Strength is stated by him as three-fold, namely energy, material and counsel, the following one being superior. Place is the topography of the country and time is the season, day and night. Power, place and time according to the Arthasastra are complimentary to one another.\(^{92}\)

\(^{93}\) Manu praises only that march which is against the enemy who is equal. In Manu's view, when a king finds
himself superior in power, he should march. In the Rāmāyaṇa it is said that the king should march against an enemy who is negligent, is under attack from another enemy and or has been afflicted by some calamity due to misfortune, but never against an enemy who is alert, desirous of victory and formidable. According to the epic, one should never march on others who are powerful and have big armies. The conditions for yana have been further explained in the Rāmāyaṇa in the speech of Kumbhakarna. According to this account, first of all the king should consider what should be done and what should not be done (Karma-Akarma). For this purpose he should consider three states of his kingdom i.e. Kaśya, Vṛddhi and Sthāna with reference to the five Yugas, namely Āryabhārata (means of beginning), Āryabhārata (property), Desakālayibhāga (place and time division), means to avoid calamity, and Kāryasiddhi (success). The main stress has been on the consideration of strength of the two sides and Desākala.

Āsana means staying quiet. When a king thinks that the enemy is not able to do any harm to him and he to the enemy, he should stay quiet, says Kaṭilya. Kaṭilya differs a little and says that when the conqueror and the enemy refrain from destroying each other's strength, it is called Āsana which, according to him, is of 5 types i.e. Vigrāhasāna (staying ready to attack), Sandhāyasāna (when both parties have become weak), Śambhūyasāna (when both want annihilation of each other, it is resorted to by the righteous), Prasāngāsāna (to go somewhere else in a concealed
In the *Rāmâyana* also, *Asana* has been used in the sense of staying quiet. We read that when Aṅgada and others decided to break away from Sugrīva and to stay in Svayamprabhā's cave, he was told by Hanumān that it was easier for a strong one to pick up a quarrel with a weak enemy and stay quiet (*Asana*), but a weak king could not have enmity with a strong one and then stay quiet. The above view is the same as expressed by Kauṭiliya that *Asana* can be exercised by the foes who are equal in strength and not by the unequal ones.

Dvāridhībhūya is the dual policy. Kāmapikako has the view that the king facing two enemies should surrender by word only to one and follow the dual policy, observing like the eye of a crow sometimes this and sometimes that in such a manner that nobody may know it; and because of the nearness of the two enemies, he should stay prepared. When both may march against each other, he should side with the stronger; but if both of them do not wish his friendship, he should take shelter with their enemy. The *Rāmâyana* does not provide any clear instance of the application of the dual policy. A solitary verse in the *Araṇyakaṅda*, however, seems to be projecting Valmīki's views on this means of policy. In this verse Mārīcē has been depicted as telling Śravāṇa that some weak enemy wanted to get him destroyed by forcing him to fight against a stronger enemy. Thus, the Dvāridhībhūya according the epic is to make a stronger enemy fight against another one who is more than a match for him, while himself remaining quiet and friendly.
Sapdrāva (seeking shelter) comes sixth in the list of the six measures. The one whose power is dilipated should seek shelter, says Kautilya, and adds that it should be with the one who can be completely trusted and whose friendship is sincere and genuine. In Ramayana's view the king should immediately seek shelter with another powerful and noble king if attacked by the enemy and if he is sure that there is no chance of escaping an attack; if that king drives away the enemy, he should be served like a guru. The word Sapdrāva does not occur in the Ramayana but it is quite evident that the author of the epic is conversant with the diplomatic connotation of the term. We are told that when Kabandha was killed by Rama and Lakṣmaṇa, he took a celestial form and told Rama in the following words how he could get back his wife: "A king who is in distress should befriend another placed in similar condition." He further made it clear to Rama that he should make friendship with Sugrīva who had also lost his wife and kingdom to his brother. This is, thus, exactly what is called Sapdrāva in the works on polity. The shelter seeking by Vibhīṣana has also been explained in the Ramayana. According to the epic, Hanumān told Rama, "He (Vibhīṣana) has come to you after seeing your effort, Rāvana's unrighteousness, Vālī's slaying at your hands and Sugrīva's coronation performed by you." Vibhīṣana was in distress and Rama was a powerful and righteous enemy of Rāvana; so the Sapdrāva was the right course for him. Thus, the shelter seeking explained in the Ramayana is almost the same as has been advised by the later writers on polity.
Our political thinkers base their doctrine of success on *Utaха* i.e. the three powers, namely *Utaха*, *Prabhu* and *Мentra*. The *Mahābhārata* refers to these in *Ā śr̥mavāsinikanārā. Kāṃsādaka* defines the three thus: the employment of the proper line of policy out of the six measures is the *Мantrasakti*, a full treasury and army is the *Prabhāvasakti* and activity of the strong is the *Utaхаsakti*. Of these we hear of *Мantra* very frequently in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in the sense of policy as well as consideration. The second power we hear of much, and given much importance with regard to achieving success, has been called *Anirveda* (non-depression), which is a synonym of *Utaха*. It is said in the epic that non-depression is the root of success (*sītā*) and ultimate happiness (*karmaśūkha*), and it is the accomplisher of all the ventures and fruit of action of the living ones. The importance given to *Prabhāsakti* in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is also quite manifest.

There is also talk of the four *Balas* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which are explained by the commentators as *Bāhubala*, *Мanobala*, *Uпavahala* and *Bandubala*. In the same reference, intellect having eight organs vis to desire to listen, to listen, to retain what is listened, to accept after retaining, to consider, to understand properly and to be accomplished with understanding. Besides these, there are fourteen qualities which were considered necessary for success.

The king endowed with valour was to employ several means (*Уpāvas*) to protect his dominion, win the enemy and
keep his subjects under control. According to Manus,117 Yajnavalkya,118 Suka119 and others, these Upayas are four, namely Sama (conciliating), Dana (giving gifts and presents), Bheda (causing dissention) and Danda (coercion). According to Kautilya, the six-fold foreign policy should be applied through the four means120 i.e. the recognised means of the ancient Indian polity. Kamsaskaka, however, adds three more, namely Maya, Upeksa and Indrajala to make them seven.121 He further divides the four means into two categories: for internal use and for foreign relations.122 His Maya means trickery, changing forms, disappearing in darkness and disguising.123 Upeksa’s examples are given as Virata overlooking the death of Kicsaka and Himsa of her brother because they were slaves of vices;124 Indrajala is creating strange visions such as providing a sight of mutilated, torn apart artificially made figures in order to frighten the enemy.125

The Ramayana is fully in know of the four measures defined by the writers on polity and their use for achieving the Artha in internal as well as in external affairs.

The Ramayana says that Vikrama (Danda) should be employed only when it is not possible to achieve the desired result through the other three means.126 On the judicious use of the four means, the Ramayana’s view can be understood from what Hanuman said to himself before destroying the garden at Lahka127 and which can be analysed as follows:

(1) Sama should be used in the case of people who are
righteous; it cannot be employed while dealing with those who have no faith in Dharma and the noble ways of life.

(2) Dharma should be exercised while dealing with persons who have greed for money, but cannot be employed when facing a nation who are already affluent.

(3) Bheda should be made use of to win-over those men on the other side who have lust for power.

(4) when the aim cannot be achieved through the above three means because of unfavourable conditions for their employment, the king should resort to Danda (Vikrama).

These means were employed in internal matters also. We read that when Rāvana failed to persuade Sītā, he ordered the Rākṣasīs to use the four Upāyas in the same order and in the reversed order (Amuloma-Pratiloma) to bring Sītā round to his desires. This is a fine exposition of the two orders in which the four means were used in the times of the epic.

Sama has been referred to in the epic as Kṣīma. too. We read that Rāma used this means while dealing with the sea, requesting him to make way for his forces to cross it to reach Lehka. When he found the sea unyielding, he said to Lakṣmana, "It is not possible to achieve fame or praise or victory in battles through Sama." The Sama means was used by Rāvana also, when he desired to get back Lehka from
his brother Kubera. His minister Sumali advised him that he should first make use of Soma and Dana, and then attack if these failed. Consequently Ravana sent his messengers to Kubera, asking him to vacate the area as it belonged to the Rakṣasas. Rama, we read, employed the measure to avoid war even after surrounding Lanka by his army; he sent a messenger to Ravana and asked him to return Sītā.

The Dana measure was used by Kubera who told Ravana that he was ready to share his riches with him. He said so just to avoid conflict and to get time to discuss the matter with his father. So the assumption that the epic does not furnish any actual instance in which Soma and Dana were used as political measures by any ruler for achieving his object is not well founded.

Rhesa and Danda, we are told, were employed by Hammān when he found that Aṅgada was trying to severe away from Sugrīva along with some Vānara chiefs. First, he won-over all the Vānaras through his shrewd arguments, and then told Aṅgada that the Vānaras were fickle minded and would, therefore, leave him as soon as he decided to live in the cave. Ravana, according to another instance, accused his charioteer that he had been won-over by the enemy, because he had taken him away from the battle field. Ravana accused Vibhiṣaṇa and Mālayān also of being agents of the enemy.

To Vibhiṣaṇa he said, "One may live with an enemy or a snake
but not with one who is said to be a friend but serves the enemy." The use of Dppa is too obvious in the epic to need any example.

Besides these four measures, we find that the use of Māvā and Indrajīta, the two other means suggested by Kūmundaka, was also in vogue; but both of them have been termed in the epic as Māvā. Māvā was employed internally and externally. For internal purpose, we find it being put to use to make Śītā surrender to Raavana's wish. Raavana, we are told, had a Kāyavid (magician) named Vidyanūlīva, whom he told to bring an allusionary head of Rāma, a big bow and arrows to show them to Śītā in order to make her believe that Rāma had died. This was what has been termed by Kūmundaka as Indrajīta. The Rañayana tells us also that Indrajit used Māvā when he feigned to kill Śītā before all the Vēnaras. Prior to that also, the son of Raavana had made uninhibited use of trickery when he fought Rāma while remaining invisible.

We already know that the state in the epic period had a standing army. Raavana's army has been described in the Rañayana consisted of 14000 soldiers; Bharata's army which went with him to the forest to bring Rāma back is said to have inter alia 60000 chariots and one lakh horses, a rather unrealistic account; the army which went with 'Satruhnana was made up of 4000 horses, 2000 chariots and 100 elephants; Khara's army had 14000 men who were killed by Rāma, as the account goes. These armies, we are told, were provided
pay and allowances at a fixed rate, and were kept contented, obviously, to keep them in the best of spirits.

The king, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, had a daily inspection of the army. The king was very alert in keeping the soldiers in a good mood; for instance, Rāma advised his brother before he left on the expedition against Lavaṇa that he should look after his soldiers properly, speak to them nicely and give them presents because "wealth, wives and relations do not stand by whereas well contented soldiers do." Kamandaka talks of six divisions of army comprising Kaūla and other forces, adding Mantra and Koṭa to the four well known divisions. The views of the Rāmāyaṇa have been discussed already. Although the epic generally speaks of the four organs of the army, yet the existence of navy in that period cannot be denied. In the book VI we read that while reporting the inaccessibility of Lāṅkā, Hanumān told Rāma thus: "O Rāghava! it (Lāṅkā) is situated on the other side of a vast sea and there is no sea-route due to lack of information." In addition to that there is a clear reference to navy in what Guha said to his men on seeing Ḥanumāṇa's army. We learn that the boats used for military purpose were as large as could accommodate one hundred warriors each and were available in a big number.

The use of war-elephants has been referred to again and again in the epic. Rāvaṇa's army, for example, is said
to have had mountain-like elephants. Akampana rode an elephant during battle and Kahodara fought from an elephant named Sudarsana.

Chariot was considered to be very important for warfare; chariot for war was called Sāṅgūrūmikaraṭha, which was yoked with four horses. The epic has a beautiful description of a chariot in the book VI as also of the arms placed in the vehicle. Fighting from a chariot was viewed as advantageous; therefore, Indra is described sending his chariot and charioteer for Rāma to fight Rāvana from an equal position. Indrajit, Jambumālī, Vajramuṣṭi, Asūnprabha, Nikumbha and Vidyunmālī were some of the warriors on Rāvana's side who, according to the Rāmāyana, fought from chariots.

The movements of a chariot in war were well defined and, therefore, we find terms like Mādaḷam (circle), Vīthī (street or driving straight), Gata (forward movement) and Bratyāgata (backward movement). We hear much about the war horses, too. Valmiki has described various breeds of horses used in those days, namely Dādā, Kulaṭa, Mahunša etc. Even their number in different armies have been given. It may, however, be admitted that the use of cavalry has not been referred to much while describing various battles.

The foot-soldier has been called in the Rāmāyana as Podāṭika, Podāṭi and Podāṭa.

The army was divided into units known as Gulma comprising a certain number of foot-soldiers, horses, chariots.
According to Apte, a Gulma contained 45 soldiers on foot, 27 horses, 2 chariots and 9 elephants. But Kāmāndaka advises— it may be worth comparing—a unit of 5 horses, 10 foot-soldiers, one chariot and one elephant, and Kautilya of 5 horses, 15 foot-soldiers, one chariot and one elephant. Harṣa also ordains the employment of Gulmas in the battle-field. In the Rāmāyana we read that Vibhīṣana and others arranged the Gulmas in the battle-field.

Mahuratas (auspicious times) and Nāmittas (omens) were given much importance in the Rāmāyana period for the success of undertakings. For instance, Rāma took into account the Mahurata at the time of marching and said, "It is the opportune Mahurata Vijaya and the sun has reached the middle of day ----; therefore, I would like to march this moment." Talking of the Nakṣatras and omens he said, "Today is Uttrārṣuṇa Nakṣatra; tomorrow the moon will enter the Hasta Nakṣatra; so Sugrīva, you collect all the forces; we shall march today." He further said, "I see omens which make me believe that I will kill Rāvana and bring back Sītā."

The proper time for the march has also been discussed by our polity writers and the Rāmāyana. Many says that the king should launch an expedition in the months of Mārgaśīrṣa, Hūlaṇa or Chaitra. But adds that if the king is sure of his victory, he may attack during other seasons, also. On this point of policy the Rāmāyana tells us that the king was not interested in beginning a march during the four months
of rains, which set in with the month of Asāda. The Sarada season, that is to say the period beginning with Kartika month, was considered most suitable for attacking. The period towards the summer ending and before the rains was also considered good for march through plains.

The Rāmāyana lays great stress on the secret movement of the forces. We read that in the case of attack on Lavaga, Rama told 'Satruhna to march in such a manner that the enemy might not know his intention. 'Satruhna sent his army separately by a different route and himself advanced with a small contingent.

The Rāmāyanā has described the army marching on different occasions. Of these marches three have been reported in some detail, from which we can form an idea about the pattern of the march during the epic period and can compare it with the views of the polity writers.

Manu says that the king should collect the necessary things, send messengers in advance and march in a formation. According to Kamandaka, the Senāpati should proceed with the army after arranging it into a formation; the Nayaka should march in the front, surrounded by very brave units of the army; the women, Svāmī and Kośa should be in the middle; the horses should march on both the flanks; by the sides of the horses the chariots should be arranged and by the chariots the elephant force should move forwards. The army, according
to him, should march in a *kakaravyāha* or in a formation suited to the occasion, and the king should be protected from all calamities and sudden attacks etc. 185

In the *Rāmāyana*, we come across an excellent sense of marching strategy as we shall explain below:

From the account of the expedition led by 'Satrughna, we come to know how a march was organised. First of all, the king or the leader spoke to the leaders about the plan of march and the strategy. He exhorted them to strive in harmony so that there was no difficulty to anyone. The places of halts were decided in advance and the army stopped on its way only at those places, obviously because they were properly protected and had all the required facilities. During the march and at the camping sites the army was entertained by Naṭas and Nartakas who also accompanied it. The arrangement for provisions was made by the rich traders who travelled with the army taking large quantities of desirable articles. 186

The modern armies, we know, have a regular corps of engineers, which accompanies them during marches to clear the way, and to prepare bridges and roads to make the travel easy and pacy. We find that such a force existed in the times of the epic also. We are told that Bharata ordered his engineers to march ahead of his army going to forest to meet Śrīnā. 187

*Kāmandaka* and others have suggested dispatch of advance units. In the epic also we find a reference to the
advance unit (Agranikam). It was read that the army unit sent by Rama to march ahead of his army was commanded by Nila himself. It was required to select the best way for the army to travel and see remaining ever vigilant that fruits, roots, water etc. on the way were not defiled or destroyed by the enemy. The path to be selected by them was required to be full of fruits, roots, shady groves and water. They were to see also that there was no ambush laid by the enemy, and for this purpose they were to search all the pits, groves, caves and forests in the way. It can be seen that the Ramayana's view on the possible hide-outs of the enemy for ambushing the army is almost reproduced by Kumandaka who advises that Mithra, Timira, Gaya, Suvakra, Aditi, Vayu, Nimmaya are the seven umbrellas of the enemy.

During the march, the army was protected at the flanks, the front and the rear. We are told that Gaja, Gavaya and Gavaksha were ordered to march at the front, Agabha and Gandhamadana were made incharge of the left, Rama travelled at the centre and the Kukas (inner-flanks) were protected by Jambavan, Susepa and Vegadarshi.

Kautilya has described the camping strategy in detail. According to him, the camp should be set-up on a site approved by the experts, the commanders, carpenters and astrologers; it should be circular, rectangular or square or in conformity with the nature of the ground and should have four gates, six
roads, a parapet, gates or towers, when there is danger and army has to halt. 195 We find description of two camps in the Rāmāyaṇa. Regarding the first camp, which was set on the northern shore of the sea before Rāma's army crossed, we have a very brief description. It is said that Nila, the Commander-in-Chief, set up a camp nicely for his army arranging for the protection in accordance with the rules and that Maina and Divida were roaming in directions around the camp to guard against an attack. 196 The second camp was established by Rāma on the southern shore of the sea. About this camp-arrangement 'Sārduḷa reported to Rāvaṇa that it was not possible to spy on it because all routes to the camp were protected by strong Vanaras; he was detected as soon as he entered, caught and beaten up before being taken in the presence of Rāma. 197 The army, we read, was encamped on the mountain Suvela for the reasons of protection against a sudden attack and in order to be able to watch enemy movements. First Rāma went up the mountain and was followed by his Commanders and others. 198 The rest of the army, it seems, encamped at lower levels.

The army was deployed in suitable formations (Vyūhas) before the fighting. The Mahābhārata, Kautilya, Manu and Kūmaṇḍaka refer to many kinds of formations. Kūmaṇḍaka describes seven elements of the Vyūha. 199 Of these the Rāmāyaṇa is conversant with Agra, Prāya, Madhya and Kukṣī i.e. four. Kūmaṇḍaka describes many types of formations and their
many varieties. In the epic we read that Rāma’s army was deployed in a formation called Garudavyūha, which has been referred to by Manu also. In another reference Rāma is shown advising Nila to go and arrange his army in a formation. The Rākṣas forces are also described standing in a formation. The method of forming a particular formation has not been given in the epic, but that is no exception because Kāmandaka and Manu etc. also do not tell us much about this aspect; they give us the formation of units only.

The epic tells us further that the army was divided into Vibhūkas (divisions), each having a leader. These divisions made of several Gulpas were deployed in the battlefield according to the directions given in the treatises on warfare.

Kautilya gives the commonsense advice that the state should follow the chivalrous code if it has immense superiority over the enemy; otherwise, it should have recourse to the other methods of warfare, fare or foul. The Mahābhārata also has the same view and Śukra concurs with his two predecessors. Kāmandaka describes Kūtavuddha in detail and among its many methods gives strategy of dividing and killing the enemy army while asleep by men having coverings from head to foot to look like demons; besides that, he advises to kill the enemy when their eyes are closed by the sunlight or strong winds. He does not consider it a sin. In the Rāmāyana, the Rākṣasas have been particularly accused of
adopting unfair methods and being of crooked disposition; they have been called Mâyā and described fighting Mâyā and Mantravāḍha. But the Kūta, Mâyā and Mantravāḍha of the Rāmāyaṇa, it seems, was limited to display of Mâyā i.e. tricks and illusions. There are no instances of the Rākṣas or any other army attacking the sleeping enemy or adopting other crooked methods suggested by the later writers. At the same time, there was not any hesitation in killing a crooked enemy by resorting to tricks or deceit. The Rāmāyaṇa, we see, does not deprecate killing of Vālī unaware and fighting another enemy or of Meghanāda when he was not prepared for a fight. Similarly, we find that Lavaṇa was attacked by Satrughna when he was out of his city and did not have the proper arms. But generally the states fought using fair means.

There were definite rules regarding quarters to be given to the enemy. Manu says that when the enemy has his chariot destroyed, is powerless, begs for life, is running away with loose hair, is not fighting or is asking for shelter, he should not be killed. He further says that the one who is sleeping, is without armour, is naked and without arms, has abandoned fighting, is only a viewer or is fighting with another warrior should not be killed. Kautilya on the subject says, "(the king) should give quarters to those who are fallen or are running away, who have loose hair or lost their weapons, whose faces are distorted because of fear and who are not fighting." In the epic it is said, "The one
who kills an intoxicated, unaware, sleeping or unarmed person
earns the sin of killing a foetus. Further, we are told
that Atikāya did not like to fight with those who were not
ready to face him, which avers that the non-combatants were
not attacked. Some other principles of the ethics of
war as enumerated in the epic are thus:

(A) The one who kills an enemy who is not ready to fight
commits a sin and, therefore, does not receive the
fruit of good deeds on going to heaven.

(B) When somebody is fighting another enemy, he should not
be attacked.

(C) When the enemy is tired and cannot fight, his life
should be spared.

On the treatment of an enemy seeking shelter it is said,
"If an enemy comes to seek shelter with a noble one, he should
be protected even at the cost of life whether he is distressed
or haughty; it is a deplorable sin if one does not do so to
the best of one's ability and according to justice because of
fear, infatuation or desires; it is a great sin to refuse
protection to an enemy who seeks shelter; and it sends the
sinner to hell, destroys his power and brings ill fame." It is also very clear that there was not any unnecessary killing
in the war. As soon as the king died, the war ended and the
remaining army surrendered.
Kautilya has an advice for the king to send an envoy before the attack as a final effort to stop war. The envoy, according to him, should say to the enemy king who is not ready to accept peace. The above principle seems to be on the line of the approach adopted by Rama before the war. His envoy Angada told Ravana thus - "Hiranyak! King of Rakshasas! you have done great harm to the sages, gods, Gandharvas, apsaras, Nagas, Yaksas and kings, being under the control of senses and pride. You have become very haughty, too, by receiving boons from Lord Brahma. Surely, the time of your destruction has come. The fruit of your sins has presented itself today ---- You are a sinner bereft of knowledge about yourself, and your associates are fools ----. If you do not come to surrender to me and hand over Sita, I will make this world devoid of Rakshasas." Thus, that was the verbal use of Daitya meant to overawe Ravana to accept the offer of peace. This effort of Rama compares well also with the effort of Pandyas described in the Mahabharata.

For the encouragement of the army before fighting, Kautilya says that the commander-in-chief should address the ranks after they have been put in complete array and got favourably disposed and honoured. He should tell them that those who kill the enemy king, prince or commander shall be properly regarded. In the epic period also, the soldiers were addressed and exhorted before and during war. They were told thus: "This is the time for you to repay and to be true
to your masters salt. Such an exhortation is found in the famous verse of the Arthasastra which warns those who may think of running away from the battle-field. If the warriors tried to turn back during the epic period, they were put to shame and exhorted to return and fight.

Vālmiki has referred to a number of musical instruments which were sounded to collect the soldiers and to instil a sense of pride in them, besides raising their spirits. The musical instruments were played upon before the start and also during the fighting. The Vānaras, we read, sounded Sārītas and Sāṅkhas, when they had crossed the sea and reached near Lanka. The other war-music-instruments mentioned in the epic are Vāṇa, Nṛdāṅga, Paṅava, Dandubhi and Paṭāha.

Besides the war-music, the armies created a lot of noise while attacking, on achieving victory in the battle and on regaining strength.

The Lanka war has been described in the Rāmāyana in detail. From this description we can learn about the war strategy of the times. Lanka, we learn, was a formidable fort having a deep and big moat around it, crossable only by means of bridges. The bridges could be placed across it or lifted with the help of machines which could throw away the enemy soldiers who tried to cross them. There were some machines also, namely Parighas and Sataghmis. The four doors were very...
strong and big, and there were stone throwing machines which warded off the enemy forces. The moat had crocodiles and man-eating fishes, and the walls were very high and strong. Even then it was won by Rāma.

Kauṭilīya advises regarding the taking of a fort that the conqueror desirous of capturing the enemy's (fortified) town should fill his own side with enthusiasm and the enemy side with terror. In this regard the epic has even more developed idea. According to it, Rāma was not only known for his association with the gods but he was proclaimed an incarnation of Viṣṇu himself also. It was done so deftly that the Rākṣasas also started believing in it. This can be attributed to the successful execution of the war strategy known to the kings of the epic period. Kauṭilīya further says that the fort can be won by five means, namely instigation, killing the enemy through secret agents, use of poison, seige and destruction. His method can be divided into two parts, bringing the enemy out and employment of seige. The means prescribed by him for forcing the enemy to come in the open comprised creation of fear of gods and superhuman elements and instigation of greed by a promise of buried treasure or by fascination of victory. The second method emphasises that the king should make a trustworthy chief of band desert (ostensibly) and join the enemy whom he should kill after winning his confidence. This method was feared being employed by Rāvana when Vibhīṣaṇa went to seek shelter with Rāma.
About the siege, Kautilya says, "It should be preceded by weakening the enemy." After securing the protection of the camp, of supplies, reinforcements and the roads, he should encircle the fort along the moat and the rampart, defile the water, empty the moats or fill them with dust. He should cause the rampart to be taken by means of an underground passage, storming by troops or causing a breach by means of elephant-armour. He should fill the hollows with earth and destroy by machines what is guarded by many troops. He should release birds with fire-mixture tied to their tails or set the fort on fire by throwing fire with the help of bows. Kimandaka also advises storming method.

Taking the fort was considered very important to win a war in the epic period. The strategy employed to take the fort was not much different from the method given in the Arthashastra and other works. When it was clear that the war could not be avoided, Rama put Lanka under siege by deploying his army under different leaders at all the four gates of the fort and around the parapet. The eastern gate was blocked by Nila, the southern by Angada, the western by Hanumān and the northern by Rama and Laksmāna themselves. There was another contingent of soldiers under the leadership of Jambavān, which occupied the centre. The Vānaras filled the moat with dust, stones, wood and straw, and then crossed it to reach the gates and the wall. After that they stormed the fort from all sides, climbed up the wall, and forced the enemy to come out in the open to fight.
The warriors fought duals by challenging each other. If the warriors thought that they could continue fighting beyond the day-time, it was allowed. In such a battle in darkness, the identity of the opponent was established before attack. There is a reference to Ulka, i.e., torch being used to locate the soldiers. It can be deduced that some kind of torches were used during a fight after the nightfall.

The warriors wore armours which were difficult to pierce through. Every army had its own flag for which reason it was known as Dvajini. Besides the army, the chief warriors also had flags on their chariots.

The Ramayana has a long list of weapons known to the people of that period, namely Khanga 'Sakti, Asa, Patīśa, Paraśva, Tomara, Cakra, Gadā, Mūsala, Vajra, Parigha,
Besides fighting with arms and missiles, the Rākṣasas and the Vānara were experts in fighting with hands. The Vānara have been shown fighting with trees, rocks, hands, nails and teeth, although on some occasions they took up arms of the enemies and used them. The warriors had a complete knowledge of the vital parts (Nāmas) of body and killed the opponents by hitting at those places; for instance, Rāvana and Hanumān fought each other with their hands, striking at the vitals of the other. While fighting with hands and hitting the enemy, the Vānara and the Rākṣasas either slapped with full open hand or gave blows with fists.

Kumandaka advises the king to honour his soldiers and give them rewards, saying, "Those who are ahead of others in work should be praised, and the king should give rewards to the fighters because all fight for a benevolent king." In the epic we find Rāma telling Vibhūṣaṇa to reward the Vānaras in following words, - "O Vibhūṣaṇa! all these Vānaras have fought in the war and done well; so you should honour them with various kinds of jewels. O Lakṣāvara! these Vānaras did not retreat and fought without any fear for their lives. You have achieved victory over Lakṣa with their efforts. You should, therefore, reward them with money and jewels. If you honour them in this way being grateful, they will be satisfied."
The polity writers attach great importance to the agency of spies. Kautilya in fact advises that the king should overcome his enemy with the help of his spies employed in various ways to kill the enemy king, instead of waging a war against him. Out of the five means of taking the fort suggested by him, three are based on the activities of spies. According to Kameshaka, they (spies) are the eyes of the king; therefore, he should employ them all over the country. He declares that the king who uses spies as his eyes is difficult to win, and whosoever attacks him falls like a blind man even though equal. The state in the epic period also believed that it was not possible to rule without employing them in the required quarters. The king was known as Darshaksha, because he could see far off objects through his spies. It was said that the wise king collected intelligence about his enemy, and then defeated him after a short battle. The king who did not have spies was considered no better than an ordinary man. So all the states in the epic period employed a large number of spies and used them within the state and outside the territory for spying. The spies were required to collect information about the eighteen Tirthas in the foreign countries and fifteen in their own state, as already stated. They were also to keep a close watch over the people of the state and note what they said about the king. There was nothing which escaped the notice of the spies and, though them, the notice of the ministers and the king.
Rāvana, Vālī, all had efficient spies. We are told that Vālī had a complete knowledge of Rāma-Sugrīva alliance and Rāma’s power, but believed that Rāma was righteous. He told Rāma that he knew about Sīta’s abduction also. Sugrīva, we read, sent Hanumān to collect information about Rāma and Lakṣaṇa. Rāvana also had a department of spies, as he asked Mahodara to present clever spies who were dependable, faithful and untiring. The spies disguised themselves in various ways to avoid detection.

The Rāmāyana employs several terms to denote the spy, namely Cara, Caraṅga and Cara. The polity works refer to two categories of spies, Prakāśa i.e. Duṣka (messenger) and Auvakīśa i.e. Cara. On the types and appointment of spies Kautūlīya says, “The king should appoint as spies the sharp-pupil, the apostate monk, the seeming house-holder, the seeming trader, the seeming ascetic, the secret agents in the brave, the poison giver and the begging nun.” They are divided by him further into two categories, the roving and the stationary. In the Rāmāyana, we are acquainted with spies roving in various forms. For example, we read that Hanumān disguised himself as a Shīkṣa in order to understand the intention of Rāma and Lakṣaṇa, though Sugrīva had told him to do so in the form of an ordinary man. Later, we read that Hanumān saw many spies in Lanka who were roving among the people. Some looked like Yogis, some had grown long matted hair, some had shaved heads, some wore cow-skin or deer-skin,
some carried pots of fire as weapons, some were naked and
some carried Kusa-grass, Mudgaras and reeds as weapons. 286
We find that Rāvana's spies disguised themselves as Vānaras 287
and Hanumān (again) used a proper disguise before entering
Lenkā under the cover of darkness. 288 It is interesting that
courtesans (Gapikās) were also used as spies in the epic period. 289
It is also said that the sages supplied information on the
enemy such as his movements, habits, power, arms etc. 290

The four Sakivas of Vībhīṣaṇa worked as Rāma's spies
and collected intelligence about the Rākṣas army. 291 'Suka,
Śravaṇa 292 and 'Sardula 293 tried to spy on Rāma's army. Rāma
could gather a lot of information about the fortification of
Lenkā, Rāvana's forces and their deployment, 294 and Rāvana
received the details of Rāma's arrival on the island, his
warriors and army. 295 The intelligence gathered by the spies
was termed as Pravṛtti. 296

The spies collected the following information about
the enemy during war:

(1) The number of enemy forts, their construction, gates
and security arrangement. 297
(2) The strength of the army on the opposite side. 298
(3) Names of the trusted officers with whom the enemy
king discussed secret matters. 299
(4) The habits of the enemy.
(5) Names of the chief warriors, their strength. 300
The spies used several methods to extract the required information. According to one method, one of the spies approached the concerned person and talked to him keeping his back towards the other spy who stood observing them from a distance. Thus, the gestures and expressions of the victim were noticed and analysed. The spy who approached for a talk tried to win the confidence of the other person by profusely praising him. The method of extracting information through talking and by asking indirect questions has been referred to again in the account of 'Sārdūla who said to Rāvaṇa, "It is not possible to talk or put questions to Vānaras; I was caught as soon as I entered." That shows the existence of a counter espionage system also, in the epic period. Rāvaṇa's other spies also admitted that it was not possible for anyone to spy upon Rāma's forces because of the protection of the entries to the camp. The spies of Rāvaṇa were caught because of the system, although they had disguised themselves as Vānaras.

The above references to the counter espionage system and checks against enemy spies show that the arrangement was in no way inferior to the antiespionage measures advised by Kauśīkīya to check the foreign spies.

The beautiful courtesans working as spies used to go
to the concerned quarters wearing ornaments and decorating themselves. They tried to entice the enemy and his men.\textsuperscript{306}

The \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} is aware of the double agents also. In the discussion held in Rāma's camp, the fear was expressed that Vibhīṣaṇa could be a double agent sent by Rāvana.\textsuperscript{307} Earlier, Rāvana also suspected him in the same manner as above and called him as an agent of the enemy.

The diplomatic norms conceded Dūta's inviolability under all circumstances whether they were caught spying or they caused serious damage to the state.\textsuperscript{308} But the life of a Cāra was totally insecure on foreign lands. He was normally put to death when detected for he was considered \textit{vadhārtha}.\textsuperscript{309} (deserving death-punishment). The enemy king, however, could spare his life if he so desired. For own spies, Kaṭhila has prescribed silent punishment and dismissal from service if any of them failed in his duty or provided wrong information.\textsuperscript{310}

In the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} we read that 'Suka and Rāvaṇa were turned out of the country for they praised Rāma.'\textsuperscript{311}

The spying within the state is confirmed by the references to spies roving in Laṅkā, as stated above. It is also proved by the description of the meeting held by Rāma, wherein he enquired what the people thought about him and his brothers.\textsuperscript{312} He was told that there was a scandal involving him and Sītā.\textsuperscript{313} The reporting by Ḫaḍra in the meeting
confirms further that the state employed spies within its own boundaries to collect information and judge the reputation of the king and his family. These spies frequented the streets, crossings, forests and other public places.

The information collected by the spies was passed on to the king in the epic period, and that is exactly what Kautilya demands of a spy when he says, "Regarding the king and me (the minister should tell the spy) as your authority, report to us at once any evil of any person which you may notice." 314

The Rāmāyaṇa does not tell us whether there were the permanent embassies fostering friendship between the allies. But we read that Dūtas were sent to the courts of other kings with specific missions: (i) Sumantra was asked to go to invite the kings of Mithilā, Kāśi, Kekaya, Ayga etc. to come to Ayodhya to take part in the sacrifice; 315 (ii) Janaka sent his Amātyas as messengers to request Daśaratha to come to Mithilā and to allow the marriage of his son with Sītā; 316 (iii) Vasīṣṭha sent messengers of the status of Amātyas to Kekaya country to bring back Bharata; 317 and (iv) Indhājit sent a messenger to Rāma to send army to win the Gandharvas. 318 The messengers who went to friendly kings took very costly presents with them. 319 Indhājit, according to the epic, sent beautiful clothes, ornaments etc. 320

The king who received the presents from an ally reciprocated the gesture by sending presents himself. 321 The
exchange of presents in such a manner was called ṛitidāna, i.e., giving something for the sake of love or friendship. It was not the tribute (Bali).

We come across several names of cities and states in the Rāmāyaṇa like Kaushāmbī, Mabodaya, Girivraja, Vasumati, Brahmmāla, Videha, Mālava, Kaśī, Kosala, Magadhā, Mahāgrāma, Rupāra and Vaṅga. They are spoken of as allies who were requested to assemble in the event of a coronation, an emergency or a sacrifice. Besides the exchanges of presents, the allies entered into matrimonial relationship among themselves. We read that Daśaratha was married to the daughters of the Kekaya king and the Kosalendra, namely Kaikesī and Kausalyā. Later we find that Janaka and his brother married their daughters to the princes of Ayodhya to strengthen the bonds of friendship.

The allies often combined their forces to attack the enemy. An ally's help was sought by the conqueror in order to win his enemy. We find that there was another attack by the allied forces of Ayodhya and Kekaya on the Gandharvas, besides the Rāma-Sugriva combination against Lanka.

The epic refers to the existence of another type of neighbouring states which were not totally independent; they were the feudatory states. The kings of these states have been referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa as Sāmantarājasapha.
The kings of Ayodhya had many such states under their subjugation as we are told that Dasaaratha was surrounded by the kings of eastern, western and southern kings, besides the Maleechoha, Arya and Vanaasailantas1 kings. Later, Rkaas, Vanaaras and Rkaasas were also brought under subordinate-alliances by Rama.

The Samaanta kings were probably not independent with regard to foreign relations, and their existence depended on the pleasure of the sovereign which they tried best. In addition to making efforts to keep the sovereign good-tempered and to obey his orders in word and in practice, the Samaantas had to pay him tribute (Bali) on a regular basis, besides bringing presents on the occasions demanding so. They told the sovereign while paying their tributes, "we are your servants and you are our master." It can be concluded that the state in the Ramayana period was generally not expansionist. It did not engage itself in unnecessary war while it took care of its own security through a strong army, a good network of spies and a wise application of diplomatic measures. In its relations with the neighbouring states, it remained satisfied with subjugation and peace. The diplomatic measures used in those days were of a high moral standard and no underhand methods were generally made use of. The kings aspired to defeat the enemies by using righteous means and involving minimum of bloodshed. The maxim for the king was to avoid war as far as possible and to make all efforts for peace and good relations.
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