CHAPTER NINE

THE FOREIGN POLICY

THE THEORY OF MANDALA ACCORDING TO THE MANUSAMHITA

The foreign policy of a certain country means its policy with regard to its relationship with and attitude towards foreign countries. The foreign policy as recommended by the ancient texts under the present study envisages a policy in respect of only the neighbouring countries obviously because of the reason that in those days communications were not as easy as in the modern times. Hence for any particular country the relationship with a geographically remoter country was of little consequence. That is why in the context of the foreign policy, a particular kingdom is supposed to be surrounded by a number of neighbouring states, which could be more easily reached by land routes and presumably also by sea routes and could be readily classified as friendly, ánádik and neutral. Such neighbouring countries maintaining various postures towards the central kingdom concerned are together referred to by the technical term mandala, i.e., the circle of neighbours. The Manusamhitā recommends mandalasya praśāraḥ, i.e., the conduct of the circle of neighbours as one of the topics on which the king would deliberate during his meeting with the counsellors for discussing policy matters. This is followed by a very short discourse on the nature of the mandala. But this treatment is neither elaborate nor very clear.

It is observed that four kings, representing four different states or political powers, technically called viśram, satru (or arj), madhyama and udásina are to be recognised as the basic elements of the mandala. There are

1. cf. praśāraṁ mandalasya ca (MS.VII.134)
also eight other kings with eight technical terms for indicating their attitude toward the central king concerned. Thus a mandala consists of twelve kings.²

Each of the said twelve kings possess five vital elements deserving special attention in the context of a foreign policy, and these five vital elements are namely amśtya (= ministry), rāstra (= realm or territory including the inhabitants), dūrga (= fort), arthā (= treasury) and danda (= army). The twelve kings possess a total of 60 (= 12×5) vital elements. Adding of the number of the kings themselves with the total number of the vital elements would give the total number of the elements constituting the mandala as 72 (= 60+12).³

Keeping in view the physical situation of their respective territories, it is observed that for a particular king who occupies the position of the central figure in the circle of kings, the immediate neighbour, i.e., the king of the immediately contiguous territory is an ari, i.e., an enemy). Any other king who remains obliged to the ari is also to be considered an enemy. A king, who rules over a territory lying immediately beyond the territory of the enemy, is a mitra, i.e., an ally or a friend.

---

2. cf. madhyamasya praccāreṇa viṣjīgosca cestītam.

udāśinapraccāreṇa śātrosaiva prayatastah:

etāh prakṛtyo muleś mandalasya samāstataḥ.

astau dānyaḥ sanākyata dvādasaiva tu tāh saṁtaḥ: (MS.VII.155f.

The king of the territory lying beyond the territories of the ari and the mitra is to be treated as an udāsīna (i.e., a neutral king). 4

With regard to the above short account of mandala given in the Manusāhitā, the following points deserve to be noted:

The central figure of the mandala, i.e., the circle of kings, from whose point of view the attitude of the other kings is considered, is called the vijīgīśu, i.e., a king who seeks conquest. This particular king is also a component part of the mandala, and in time of discussing the foreign policy his own doings and the vital elements like smātya and rāstra, belonging to himself also should be sedulously deliberated on. 5

The Manusāhitā first names four types of king as the basic elements (= māla prakṛti) of the mandala, and they are vijīgīśu (= one who seeks conquest), satru or ari (= enemy), madhyama (= medial) and udāsīna (= neutral). Of the remaining eight kings one more, namely mitra (= ally) is mentioned in MS.VII.158. Seven kings of the circle are not named at all. These names may be gathered from the commentaries. Kullūka refers to the eight kings, other than those called basic elements (= māla prakṛtis) as sākhā prakṛtis (= branch elements), and refers to the five elements namely smātya, rāstra, dūrga, artha and danda as the dravya prakṛtis (= material elements). 7 Kullūka gives the names and positions of the eight

4. of. MS.VII.156
5. of. vijīgīśa ceṣṭitam ("S.VII.155 A")
6. of. smātya-rāstra-dūrga-rha-dandākhyāḥ pānea cāpāraḥ . pratyekāt kathā layetaṁ saṁkṣepaṁ dvīsaptatiḥ : ("S.VII.157")
7. of. "..... sastirvā dravyaparakṛtyo bhavanti. tathā mālaprakṛtibhis cataṣāhāḥ sākha-prakṛtibhis caṣṭāhāḥ sāha saṁkṣepaḥ dvīsaptatiparakṛtyo saṁmibhāḥ kathitaḥ" (Kullūka on MS.VII.159)
sākhā prakṛṭī as follows:

In front of the vijigīṣu there stands the ari (= enemy) as the immediate neighbour. Kullūka says that beyond the territory of the ari, there stands the mitra (= ally); beyond the mitra there stands the arimitra (= the ally of the enemy), beyond the arimitra there stands the arimitramitra (= the ally of the ally) and beyond him stands the arimitramitra. In the opposite direction, i.e., at the back of the vijigīṣu, the immediately contiguous territory is that of the pāramigrāha (= one who attacks in the rear); one who restrains the pāramigrāha from his back is called the ākranda; beyond the ākranda there stands the pāramigrāhasāra (= supporter of the pāramigrāha); and beyond him stands the ākrandāsāra (= supporter of the ākranda). Thus the twelve kinds of the mandala may be named in the same place as follows:

1. vijigīṣu
2. ari
3. mitra
4. arimitra
5. mitramitra
6. arimitramitra

Occupying successively receding positions in front of the vijigīṣu:
7. mitramitra
8. arimitramitra
9. pāramigrāhasāra
10. ākrandāsāra

Occupying successively receding positions behind the vijigīṣu:
11. pāramigrāha
12. ākranda

of. "... agrato ribhūmīna mitram arimitram mitramitra arimitramitra
mitramitra prakṛtyayō bhavantīj pasācoca pāramigrāha
ākrandāḥ pāramigrāhasāra ākrandāsāra iti ca tathā. (Kullūka on Y's VII.156)"
7. pārṇigrāha
8. ākranda
9. pārṇigrāhāsāra
10. ākrandāsāra

Occupying a medial position:

11. madhyama

Occupying a position beyond both arī and mitra:

12. udāśīna.

It may be noted here that arī and pārṇigrāhas are both immediate neighbours and both are equally hostile. When the viśjīṣu intends an aggression to the front, one facing the onslaught becomes the arī and one resisting or harassing the aggressor becomes the pārṇigrāha. But when the viśjīṣu takes an aggressive posture in the opposite direction the pārṇigrāha becomes the arī and the arī becomes the pārṇigrāha. 9

The implications of the two terms madhyama and udāśīna seem to be somewhat confusing. Although madhyama is said to be one of the basic elements, yet its position is not duly pointed out by the text. The function and attitude of the madhyama are also not mentioned at all. Ullêka's commentary also is not much helpful. From the commentary it appears that

9. of. "strāgravartino'rivypadēṣa eva pascaadvartinvastvaritve'ī
pārṇigrāhavyypadēṣaḥ" (Kulūka on Ms. VII.150).
In fact both these kings seem to be neutral. Moreover according to the Manusmität, the territory of the udāśīna lies beyond the territories of the ari and the mitra. Such a territory seems to be overlapping with the territory of the arimitra of Kallůka’s distribution of the śākha prakṛtis. To find a way out of this confusing situation it may perhaps be suggested that the madhyama is one who has a common border with, and a similar attitude of nonalignment towards, both the vijigīṣu and the ari. Thus the madhyama may be supposed to be an immediate neighbour of both the vijigīṣu and the ari occupying one of the two flanks of either of them. The udāśīna, may be supposed to have a territory having a common border with the territories of the ari and the mitra, and flanking the territories of both the ari and the mitra at the same time, being located in the flank of the said two territories, the territory of the udāśīna need not be overlapping with the territory of the arimitra.

This is what is perhaps actually intended by the expression tayoph param in M VII.158, where, an expression like mitrāt param would have actually left some room for the overlapping of the territories of the udāśīna and the arimitra.

10. The madhyama remains neutral with regard to the ari and the vijigīṣu, while the udāśīna remains neutral with regard to the vijigīṣu and the ari and the madhyama, according to Kallůka. of. "ari-vijigīṣor yo bhūmyantarāḥ samhatayor anugrahasamartho nigrāhe cāsamhatayor samarthah sa madhyamah ..... tathā ari-vijigīṣu-madhyamānāṁ yah samhatām anugraha samartho nigrāhe cāsamhatānāṁ samarthah sa udāśīnāh" (Kallůka on M S. VII.155). The udāśīna remains neutral with regard to the enemy and the aggressor and the meddler at a time and is strong enough to be helpful or to be hostile to all of them respectively.
In the Manusūkta there are also some more observations which relate to some particular types of kings belonging to the mandala, as follows:

The viṣṭeṣu, i.e., the king who seeks conquest, should pay proper attention to the parṇiprāna and the akṛanda (i.e., one who attacks him from behind and one who harasses this attacker in the interest of the aggressor, the central figure of the mandala), if he wants to derive the best fruits from his acts of aggression.

The viṣṭeṣu may rely on an udāsīna if he is found to possess the following qualities vis., honesty, knowledge of (the nature of) men, bravery, a compassionate disposition, and a splendidly generous nature.

It should be remembered by the central figure of the mandala that the most dangerous enemy is one who is wise, hailing from a high family, brave, clever, liberal, grateful and patient.

A friend (= mitra), gold and land are the three types of gains derived from an aggression. But by gaining gold and land a king does not have as much growth (in strength and prosperity) as by obtaining a true friend, who though weak yet possesses the potentiality of becoming powerful in future. One who is righteous and grateful, whose people are

11. cf. MS. VII. 211.
12. cf. Āryāb puruṣājñāneśa saurya karṇāvedi. sthulaalakṣya ca satata uḍāsīnagamodayaḥ (MS.VII.211). The word sthulaalakṣyam means munificent. Nilakṣeta on MS.III.36.19 also supplies the gloss "sthulaalakṣya bahupradah".
contented, who himself has attachment for the subjects, and is persevering in his undertakings is most desirable as an ally even if he happens to be a small power. 14

The king is also advised to be very much on his guard against a mitra (i.e., a friend) who secretly serves the enemy, and against such persons, who having earlier left the company of the viṣiṣṭa and presumably having passed some time with the enemy now comes back seeking company of the viṣiṣṭa; because such men are the most dangerous foes. 15

It is, however, recommended as a matter of principle that the king should take none of the foreign powers for granted. It is observed that a king who knows policy should by all means arrange matters in such a manner so that neither friends, nor neutrals, nor foes might become superior to himself. 16 The king should also arrange everything in such a manner that no ally, nor any neutral, nor also any foe may ever injure him. This is the political wisdom presented in a nutshell. 17

It may be noted that in the domain of politics even the friend cannot be taken for granted and even the friend is recommended to be kept in a check. Because, as it is observed severally in the Mahābhārata also,

14. cf. MS. VII.206 and 208f.

15. cf. MS. VII.186

16. cf. MS. VII.177. Here 'sarvopāyaiḥ' ( = by all means) actually means 'by the employment of all the four upāyas, i.e., political expedients, which will be discussed in a later section in this chapter.

17. cf. MS. VII. 180.
it is not certain at all as when a friend might become a foe, and a foe might become a friend.

THE THEORY OF MANDALA ACCORDING TO THE SANTIPARVA:

The Sān̄tiparva does not present any systematic or elaborate discourse on the theory of mandala. There are only some scattered references to the mandala as a whole or to the various constituent elements of the mandala. Those references are presented and studied below:

1. Bhāṣa recommends it as a wholesome policy for the king to keep the affairs of his friends, foes and the medial neutrals under constant and careful observation.\(^{19}\)

2. Bhāṣa observes that even a weak enemy should not be neglected even by a stronger enemy, because even a small fire might burn a lot and even a small quantity of poison might do a lot of harm. An enemy being endowed with even a single variety of the four varieties of the army viz. elephants, horses, chariots and infantry, having taken shelter in a fort might vex the whole realm of even a prosperous king.\(^{19}\)

3. Bhāṣa says that ari, mitra and udāśina are described in the treatise on dandaṇāti composed by Bhāṣa.\(^{20}\)

---

20. "arir mitra udāśina ityeta'pyanuvartitāṁ" (MB.XII.59.43.B)
4. Bhīṣma further informs that the said treatise on dandaṇī contains also deliberations on the twelve kings of the maṇḍala.  

This reference is significant in so far as it reveals that the Mahābhārata also recognises the maṇḍala to be consisting of twelve kings.

It may be noted that Nilakanṭha, commenting on the said extract, gives an altogether different description of the maṇḍala. Accordingly, the viṣṇiṣṭa stands in the centre of the circle, around him on his four sides there are four aris, beyond for aris there are four mitras on the four sides of the viṣṇiṣṭa and beyond the four mitras there are four udāsina on four sides of the viṣṇiṣṭa. Thus, according to this scheme, the viṣṇiṣṭa is the thirteenth king surrounded by twelve foreign powers.

5. It is advised by Bhīṣma that with the help of spies intelligence should be gathered about the activities of all the udāsina, aris and mitras pertaining to the fortified city as well as the rural areas.

6. It is recommended by Bhīṣma that spies should be employed to breed dissension among the sudhāraṇa (i.e., the friends of the foe), and alliance should be sought with a power superior to the foe. The idea contained in this precept is that instigation of the friend of the foe

---

21. 'maṇḍalāsthā ca yā cintā rajan dvādaśarājika' (Ibid, 70.8)
22. "dvādaśarājika samuḥa dvādaśarājika madhyasthāya viṣṇiṣṭa sa estur dikṣa vasuṣṭara devayāj pare āsūru nārāyaṇi te bhāya pare satvāra udāsina iti." (Nilakanṭha on above)
23. of. udāsinaṁ nārāyaṇaṁ sarvas eva cikirsitam.
   pare janapade caiva jñātayām śārvaśāyaṁ : (MB.XII.81.21)
24. of. MB. XIII.102.27.
against the foe and intimidation by way of gaining alliance with a superior power, are the two measures, which should be applied simultaneously.

7. Sage Kalakavyāṃya recommends that for saving certain situations it may be advisable also to pay homage to those who are not allies.

8. The same sage in the same context refers to the acquisition of what is called sahāya-bala. This term may be same with mitra-bala referred to by Dṛṣṭarūtra in the Āraṇyāṇapārvasya, where some six such types of balas are named in the same context. The said balas are vis., maumlubala, mitra-bala, śavā-bala, bhṛtya-bala, āruṇi-bala and cārā-bala. In the Arthasastra also six types of balas are recognised. These names of the balas are same with those given by Dṛṣṭarūtra except in one case where in place of cārā-bala of the former the latter gives amitrabala. Now the question is, what does the term bala means in these contexts? In the Arthasastra the term bala is used invariably in the sense of soldiers drawn from various sources like the kingdom of the ally (= mitra-bala, and the kingdom of the enemy (= amitrabala). But Nilakantha's commentary shows that bala should mean any type of strength of the king. Thus, for instance, 'maumlubala' means 'dhanabalama', i.e., the strength derived from the treasury. Thus the term sahāya-bala in the Āraṇyāṇapārva may mean either

25. cf. Nilakantha on above.
26. cf. MB.III.105.6
27. cf. MB.IV.7, 7-9.
'an ally as the source of strength' or 'the soldiers provided by the all ally.'

9. Sage Kalakavyakiya to the antara (i.e., the ally of the foe) and the ari (i.e., the foe) while recommending that the antara should be instigated against the ari so as to break a bilva fruit (i.e., a wood apple) with another bilva fruit.  

10. Sage Kāṇika Bhāradvāja makes a very important observation that nobody becomes an enemy by nature and nobody becomes a friend by nature. Foreign powers become friends and foes, depending on their own potentiality. In an episode told by Bhīma it is observed that there can never be any permanent friendship and there cannot be also any enmity for ever. Parties become friends or foes depending on self interest. There are many other similar observations on the point which are referred to in the foot note.

30. cf. MB.XII.109.10.B.
31. antarah bhedaśitvāraṁ bilvāṁ bilvema bhedaśa. (Ibid, 11.A)
32. nāsti jātyā ripur nūma mitrāṁ vāpi na vidyate .
śaṁarthayogājayaṁ mitrāṁ ripavas tathā : (MB.XII.140.51)
33. nāsti mitrā sthirā nūma na ca dhruvaṁ asamśaśaṇam .
arthayuktyā tu jāyante mitrāṁ ripavastatha : (Ibid, 138.141)
34. MB.XII.140.51 is found also as MB.XII.138.159 with the only difference that for jātyā the word ātu is given in the latter cf. also
na kasaṁ kasyacin mitraṁ na kasaṁ kasyacidripaḥ .
arthatastu nībadhyante mitrāṁ ripavas tathā : (MB.XII.138.110)
mitraṁ ca sātrutāṁ eti kasmīśc eti kāleparyāye .
śatrusā ca mitrāṁ eti svārtho hi balavattarah : (Ibid, 142)
The foreign policy of any king invariably calls for the application of the four political expedients technically called upāyās. In certain other texts more than four expedients are recognized. But Manusamhitā recognizes only four upāyās, and they are namely, 1. sāma (= conciliation), 2. dāna (= bribery), 3. bheda (= dissension) and danda (= application of force). The last one is also sometimes plainly referred to as yuddha (= war). In the Manusamhitā none of the said terms is defined. The terms are obviously taken to be self-explanatory. The upāyās, i.e., the expedients are required to be referred to in different places of the text as shown below:

1. It is recommended that the king, who seeks conquest, should subdue all the opponents he might find on his way to victory, by the application of the four expedients, viz., conciliation and the rest. 35

2. If the opponents cannot be stopped by the first three upāyās, namely, sāma, dāna and bheda, then alone the last upāya, namely, danda alone should be applied and thus overcoming them by force they should be gradually brought under control. 36

3. Among the four expedients, sāma and the rest, the learned always recommend sāma (= conciliation) and danda (= employment of force) for the prosperity of the kingdom. 37

4. The above recommendations seem to relate to the opponents in general. Some of such may be from within the own kingdom also. But with reference to the kings of the mandala there is a further recommendation.

35. cf. MS.VII.107
as follows:

For overcoming all the different types of kings of the mandala, the vijigāṣṭa should apply all the four upāyas, either singly or conjointly. Or in place of all the four, only pauruṣa (= danda = force) or only naya (= sāma = conciliation) may also be applied. 38

3. From the above recommendations it appears that sāma and danda are recommended as the best upāyas. They are taken to be the best perhaps in the sense that they are the most efficient ones. But yet there is a further recommendation that despite of its efficiency danda should be the last choice. This recommendation goes as follows:

The vijigāṣṭa should try to conquer his foes by sāma (= conciliation), by dāna (= gifts), and by bheda (= creation of dissension in the enemy camp) applied either separately or conjointly, but never by fighting if it can be avoided. Because, it is often seen, that when two kings fight, victory and defeat in the battle remain uncertain. Hence, a battle should be avoided as far as practicable. If, however, the other three upāyas fail, the king should fight with such a determination that he might completely conquer his foes. 39

6. It is further recommended as a principle that when a king finds that all kinds of misfortunes are violently assailing him at the same time, he should try all the four upāyas either jointly or separately. 40

---

38. Ibid, 190.
40. Ibid, 214.
7. For the fulfilment of his own interests, the king should try his best with the help of the persons who employ the upāyas, all the upāyas taken together and also the nature of the business to be accomplished. 41

3. The main purpose of the employment of all the expedients by a king endowed with political wisdom is to make sure that neither friends, nor neutrals, nor foes may become superior to himself. 42

THE TREATMENT OF THE POLITICAL EXPEDIENTS IN THE SĀNTI-PARVA:

In the Mahābhārata, and for that matter in the Sānti-parva, also the upāyas are not defined. But yet in comparison with the Maṇḍavyaśī, the treatment of the upāyas in the Mahābhārata is more elaborate in so far as some of the precepts here are accompanied also by illustrations. 43 Particularly in the Sānti-parva also the theory is accompanied, to some extent, by its applied aspect as well. But the treatment is not as systematic as it should have been. Yet, confining the attention to the Sānti-parva alone the relevant precepts and observations may be sorted out as follows:

41. Ibid, 215
42. Ibid, 177
43. For instance in MB.I.129.36-49, there is the story of an intelligent jackal who successfully employed sāna, dāna, bheda and danda in turn against four of his animal rivals.
1. Bṛhmaṇa informs that in the treatise on dandaśānti composed by
Brahmā āśīra, bheda, pradēsā (= āśīra) and danda, as well as upakāsa
(= indifference) are completely dealt with.\(^{44}\) Thus in the Sāntināraya as
many as five upāyās are recognised. Of these upāyās, bheda is sometimes
referred to also as bhedana or upadhi.\(^{45}\) But, although a fifth upāya is
also recognised yet in most cases reference is made only to the four
expedients as usual.

2. Recommending that the four usual upāyās should be applied to
four different types of opponents it is advised by sage Kṣapika that one
should bow down to a courageous opponent, i.e., should apply āśīra in case
of a stronger opponent, then should defeat a timid opponent with the help
of dissimulation (= bheda), and should subdue the greedy by giving wealth,
i.e., with the upāya called dēna, and in case of an equal opponent should
follow the policy of confrontation (= vigraha), i.e., should take resort
to daanda as an expedient.\(^{46}\)

3. As in the Manusāhitī, in the Sāntināraya also advocates the
avoidance of war as far as practicable. Bṛhmaṇa observes that an intelli-
genent seeker of conquest should always avoid a war, because Bṛhaspati also

\(^{44}\) śrāvakṣeṣa pradānāṁ tato dandaśa pārthiva .
upokṣeṣa pūnāṁ eṣṭa kārtavyam sa-upokṣeṣā (NB.III.99.35)
\(^{45}\) cf. trivarga viditārthasam yuktasāropadhīsa yah (Ibid, 97.173).
"upadhiḥ paraśyam sātvādaṁ utkrodhaṁ dandaṁ bhedanaṁ" (Nilakantha).
\(^{46}\) cf. 11.4. samālāpātana bhūram bhedana bhedayet.

Lubdhana arthapradānena sāmā tulyena vigrahaḥ (Ibid, 140.63)
with slight difference, this verse occurs also in the Aṣṭīnāraya as
follows : bhayena bhedayaḥ bhūram sāmā mānasākarnām .
Lubdhana arthapradānena sāmā nyāman tathājñāsi (NB.1.139.
50b-51a)
recommends acquisition of wealth with only the first three upāyas. 47

In the context of presenting a longer discourse on the proper time and occasion for waging a war, sage Vāmadeva says that a king should never earn victory with a war. A victory earned with the fighting of an actual battle is said to be the worst. 48

Byhaspati, as quoted by Bhīma, observes: One should not wish to subdue his foes with the help of an armed confrontation. It is rather childish to be angry and to lose forbearance. 49 “One wishing to kill his foe must not put that for on his guard: the king accordingly should conceal his anger within himself; he should wait upon the enemy by making a show of trust, he should speak sweetly to him and never do anything disagreeable to him; he should abstain from empty display of hostility and harsh speech: ‘As a Fowler uttering the cries of birds captures them, so should the king bring his foes under subjection and then kill them.’” 50

Byhaspati among many other things also offers this advice that the king should not attack many enemies simultaneously; he should on the contrary grind them one by one by the application of śama, dhāma, bheda and danda. 51

---

47. varjanīyam sadā yuddhaś rājayakśena dhīnata.  
upāyaṁ tribhir ādānaṁ arthasyaḥ brhaspatih : (MB.XII.89.23)

48. ayuddhenaś vijayaś varthyayod vasudhākishapah.  
jaṅghyaṁ āhur vijayaś yuddhena ca naradhipa : (Ibid,94.1)

49. na jujā kalaheneśaḥ aiyāntum apakārinah,  
vālair āeśvisai hyetad yad samṛpo yad akṣamā : (Ibid,103.7)

50. cf. MB.XII.103.8-11. The translation of these verses is reproduced from KIPI, p. 222.

51. cf. MB.XIII.103.24f.
Denouncing an open armed confrontation which amounts to alerting the enemy ahead of actual action, as observed a little earlier, Vyhaspati observes that 'śama i.e., conciliation cannot be recommended in case the enemy is more powerful. What is recommended in this case is a rahasya danda, i.e., a secret killing or a destruction through deceit as suggested earlier. The king should not be excessively lenient towards the enemy; but a yātrika, i.e., armed aggression, also should not always be reported to, because it involves loss of standing crops, and saṃkarakriya, i.e., poisoning of waters of the tanks and wells, and also a lot of concern over the prakṛtis, i.e., the elements like asātya (i.e., officials), kosa (i.e., treasury), pura (i.e., condition of the fort) and so on.\textsuperscript{52}

Further elaborating the idea of deceitful destruction Vyhaspati recommends that instead of going for an open confrontation the king should apply various types of nāya (i.e., strategem), and upasarmāṇā (i.e., devices like instigation of one of his enemies against another of his enemies) and also pāma (i.e., deceits of other forms) in such a careful way so that his own fame does not get impaired through and revelation of his own involvement, and for this purpose trustworthy persons should be engaged as spies in the forts and the rural areas.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{52} of. na sāmadandopaniṣat prasasyate
na mārdavemi cātraṣa yātrikam eṣadā.
na sāyaghaṇā na ca saṃkarakriyā
na cāpi bhūyaḥ prakṛter vīśeṣamāḥ (Ibid, 40). The purport of this verse is given in the light of Nālakaṇṭha’s commentary.

\textsuperscript{53} nāyāvibhṛṣṭām upasarmāṇān
tathāiva pāpaḥ na yaṣākramayet.
āptair naṃguṣair upasaryayet
paṛṣu nṛṣṭrāṇa ca samprayuktām (Ibid, 41).
4. In a long discourse presented by sage Kālavākyāya to prince Kāsandarāj, reproduced by Bhūṣaṇa, one of the devices for deceitful destruction as follows: The king concerned should first surrender to the powerful enemy and win his confidence as one of the devoted wall watchers. Subsequently, tastefully induce him to launch upon expensive and difficult projects and to indulge in the pleasure of costly parks, and expensive beds and thrones and so on so to reduce his exchequer. The king should induce his enemy to spend more and more for sacrifices and religious donations, and to rely more and more upon destiny so as to lose his own initiative in all affairs. Then finally the enemy should be tempted to perform a visvajit sacrifice, which would relieve him of his whole wealth. At this stage a strong propaganda should be made about the sufferings of the subjects. Then king concerned should engage a fake yogi to advise the enemy to leave the kingdom for relieving the subjects of their suffering, and then should kill the enemy’s elephants, horses and men with deceitful application of poisons and medicinal drugs.

5. Sage Kariya Bhāradvāja also recommends extreme steps to be taken against the enemy. Among other things he says that one should carry his enemy on his shoulders so long as the right time is yet to arrive. But when the right time comes one should destroy the enemy in the manner of breaking an earthen jar striking the same against a stone. A king should

---
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34. Vide NŚ,III,108 and particularly verses 6-23.

35. vahed smritis amandhena yāvat kālaya paryayah
prūptakūlantu vijnaya bhindyād ghatem ivānena : (Ibid, 140,18)
destroy the kingdom of the enemy by killing the latter’s men, by cutting
the roads and by breaking the houses. A king should first win the confi-
dence of his enemy and then strike at the enemy as soon as he is found
to make a mistake.

It may be noted that in the extreme devices suggested by Brhaspati
or Kalakavyughiya or Kañika, the terms like naya and daṇḍopanisat are used
to mean various deceitful expedients; but yet these are not reckoned as
additional upāyas nor these are anywhere named side by side with the four
celebrated upāyas. Thus these devices may perhaps be included within the
purview of either bheda or daṇḍa itself.

6. As against the aforesaid extreme devices it is also recommended
that while facing a very strong adversary a king should assume vaitasi
vṛtti, i.e., the behaviour of the reeds which bend low so long as a strong
current is passing over them and stand erect once again after the onrush
of water ebbs low. The implication is that a king should sometimes be
submitive to a strong opponent so as to become independent later on
after gathering adequate strength.

56. vadhena ca manasayānāi mārgānā ca sānātena ca
   agnīrūpānāi vināsānā ca pararūpānāi vināśayet : (Ibid, 61)
57. visvāsasyītvā tu pari tattvabhūtena hotunā
   athānya praharit kāle kliśsid vicitre pada : (Ibid, 44). The
second half of this verse is common with MB.XII.103.15a.
58. cf. evam eva yada vidvān manyaśeśivalaśi ripam
   samśrayata vāśānā vṛttin etat prajñānalakṣānam : (MB.XII.113.14)
7. In the very first canto of the  

apadharma section of the  

Sūnti-

pārva, Bhīṣma suggests a number of alternative measures to be taken by a  

king in the extremely emergent situation of facing troubles both from within and without. Bhīṣma says that if the aggressor is pure in heart and intent on earning fortune only in righteous ways, then the king who is facing the emergent situation should immediately seek peace with the aggressor and also thus get the territories already occupied by the aggressor released. If the invader happens to be unrighteous, strong and sinful peace should be sought with him by 'practising much self-denial' i.e., by giving away some villages. If necessary, the danger should be avoided by abandoning the capital also. If the vanquished king is really endowed with kingly virtues he should surely be able to regain his lost fortune. If it is possible to remove the danger by sacrificing wealth and the army, the king should not allow himself to be captured. He should try to protect the harem as far as practicable, but never at the cost of his own self. When the ministers become rebellious and the forts and rural areas also face the assault, the king should quickly decide to make peace or to exhibit his prowess. These are the only two alternatives to repulse the invader. The alternative of showing prowess is recommended on the strength of the truth that a king might win the world even with a small army if it happens to consist of loyal, well wishing and contented persons. If he can win the battle he gains the dominion, while on the other hand he dies, he goes to the heaven, the same abode as that of Indra. If it is not at all possible to fight, the weaker king should seek peace and stay away from the fort for some time so as to regain the lost territory at a later time with the help of sound counsel.  
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59. Vide MB.XIII.131
In the face of so many alternatives suggested in the *Sātīparva* it may be gathered as the sum and substance of the whole recommendation of this authoritative text that the choice of the political expedient would always depend on the nature of the exigency. It may be noted here that regarding *upekṣa* which is mentioned in MB.XII.59.35 as the *fifth maṇḍya* there is only one verse in the *Sātīparva* and that runs as follows:

yo nepakartum saketi nepakartum mahāpatih.

na sākyarūpas ceddhartum upakṣyas tadṛśe bhavet: (MB.XIII.69.18)

Purport: The vijigita should assume the policy of indifference (*upekṣa*) towards that king who can neither help nor harm, and also towards one whose lost position is beyond the scope of any recovery.

THE SIX MEASURES OF FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MANUSMṚTI:

Apart from the *upeyās* or political expedients applied as diplomatic measures, a king is required to take some immediate and practical measures in the context of his behaviour towards the foreign powers. These later measures are technically called *guṇas* and since there are six such *guṇas* they are together called *sad-guṇas*. It will, however, be seen that it is not always possible to draw a clear-cut line of demarcation between some of the *upeyās* and some of the *sad-guṇas*.

In the Manusmṛti the six guṇas are named as follows:

1. *sandhi*: This term may mean (1) a truce, or (ii) an act of seeking peace in time of an armed confrontation or (iii) a treaty or alliance between two powers.
2. **viṣṇe**: This term means a war in its broader sense. It is the total state of a declared strained relation with a foreign power.

3. **yāma**: This term means the act of actually marching against the soldiers of the enemy. It is a practical military expedition carried on in the broader context of a war.

4. **śāna**: This term means sitting quiet so far as any martial action against the enemy is concerned.

5. **dvaidhībhāva**: This term literally means dividing the army into two groups. This relates to the broader context of actual military action against the enemy troops. It is actually the strategy of keeping a part of the army, under the command of a general, engaged in action while keeping the other part, under the command of the king himself, in reserve in the fort. It may be noted that while yāma seems to be concerned with the act of aggression, dvaidhībhāva appears to be concerned with the act of defence.

6. **saṁśraya**: This term means seeking protection. This is in fact a sort of alliance but neither with a weaker power nor with an equal, but with a superior power. In other words it is like joining a power block headed by some super power. Perhaps this is how it differs from sandhi, which appears to be an alliance with an equal or with a weaker power.
It is recommended that a king should always give his thought to these six measures and having carefully considered the business in hand he should take resort to any one of these measures.  

All these measures have two varieties each, as shown below:

1. **sandhi**: A sandhi yields present and future advantages. It is of two varieties, viz. (i) that when the king concerned marches together with an ally and (ii) that when the two allies act separately with full understanding.

2. **vigraha**: War is of two kinds, viz., (i) that which is undertaken in season or out of season by a certain king himself for fulfilling his own purposes, and (ii) that which is undertaken to avenge an injury done to an ally.

3. **yiña**: Yiña is of two kinds, viz., (i) that which is undertaken by a certain king when a certain urgent matter certainly arises, and (ii) that which is undertaken jointly with an ally.

---

60. cf. MS.VII.130f.
61. cf. Ibid, 152
62. cf. Ibid, 153
63. cf. Ibid, 154
64. cf. Ibid, 155
4. āsana: Sitting quiet is of two types, viz., (i) that which is resorted to by a king who has gradually been weakened by fate or as a result of his former deeds, and (ii) that which is resorted to in favour of an ally. It may be noted that the former type is resorted to by a king being compelled by his own weakness, which is caused either by his fate or by some unwise deeds done previously in this life. Misdeeds done in the previous births would, however, be covered by the idea of fate itself. 65

5. dvaidhiśhāva: The relevant verse seems to give only an idea of what a dvaidhiśhāva is. Accordingly, if the army takes its stand in one place and the master (i.e., the king with a portion of the army) in another place (i.e., in the fort), in order to affect some purpose, that is called the two-fold division of forces. On the strength of the context and particularly in analogy with the twofold classification of āsana, dvaidhiśhāva also may be presumed to be of two types, viz., (i) one which is resorted to by a king in his own interest and (ii) one which is resorted to by a king in the interest of his ally. 66

65. cf. Ibid, 166
66. cf. Ibid, 167
6. संक्षेपतया: Seeking refuge is of two kinds, viz., (i) one resorted to by a king for attaining an advantage when he is harassed by an enemy, and, (ii) one resorted to by a king for attaining some celebrity among the virtuous. It may be presumed that joining a power block headed by a super power adds to the status and prestige of the king who joins the block.

The time and occasion suitable for taking the various measures are recommended as follows:

A king should take resort to sandhi if he can be sure that because of the present sandhi he would definitely gain superiority in some future time and also in the time present his suffering would be less. When the king thinks all his subjects to be exceedingly contented and that he himself is most exalted in power, then he should wage a war. When he knows his own army to be cheerful in disposition and strong and that of his enemy the reverse, then he may march against his foe. But if he happens to be very weak in chariots and beasts of burden and in troops, then he should carefully take resort to sitting quiet, gradually conciliating his foes. When the king knows the enemy to be stronger in every respect, then he should divide his army and thus achieve his purpose. But when he finds himself to be very easily assailable by the forces of the enemy then he should immediately seek refuge with a righteous powerful king. If that

---

powerful king is really capable of coercing the disloyal elements belonging to the state of the king who seeks refuge and also to check the army of the foe of the king who seeks refuge, then the powerful king should be venerated with all services like a venerable guru. But if that act of taking refuge is also found to cause some evil, the king should, without hesitation, have recourse to a total war.

THE SIX MEASURES OF FOREIGN POLICY IN THE SĀNTIPARVA:

The six measures are known as śād guṇas. These measures together are often referred to by the term śādguṇya also. Bhīṣma in the Sāntiparva observes that the tiger-like man who knows well about śādguṇya may rule over the whole world. Then he names the six measures as follows:

śādguṇyaṁ iti yat prakṣaṇa tannibodha yuddhiḥkṣaṁ.
sundhānāśeṇaṁ ityeva yātreṇ sandhānāṁ eva ca:
vigṛhāṇeṇaṁ ityeva yātreṇ samparīṅhiṣya ca:
dvaidhiḥbhaṁ vastabṛāyeṁ āṇārayaṁ the parasya ca:

with the help of Nīlakanṭha these verses may be found to refer to

sandhi (= sundhānāśeṇam)
śena (= yātreṇ sandhānāṁ)
vigraha (= vigṛhāṇeṇam)
dvaidhiḥbhāva (= yātreṇ samparīṅhiṣya dvaidhiḥbhāvah)
śeṣaṁraja (= anyeṣaṁ parasya ca śeṣaṁrajaḥ)

69. cf. Ibid, 175
70. cf. Ibid, 176. This is comparable with MB.III.131.10, etc.
71. cf. MB.III.69.66
It is difficult to find out as to where the reference to āśana lies. Perhaps the first half of the second verse may be taken to mean (i) viśrṣya, (ii) āsanaṃ samsāryagṛhya and (iii) yātrāṃ samsāryagṛhya ca (avasthānāt). This will give the idea of āśana also.

Bhāṣa offers a piece of advice as follows:

sadgavya-unadośāṇa nityāḥ buddhyāvalokayet. (MB, XII. 57. 16 B)

Purport: The king should always carefully examine the merits and demerits of the six measures of foreign policy. It is a merit of the measure concerned if it is endowed with the prospect of bringing victory, and it is a demerit if the same measure is likely to yield a defeat.

Commenting on this extract Nīlakaṇṭha gives a nice exposition of the nature, and the appropriate occasion for the application of the six measures as follows:

When the sthāyī (i.e., the defending king) is found to be more powerful, the yāni (i.e., the viṣāla or the aggressor or the central figure of the maṇḍala) himself seeks a sandhi (i.e., a treaty). When the sthāyī is found to be of equal strength the yāni wages a war (= viṣāla). When the sthāyī is found to be weak the yāni begins an assault (= yāna) on the former. Judging from the viewpoint of the defending king, if the yāni is found to be more powerful, the sthāyī takes resort to āśana, i.e., protects himself by remaining quiet inside a fort. When the yāni is found to be of equal strength the sthāyī takes resort to dvaidhībāva, i.e., remains inside the fort with one half of the army while engaging the other half of the army in destroying, or obstructing the movement of, paddy, etc. in the enemy kingdom. When the yāni is found to be weak, the
sthāyī would apply the measure called sañcāraya, i.e., would take the help of an ally and fight with the yāṇī. 72

Bhāṣa offers another piece of advice relating to the adoption of the measure called sandhi as follows:

If a king finds himself to be weak, he should have a deliberation with his ministers and then seek peace with the stronger adversary. Even if there is no question of his knowing his own weakness yet a wise king might go for a treaty for the fulfilment of some other purposes. A king engaged in protecting his realm according to the principles of righteousness should seek alliance with such kings who are qualified, highly enthusiastic, pious and honest. 73

In another place Bhāṣa recommends that the king should engage spies for creating dissension among the allies of the enemy and should himself seek alliance with the enemy of the enemy. 74

Coming to the close of the present section on the six measures of foreign policy, it may be noted here that the treatment of the said measures is more elaborate and more systematic in the Manusmṛti than in the Śaṅcāraya.

Moreover, it may also be noted here that there is, in fact, very little difference between āsana as one of the four expedients and sandhi as one of the six measures and between āsana as one of the four expedients

72. Vide Viśākhaṇṭha on MB.XII.39.16 B.
73. cf. MB.XIII.69.14–16.
74. MB.XIII.102.27.
and vīraḥ as one of the six measures. It is indeed difficult to draw a line of demarcation also between vīraḥ (= war) and yāna (= army-expedition). That is why it often becomes difficult to decide whether a certain observation made in the original text should be reproduced in the present study under the context of upāya or śādgya.

THE ROLE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE AMBASSADOR:

On the basis of what is observed immediately above it may be deduced that war and peace occupy the most important positions in the foreign policy of a king both as expedients and as measures. But, as observed in the Manusāhitā, these two most important aspects of the foreign policy depends largely on the role played by the ambassador, who is technically called a dūta. The Manusāhitā contains the following recommendations with regard to this very important functionary of a state:

A. REGARDING THE ROLE:

anāye daṇḍa āyatte daṇḍa vaimukti kriyā .

nṛpatu kosa-rāṣṭre ca duṭe sandhi-viparyayam : (WS.VII.65)

Purport: The army depends on the minister concerned, the proper control of the subjects depends on the army, the exchequer and the administration of the realm depend on the king, and peace and its reverse (i.e., war) depend on the ambassador.

This verse speaks of the part that an ambassador may play in establishing peace and prosperity, or in bringing prosperity by way of advising about the right time for a fruitful aggression. The ambassador is also the right man to advise when it is more profitable to avoid a confrontation.
In the first section of this chapter, with reference to MS.VII.208 it has been observed that it is most profitable for a king to gain an ally. From this angle of view also the role of the ambassador assumes great importance when it is recommended as follows:

\[ \text{duta eva hi sandhate bhinnatyeva sa sahhatan.} \]
\[ \text{dutas tat kurute karma bhindiante yena mānavah.} \] (MS.VII.66)

**Purport:** The ambassador alone makes two kings allies and separates allies. The ambassador transacts that business by which men are disunited.

It may be noted that in the interest of his own master the ambassador may bring forth a fruitful alliance between his master and another king. Again in the interest of his own master the ambassador may sow the seeds of dissension/two or more kings other than his own master.

As to the manner of the functioning of the ambassador it is recommended as follows:

\[ \text{sa vidyād asya kṛtyeva nibhāṇeitaṃ nibhāṇeitaṃ.} \]
\[ \text{ākāraṁ ēṅgatān caṣṭāṁ bhṛtyeṇu es ekāraṃ} \] (MS.VII.87)

**Purport:** While suppressing all significant gestures and actions on his own part the data should read the expressions of the countenance, gestures and efforts of the foreign king towards his own associates as well as the action intended to be taken in respect of his own servant.

---

75. The clause nibhāṇeitaṃ nibhāṇeitaṁ is interpreted here in the light of the commentators Govindarāja and Mandana quoted by Ashokamath śaastri, Vide **Manusmṛti**, ch. VII. p. 84.
The ambassador is expected to do as above in order to find out such people in the enemy's kingdom who have reason to be dissatisfied because of an unfavourable disposition of the king towards them, so that such persons could be won over to work in the interest of his own master.

With reference to a further duty of the ambassador it is again recommended as follows:

*buddhva tu sarvam tattvam pararjasikirsitam.*

*tatha prayatanasti stisthed yathathmanam na pidayet* : (MS.VII.48)

**Purport**: The ambassador should gather the most accurate intelligence regarding the designs of the enemy's king and inform his own master accordingly, who, on his own part, after receiving this information, should adopt such measures so that he does not bring any evil on himself.

B. REGARDING QUALIFICATIONS:

With regard to the desirable qualifications of the ambassador the following recommendations are made in the *Kausikidhāra*:

*dūtas eavam prakurvita sarvasāstравiśāradena.*

*ingitākaraṇaseṣṭajnaś saśī daksina kulodgataḥ* : (MS.VII.49)

**Purport**: The king should appoint an ambassador who is versed in all the sāstras (i.e., sciences), who understands hints given with beckonings, expressions of the face and gestures, who is honest and skillful and who hails from a noble family.

*amraktaḥ suśīr daksina vartimaṃ desakālavita,*

*vapūnaṃ vitabhīr vāgai dūto rajah prasanyate* : (MS.VII.44)
Purport: The most desirably qualified ambassador would possess the following qualities. He would be loyal, honest, skilful, endowed with a good memory, he would be able to know the proper place and time for action, and he would be handsome, fearless and eloquent.

It may be noted here that although in all the relevant verses there is reference to only one ambassador, yet, it may perhaps be presumed that the singular number is employed only as a matter of style and in fact there could be as many ambassadors as required by the extent of the foreign relations of the king concerned.

In the Sautiparva much less space is devoted to the treatment of the concept of the dūta. In two verses it is observed that under no circumstance, not even in an emergent situation a king should kill a dūta. The king who kills a dūta goes to the hell along with his ministers. If a king, who is supposed to follow the proper duties (= dharma) laid down for the kṣatriyas, kills a dūta who speaks the truth then the father of the king earns the sin of killing a child in the womb. In a third verse it is laid down that the dūta should possess seven desirable qualities. The concerned verse runs as follows:

\[
\text{ku} \text{lv} \text{na} \text{h kula} \text{sa} \text{mpanno vā} \text{ma} \text{a} \text{ka} \text{ṣa} \text{ḥ priyavad} \text{a} \text{ḥ .}
\]
\[
y\text{สถ} \text{tavādī sau} \text{tima} \text{n dū} \text{ṭa} \text{ḥ sva} \text{t saptabhirga} \text{n} \text{a} \text{ḥ : (MB.III.85.26)}
\]

Purport: A dūta should possess seven qualities as follows: (i) he should hail from a noble family, (ii) he should have a large family, (iii) he should be eloquent, (iv) skilful, (v) sweet-tongued, (vi) straight forward and (vii) endowed with a good memory.

76. cf. MB.III.85.26f.
It may be noted that four of the qualities are common to both the lists as found in the Manusamhitā and the Aṣṭāngahṛdaya and they are named under numbers i, iii, iv and vii of the above list.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE SPIES IN THE MANUSAMHITĀ:

It is already seen that the ambassador is required to do a lot of espionage in the foreign country concerned. But on this score the ambassador need not be confused with the spies who are called by different technical terms like gara, garā, and prāḍīkā. The spies act as secret informers as well as secret agents for doing things in favour of the king or the administration. The ambassador also does these things, but the difference of the ambassador is that he is an accredited officer who remains exposed while the spies all along remain incognito.

In the Manusamhitā the following recommendations are made with regard to the spies referred to with various designations:

1. The king should deliberate either alone or with his ministers, among other things, on sending of ambassadors (= dūtasampratam), the doings of his own spies (= prāḍīkānām caśītām) and (the affairs of) the five classes of secret agents (= pāñcaavargam). 77

The Manusamhitā does not present any detailed account of the five types of the secret agents. Kullūka, however, gives a detailed account of their disguises and method of work. The five classes are named kāpatika,

77. of MS.VII.153f.
udāsthīta, grhapati, vaidehika and tēpasavayājana. 78

2. The sāras or secret informers should regularly collect information with regard to the strength, gained, by the king concerned as well as by the enemy king, through the process of encouraging the army and with constructive works like capturing of elephants and construction of roads, and also with regard to the epidemics and other calamities occurring in the own country or in the country of the enemy. 79

3. The king should properly know about the behaviour of all the officers engaged in rāstragupti (i.e., civil administration of the towns and rural areas) through his spies (= sāras). 80

4. Spies putting on various disguises should be engaged to entrap the antisocial elements, 81 and for the eradication of theft the spies should be placed in places like brothels, drinking dens and old parks. 82

5. Before setting out in a military expedition against the enemy capital, the king should, among other things, duly despatch his spies (= sāras) for gathering intelligence with regard to the state of affairs in the enemy kingdom. 83

78. Vīde Kullūka on VII.154
79. cf. MS.IX.298f.
80. cf. MS.VII.122
81. cf. MS.IX.261
82. cf. Ibid. 264-266
83. cf. MS.VII.184f and Kullūka thereon.
6. Every day, having performed his evening prayers, and being well-armed, the king should hear in an inner apartment the doings of those who make secret reports (vahasvāthvāvināś) and his spies (praṇīdheś). Thus the king is advised to keep a direct contact with a team of secret informers and secret agents. It is suggested in a figurative way that like the wind entering into the body of every being, the king also should have access to the affairs of every one through the medium of his spies (śārāṇa) and should thus behave like god Viṣṇu (vāyu).

7. A praṇīdi or a secret agent may sometimes be engaged also by the law court. When a trustee does not acknowledge the possession of the trust the judge concerned should engage a secret agent to deposit something else with the trustee and then ask for the return of the same at a later time. If in this case also he denies the possession, he may be decided to be guilty with regard to the earlier case. Otherwise he should be acquitted.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE SPIES IN THE BANTIPARVA:

1. Bāhūma refers to sāras and praṇīdhis as two of the several instruments to be employed by a king for the protection of his realm.

---

84. cf. MS.VII.229
85. cf. MS.IX.306
86. cf. MS.VIII.191-193
87. MB.III.58.5A
Under this reference Nilakantha suggests a difference between a sāra and a prāṇidhi by saying that the former is a 'secret spy' while the latter is an 'open spy', cf. "sāro guptaspasah prāṇidhiḥ prakata-spasah". But since both are spies, what the commentator seems to say is perhaps that the sāra assumes a disguise while the prāṇidhi remains as an ordinary citizen without concealing his actual identity. But it is a pity that Nilakantha himself seems to fail to maintain consistency in respect of this distinction as it will be seen by and by.

3. Bhīṣma observes that a king who engages a spy (= sāraḥ) is always praised. In this context also Nilakantha explains the term sāraḥ as a secret spy: prakata-spasah. In the same context Bhīṣma also says that a king, whose spies and counsellors remain unknown to the enemy deserves to be the ruler of the kingdom.

3. As some of the contents of the treatise on daṇḍamāni composed by Brahmā, Bhīṣma mentions 'a sāra who assumes different disguises' (= sārasya vividhopayah) and prāṇidhis of different types (= prāṇidheyaḥ prthakviddhah). In this context Nilakantha supplies the following gloss:

"bhedaśānyakṣayetān am api rakaṣa kartavyā tadarthai prāṇidhir guptas
sāraḥ se ca sāro vividhopayah brahmaśāryādiveśadhari prāṇidheyaḥ prthak-
viddhah ekakṣamīn etatme prthak prthak vesāh trayaḥ traya iti."

88. Nilakantha on above.
89. MB.II.37.17
90. Ibid., 89
91. MB.III.59.34
Purport: The officials may be bribed and won ever by the enemy side. So the officials should also be properly guarded. For this purpose āras (i.e., secret agents) assuming various guises like that of a brahmastāri, and in every place three different prāṇidhāyas assuming different guises, should be engaged.

Here Hilakanṭha makes the confusion worse confounded by explaining the prāṇidhā also as a gupta āras and by referring to different guises also of the prāṇidhā.

4. In another canto, presenting the longest discourse on spies, Bāṇaṇa offers the following advice:

Persons, whose integrity has been duly tested, who are wise and capable of withstanding hunger and thirst, should be engaged as prāṇidhās. They should assume the forms of idiots, blind men and deaf men. They should be carefully placed by the side of officials, various types of friends, and of the princes. They should be engaged in the cities and the rural areas and near the vassals, in such a way so that one prāṇidhā may not know about the presence of the other. The king should also know about the spies engaged by his own enemy who move about in the market places, hermits' dens, meetings, gatherings of mendicants, parks, gardens, assemblies of scholars, mines, smaller courts, royal courts, and the residences of the richer persons. A king should intelligent enough to detect the āras engaged by the foe. It is beneficial to have a prior knowledge about the foreign spies. 92

92. Ibid, 69.3-12.
5. In another canto Bhīṣma again advises as follows:

The king should begin his activities only after knowing fully well about his internal and external enemies, the state of affairs in the metropolis and the rural areas through the spies. The king himself should supervise particularly the spies, the counsels, the treasury and the army, because all other matters depend on these. Information about all the affairs of the indifferent foreign powers, enemies and allies in respect of the metropolis and the rural areas, should be gathered through the spies. 93

6. With reference to another important function of the spies Bhīṣma recommends as follows:

The king should engage trusted secret spies to gather information every day as to whether the deeds performed by the king in the previous day are appreciated by the public or not, whether his personal conduct is appreciated by the public or not, whether in the rural areas and in the whole realm people are delighted or not to see that the king is gaining fame. 94

7. In another place, while explaining the reason as to why the king is superior to other men, Bhīṣma observes that the king remain unvulnerable to all others because of seeing everything secretly through the spies. 95

8. It is further recommended that spies should be engaged to sow the seeds of dissension among the allies of the enemy. 96

94. cf. Ibid, 39.15f.
95. cf. nādhārṣayet tathā kacī cāravīśpaṇḍādaśānañat : (Ibid, 59.129f).
96. cf. āntarānāca bhedārtham caram abhyavacārayet. (Ibid, 102.174)
9. Kaśika Bhāradvāja also advises that the king should remain duly informed about the spies engaged by the enemies against himself. His own spy should ever remain unknown both in his own realm as well as in the foreign country. Spies should be sent to foreign countries in the guise of heretics and mendicants and the like. 97

THE IMPORTANCE OF FOLLOWING A POLICY OF DISTRUST:

Because of the urgency of remaining ever alert against all possible harms that might be done particularly by the foreign powers through the maneuverings of their secret agents the Saṁhitā repeatedly advises the kings to follow a policy of distrust with the following words:

1. na visvāsōca kṛpatir na eṣṭyarthāṁ visvaḥ. (MB.XII.371.16a)

Purport: A king should not trust those who are not trustworthy and should not have full trust even on those who are trustworthy.

2. na visvāso adiviṣaste visvaṁ nāti visvaḥ.
   visvāśad bhayaṁ uppannam api mālaiṁ krutati. (MB.XIII.138.144)

Purport: (The first half has the same meaning as what is given under No. 1 above). The second half means: The danger caused by trusting cuts up even the very roots of the king.

This verse occurs also as MB.V.36.9 and MB.XII.130.29. Particularly the first half of this verse occurs in several places, e.g., as XIII.138.144a, XIII.120.194b, XII.140.43a besides the three places already mentioned above.

97. Ibid, 140.39B-40.
8. that balavān bhūtvā durbale visvāsat kvaicit. (MB.III.63.37a)

Purport: Even if a king happens to be more powerful yet he should not trust even when happens to be less powerful.

puratvāpi hi rājendra visvāso na prasayate
stacohāstrārthatattvāntu nayābhāsānāta tāvānagha.

avisvāso narendrasya gukṣā paraṃ parayate: (Icid.85.38f).

Purport: A king should take steps to make others believe him, but he himself should trust none. It is not desirable even to trust the sons. This is the essence of the śāstras. Distrust is the greatest secret (of success) for the kings.

THE IMPORTANCE OF KEEPING SECRETS:

In the context of foreign affairs it is repeatedly advised to keep the own weakness a complete secret while trying one’s best to know the weak points of the enemy in the following words:

1. In the Mānasāhīta there occurs the verse:

naśya chidrā pari vidyād vidyāchidrā parasaya tu

gūhet kūna ivasyāni rakṣed vivrāno ātmadh: (MS.VII.103)

Purport: A king’s enemy must not know his weaknesses, but he must know the weaknesses of his enemy. Like the tortoise which hides its limbs (= aśīṃi) within his own body, the king also should protect the elements (= aśīṃi) like mānyā (= officials) and others from the influence of foreign powers. By all means he should keep his own weak points a secret.
2. This verse occurs also as MB.III.140.84 with nāśya chidraś pariḥ reading as nāśmacheśhadeśi ripah.

3. The Suntiparva also contains the following verse:

nāśya chidraś pariḥ pasyecśhadeśi pariḥ anuvijahā
guṇot kūrma śvāṅgäṇi rakṣed vivaraṇa śtanakah (Ibid,83.49)

The purport is almost the same as in the verse quoted from the Manuśāhitā under No. 1 above. The second foot means that the king should march against the enemy when he is found to have weaknesses.

4. The Suntiparva also presents the following verse:

apramatto bhaved rājā chidradarsi paratmanah
nāśya chidraś pariḥ pasyecaśhadeśi pariḥ anuvijahā (Ibid,91.55)

Purport: A king should remain ever alert. He should try to find out his own weaknesses as well as those of the enemy. He must not allow the enemy to know his own weakness. But he should first know the weakness of the enemy and then march against him.

THE IDEAL BEHAVIOUR WITH REGARD TO FOREIGN AFFAIRS:

In the Manuśāhitā there occurs the following verse recommending what may be called the ideal behaviour of a king with regard to his foreign affairs.

vakavas sintayed arthāṁ niśavacca parākramat
vykavacceśvalampeta niśavacca viniśputet (MS.VII.106)

---

98. This verse also occurs as MS.I.139.8 reading cīraudraṃ for chidraṃ.
Purport: The king should plan his undertakings patiently meditating like a heron. As he is expected as a vigil to look for amazing the well-guarded territories of the enemy the king should patiently wait for the most opportune moment. As suggested in the earlier sections the king should wait and observe till he can know some weakness of the enemy. As soon as he discovers the weak points of the enemy he should strike. In this respect the king would resemble the heron who waits with sustained patience to catch a fish when the proper chance comes.

Like a lion, the king should show his valour. Even being smaller in size the lion challenges the much larger elephant with courage and self-confidence. The king also, like the lion, should have the initiative to undertake the acts of aggression or to defend himself with utmost courage valour if there is any occasion to do so.

Like a wolf the king also should snatch away his prey. The wolf is intelligent enough to snatch away even a well-guarded animal taking advantage of the slightest unmindfulness of the guard. Like-wise an ideal king also should seize upon an enemy in an unguarded moment even though the enemy happens to remain inside a fort.

If there is any occasion to retreat the king should jump out of the danger like a hare. A hare, even after being captured and kept under guard often deludes the guards and runs away very fast with deluding steps. Similarly when a king finds himself in an uncomfortable position being attacked by a number of powerful adversaries, he should be as quick and elusive as the hare to avoid the impending danger so as to run away to seek shelter with a more powerful king. Whether he should take recourse...
to retreat at all or not will be discussed in the next chapter.

The said verse occurs also in the Śāntiparva in the discourse presented by sage Kaṭṭha Bhārādvāja as MB.XII.140.25 with the last foot reading saevacca vinispacet. This reading gives the meaning that the king "should jump upon others like an arrow." But since in all the three earlier feet the analogy is drawn with either an animal or a bird, in the last foot also it is most likely to draw an analogy with an animal or a bird. Hence in the Śāntiparva also the intended reading should perhaps be 'saevacca vinispacet'. In such a case the principle advocated by the Śāntiparva also would be found to be exactly same as one advocated by the Maṇḍakini.