

ISSN 2322-0686

POLITICO

Volume—5
Number—2

2016

**Published & Distributed by
K.K. Publications**

4806/24 Bharat Ram Road, Darya Ganj,
New Delhi—110002.

Ph. 011-23285167, E-mail: info@kkpublications.com

**Published in association with Society for Social Empowerment, New Delhi*

Politico

Editorial Board

Editor

Sudhir Singh

University of Delhi.

Associate Editors

Amulya K. Tripathy

Berhampur University

Orrisa

A.G. Naidu

Formerly Tirupati Devsathnam University

Andhra Pradesh

Ruchi Ramesh

Himachal Pradesh University

Suresh R

University of Kerala

S.Utham Kumar Jamadhagni

University of Madras

Price:

India

Individual ₹ 200.00

Institutional ₹ 300.00

Abroad

Individual \$ 10.00

Institutional \$ 15.00

Advisory Board

Prof. J.S. Rajput

Former Director, NCERT
New Delhi

Ambassador N.N. Jha

Former Lieutenant Governor
Andman & Nicobar

Prof. RFI Smith

Adjunct Senior Research Fellow,
Monash University, Melbourne,
Adjunct Professor School of
Management, RMIT University
Melbourne, Australia

Prof. Smirti Kumar Sarkar

Former Vice Chancellor
Burdwan University, West Bengal.

Prof. Sushila Bhan

Former, Member Secretary
Indian Council of Social Science
Research, New Delhi.

Prof. N.K. Jha

Dean, School of Politics & Inter-
national Relations Pondicherry
Central University.

Prof. Darvesh Gopal

Dean, School of Social Science
IGNOU, New Delhi

Prof. S.N. Choudhary

Director, Rajiv Gandhi Centre for
Contemporary Studies,
Barraktullah University, Bhopal.

Prof. S.N. Singh

Dean, School of Social Sciences,
Central University of South Bihar,
Gaya.

Prof. Tridiv Chakravorty

Department of International Studies
Yadavpur University, Kolkata
West Bengal

Politico is a peer reviewed Journal published biannually by Society for Social Empowerment, New Delhi. It is devoted to research on social, cultural, economic, political, security, foreign policy, governance and contemporary issues. The Journal welcomes research papers, review articles, research notes, comment and book reviews on topics which broadly come under the gamut of issues mentioned above. For contribution kindly read guidelines for contributors. Manuscripts, subscriptions and other correspondence should be addressed to:

The Editor

Society for Social Empowerment

Plot No-148, 2nd Floor, Pocket-18

Sector-24, Rohini, Delhi-110085.

Email:socialempowerment@yahoo.co.in

Phones : 9810947348, 011-27046784

Published & Distributed by:

K.K. Publications

4806/24, Bharat Ram Road,

Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.

Email:info@kkpublications.com

Phones : 011-23218567

Guidelines for Contributors

- Scholarly articles and reviews are invited for publication in the following format:
- A print as well as an electronic (through email) copy of article/review may be submitted to Dr. Sudhir Singh, Editor.
- Word limit for articles: 3500-5500 words (max.) and key words should be included along with the article.
- British spelling should be used throughout.
- Institutional affiliation and designation with complete contact address, including email address must be provided along with the soft copies of the submission.
- References should be cited within the text in parenthesis by giving the author's last name, the year of publication and page number. Eg. (Easton 1999: 37)
- Notes should be numbered serially and presented at the end of the article, but before bibliography.
- Use double inverted commas for quotations and single inverted

commas for quotations within quotations. Indent quotations of more than four lines, without quotation marks. Abbreviations, acronyms, etc may please be expanded at first use.

Works cited may have the following details:

- a) **Books:** Surname, initials/first name (year of publication), *title of the book*, place of publication, publisher, page number/s. Eg. Mahbubani, Kishore (2013), *The Great Convergence: Asia, the West and the Logic of One World*, New York, Public Affairs, p.123.
- b) **Essay in a collection:** Surname, initials/first name (year of publication), "title of the article," editor's name, *title of the book*, place of publication, publisher, page number/s. Eg. Haider, Ejaz (2014,) "Counterinsurgency: The Myth of Sisyphus", Yusuf, Moeed (Ed.), *Pakistan's Counterterrorism Challenge*, Foundation Books, Washington, p.63.
- c) **Journals:** Surname, initials/first name (year of publication) "title of the article", *name of the journal*, year, volume. Number: page number/s. Eg. Choudhury, Soumyabrata (2012), "Caste and Debt: The Case of Ancient Greek Liturgies," *Journal of Polity and Society*, IV. 2: p.7.
- d) **Article in a periodical/newspaper:** Surname, initials/first name (day month year), "title of the article," *title of the source*; page number/s. Eg. Lakshman, Narayan (19 July 2014), "Parsing America's Modi Baggage," *The Hindu*, p. 8.
- e) **Websites:** Surname, initials/first name (date of posting/revision), "title of the article," name of the website, name of institution/organization affiliated with site, date of access <electronic address>. Eg. Cook, William A. (18 July 2014), "The Dementedness Destroying Israel," *countercurrents.org*, 19 July 2014, <http://www.countercurrents.org/cook180714.htm>

For more information: Contact editor: Dr Sudhir Singh, New Delhi.

Subscription Rates

The Subscription of the Journal may be sent through e transfer/demand draft drawn in Favour of the K.K. Publications, New Delhi.

Details for Electronic transfer

1. Name and address of the Beneficiary; KK Publications, New Delhi.
2. Account Number of Beneficiary; 0117002101002247.
3. Account Classification (CA/CC-11 or 29) & SB-10 as per Cheque leaf

4. Name & Address of the Bank Branch (where payments are to be sent by Institutes) Punjab National Bank, DMA House, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.
5. Branch Name / Code; Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.
6. The 9 Digit MICR code of the Branch; 110024010
7. IFSC Code of the Bank Branch for RTGS Mode PUNB0011700
8. IFSC Code of the Bank Branch for NEFT Mode
9. E mail ID of Beneficiary; kkpdevinder@vsnl.net
10. Any other particulars (to be advised by Beneficiary for the E-payments Purposes)
11. PERMANET ACCCOUNT NUMBER (PAN); AAHFK0096M

The views expressed in all the contributions which appear in the Journal are those of individuals and scholars and are not to be taken representing the views of the editor or of the Society.

Politico

Subscription Form

Subscription for:

		Individual		Institution
1 Year	<input type="checkbox"/>	₹ 400.00	<input type="checkbox"/>	₹ 600.00
2 Year	<input type="checkbox"/>	₹ 700.00	<input type="checkbox"/>	₹ 1100.00
3 Year	<input type="checkbox"/>	₹ 1000.00	<input type="checkbox"/>	₹ 1500.00

Mode of Payment: Cash/Chaque/DD: _____

Cheque/DD

No.: _____ Dated: _____ Amount: _____ in favour
of K.K. Publications, New Delhi payable at New Delhi.

Signature

Please enter full detail in CAPITALS:

Title: _____ First Name: _____ Surname: _____

Address: _____

State: _____ Country: _____ Pin: _____

Telephone: _____ Moblie: _____

E-mail: _____

Send your subscription to:

M/S K.K. Publications

4806/24, Bharat Ram Road,

Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002

Phone: 011-23285167 / E-mail: info@kkpublications.com

Contents

Preface	xi
Sudhir Singh	
Kautilya's Relevance for India's Foreign Policy	17
Alok Kumar Gupta	
Influence of Kautilya on Modi's Foreign Policy : Indo-US Relation	29
Amulya Tripathi & Roshini Kujur	
Russia-China Relations and Its Implications for India: A Kautilyan Perspective	43
Deepak Yadav	
India's Conflict-Cooperation Spectrum in The Indian Ocean through The Kautilyan Prism	61
C.S. Anuradha	
Realism in Kautilya: influence on Indian strategic thinking	71
Nirmal Jindal	
Contemporary Relevance of Kautilya's Mandala Theory and Concept of Diplomacy	81
Tridib Chakraborti	
How the PM Governs: Directions and Issues in The Modi Government	117
RFI Smith and Sharif As-Saber	
Kautilya and Women Emancipation in Contemporary India	143
Shweta Singh	

List of Contributors

Dr. Alok Gupta is Associate Professor, Central University of Bihar, Gaya, Bihar.

Dr. Amulya Tripathi is Associate Professor, Behrampur University, Odisha.

Dr. C.S. Anuradha is a Post Doctoral Fellow at the Dept of Politics and Public Administration, University of Madras

Dr. Deepak Yadav is Assistant Professor, Kalindi College, University of Delhi, New Delhi.

Dr. Nirmal Jindal is Associate Professor, Satyawati College, University of Delhi, New Delhi.

Dr. Roshni Kujur is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Sambalpur University, Jyoti Vihar, Burla, Sambalpur, Odisha.

RFI Smith and Sharif As-Saber, School of Management ,RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

Dr. Shweta Singh is Assistant Professor, Dyal Singh College, University of Delhi, New Delhi.

Prof. Tridib Chakraborti is Professor, Yadavpur University, Kolkata.

Preface

Kautilya was the minister in the Kingdom of Chandragupta Maurya during 317 – 293 B.C. He has been considered as one of the shrewdest ministers of the times and has explained his views on State, War, Social Structures, Diplomacy, Ethics, Politics and Statecraft very clearly in his book called *Arthashastra*.¹ The Mauryan Empire was larger than the later British India which expanded from the Indian Ocean to Himalayas and upto to Iran in the West. After Alexander left India, this was the most powerful kingdom in India and Kautilya was minister who advised the King. Before Kautilya there were other philosophers in India who composed the Shastras but his work was robust and encompassed all the treaties written earlier. I considered Kautilya for three reasons. Firstly, I wanted to highlight the patterns of thinking in the East which was present long before Machiavelli wrote his “*Prince*”. Secondly Kautilya’s ideologies on state, statecraft and ethics are realistic and vastly applicable in contemporary global system. Thirdly, I feel Kautilya’s work on diplomacy is greatly underrepresented in the western world and even in India and it is quite apt to analyze his work in that area.

The Arthashastra lost for around 2000 years when it was found in Mysore in 1904. It shot into the limelight with a Sanskrit manuscript was translated into English by Dr. R. Shamasastri in 1915. Kautilya’s work, which in English translation is about 200,000 words long, covers a wide field and not all of it would today be of interest to students of politics. Key parts contain detailed provisions of civil and criminal law, or recommendations on military tactics or the use of magic. Others discuss the duties of various government officials, and as such are valuable as sources of information about the details of life in that period. On the other hand, the Arthashastra does not concern itself with questions of political philosophy and morality (what is the state, the nature of political obligation) which have been the favourite topics of much of the more contemporary academic discussion of politics. Only

about one-quarter of it deals with matters properly a part of International Relations. These parts, nevertheless (chiefly Books I, VI-IX, XII-XIII) still arouse interests of students and scholars around the world even today.²

If we compare statesman on the four dimension framework of: War & Peace, Human Rights, International Economic Justice and World Order Kautilya had a strong opinion on all the four aspects. In fact people like Bismark and Woodrow Wilson in recent history had been able to demonstrate their views only on two of the four dimensions. Kautilya's 1 *Kautilya's definition of Arthashastra is as follows: Artha means the science which explains the means of acquiring and maintaining wealth and Shastra means the ways to protect this wealth and territory hence in total Arthashastra means the science of Polity Shastras – Way of Life for an individual and a state work is primarily a book of political realism where State is paramount and King shall carry out duties as advised in his book to preserve his state. Kautilya's work is so deep rooted in realism that he goes to describe the glory and brutal means a King must adopt to be in power. This could have been one reason why Ashoka, the grandson of Chandragupta Maurya whom Kautilya advised renounced violence and war thus taking the path of Dharma or Morals. The Mauryan Empire established by Chandragupta and continued by his son Bindusara (c. 293–268 B.C.E.)—whom Kautilya also advised—and by his grandson Ashoka (c. 268–232 B.C.E.) was, and still is, astonishing. With a population of about fifty million people, the Mauryan Empire was larger than the Mughal Empire two thousand years later and even larger than the British Empire in India, extending in fact all the way to the border of Persia and from Afghanistan to Bengal.*³

Many Indian historians are proud to embrace Kautilya's *Arthas'-astra* as a practical book of rugged political realism—instead of the impotent idealism of, say, Plato—that actually shaped history. D. D.

Kosambi notes, "The Greeks make excellent reading; the Indian treatise (*Artha's-astra*) worked infinitely better in practice for its own time and place."⁴ Ram Sharan Sharma maintains, "Kautilya furnishes us as full and complete [a] definition of the state as was possible in ancient times. The Greek thinkers hardly discuss the constituent elements of the state."⁵

Kautilya was a proponent of a welfare state but definitely encouraged war for preserving the power of the state. He thought that the possession of power and happiness in a state makes a king superior hence a king should always strive to augment his power. This actually coincides with the Weber's view that there is no moral in international politics which means that states must be at war all the times. Kautilya though did not state this explicitly but we can infer that he did presume to be at war is natural for a state. On the

other hand he like Thomas Hobbes believed the goal of science was power. He said that, "*Power is strength and strength changes the minds*"⁶, hence he used power as a tool to control his society as well as his enemies. He also believed that it is the King's duty to seek material gain, spiritual good and pleasures. In this he clearly comes out as a realist and does believe in ethics of responsibility.⁷ Kautilya thinks that for a King to attain these three goals must create wealth, have armies and should conquer the kingdoms and enlarge the size of his state. This is quite interesting because he in a way does believe that a state's superiority is in its military and economic might which is what later philosophers and rulers have followed.

In the case of war, Kautilya and Machiavelli have the same reasoning where they advocate the King to be closely involved in the science of war. Kautilya advocated three types of war: Open war, Concealed war and the Silent War.⁸ Open war he describes as the war fought between states, concealed war as one which is similar to guerilla war and Silent war which is fought on a continued basis inside the kingdom so that the power of the King does not get diluted. In his opinion open warfare in any form was righteous. In open warfare he believed that State is one up on over morals and no morals can stop the State from fighting an open war. He believed that there were three types of kings who go into warfare and it is important to understand the distinction between the types of kings and the appropriate warfare strategy to be selected. Firstly, he thought there was a righteous conqueror who can believes in power of the state. This is where the open warfare needs to be fought and the righteous king treats the lost king with dignity.

Secondly there is a greedy king who fights war for material wealth in which case along with power state's resources are lost and hence to prevent such a war, one should use a tactical and concealed war. Thirdly

he thought there were always demoniacal kings who wanted to plunder and here one must use silent wars.

Pliny—borrowing from Megasthenes, the ambassador of Seleucus to Chandragupta—wrote that Chandragupta’s army totaled about six hundred thousand infantry, thirty thousand cavalry, eight thousand

chariots, and nine thousand elephants.⁹ Chandragupta’s capital was Pataliputra (near modern Patna in northeast India, just below Nepal), which he apparently seized from the Nandas sometime between 324 and 322 B.C.E. Pataliputra was probably the largest city in the world at that time, a city eight miles long and a mile and one-half wide, with 570 towers and sixty-four gates, all surrounded by a moat six hundred feet wide and forty-five feet deep. Also protecting the city were wooden walls—stone was very scarce—with slits to be used by archers.¹⁰ Pataliputra “was about twice as large as Rome under Emperor Marcus Aurelius.”¹¹

Contemporary world is full of democratic societies and reaming non democratic societies are seeking democracy as the way of governance. Kautilya was the maiden thinker who shifted monarch accountability from the god to the people. He stated that happiness of the people is the happiness of the king. It is pertinent to mention here that monarchy believed that king is the representative of the god on the planet therefore he is accountable for the god only. It also believed that it has no accountability for the people. We must remember that he was the Prime Minister under a monarch and therefore he took unparallel risk to divert the accountability of the king from the god to the people. In contemporary global society, democracy has already been accepted as a way of governance and non democratic countries are even also claiming that they are democratic. But during Kautilya time it was a not even a remote possibility. In this prevailing situation he gave much importance to the people and laid the foundation of modern democracy. Today Western Europe and United States of America kept claiming that they are the pioneer of modern democracies but during Kautilya time contemporary Greece was also ruled by monarch and one may find it tough to locate any contemporary writers who used their pen for the right of the common people. Few hundred years after Kautilya departure from the planet, one may find one of the earliest democracies in Vaishali, which was not far away from Kautilyan seat of power. This transition from monarchy to people is a unique thing

for the contemporary globe and it has promoted American scholar, Roger Boesche to declare that Kautilya was the founder of 'Socialist Monarchy'.¹² Unfortunately a tiny number of Indian historian has only given due importance to Kautilya. It is basically due to the fact that he was deliberately connected with the rightist school of thought and therefore never remains the favorite for the so called progressive regimes and elements of the country.

After the end of the cold war, with the sustainable rise of India on both economic and strategic front, Kautilya became locus of research in western world but due to political vendetta he still remains in the periphery of Indian academic world. It does not reduce his relevance for the contemporary world. He still remains relevant in all important walks of life despite the fact that he wrote his seminal 'Arthashastra' two and half millennia ago. His views are relevant for almost all contemporary issues. Of course, with the passage of time, some modifications are required to cope up the modern challenges.

Kautilya still remains an icon of Indian thought and in other words for the student of international relations one of the earliest strategic thinker. When Europe was passing through the darkness, he gave new twists to the importance of common man and established that private morality is extremely important for the ruling elite but at the same vein differentiated private morality from public morality. From foreign policy to local governance, his ideas are extremely relevant even in contemporary globe.

According to Samuel P. Huntington, in 1750, India had 22% of the global GDP. Today India possesses roughly 8% of global GDP. In the financial year of 2015-16, India has superseded China in terms of rate of annual growth with 3% and slated to sustain the tempo in foreseeable future. It has occurred first time after the adoption of LPG process by China in 1978 and by India in 1991. According to Goldman Saches if things will be stable, India is all set to achieve its prominence with 23% of global GDP by 2043. We are aware about the fact that still we have over 200 million people, who live below the poverty line. For a stable society, we have to narrow down this existing gap. For that India has to reformulate its policies. Kautilya's thoughts are extremely relevant for making India as one of the important global power.

The papers included in this issue are intended to highlight gamut of relevance of his thought in contemporary world.

REFERENCES

- 1 Kautilya's definition of **Arthshastra** is as follows: **Artha** means the science which explains the means of acquiring and maintaining wealth and Shastra means the ways to protect this wealth and territory hence in total **Arthashastra** means the science of Polity.
- 2 George Modelski, *Kautilya: Foreign Policy and International System in the Ancient Hindu World*, The American Political Science Review, Vol. LVIII, September 1964, P-555.
- 3 Wolpert, *A New History of India*, 59; Mookerji, *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times*, 2; Bhattacharjee, *History of Ancient India*, 173.
- 4 D. D. Kosambi, *The Culture and Civilisation of Ancient India* (Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1994 [1964]), 141.
- 5 Ram Sharan Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, 3d rev. ed. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991), 38
- 6 Page 15, Roger Boesche, "Kautilya's Arthashastra on War and Diplomacy in Ancient India"
- 7 *Ethics of Responsibility was a type advocated by Max Weber in his lecture, "Politics as an avocation"*
- 8 Page 22, Roger Boesche, "Kautilya's Arthashastra on War and Diplomacy in Ancient India"
- 9 Op, Cit, No-3, P-59.
- 10 H. C. Raychaudhuri, "Chandragupta and Bindusara," in K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, ed, *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, 2d ed. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996 [1967]), 132-70, see 158; A. L. Basham, *The Wonder That Was India*, 2d rev. ed. (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1963), 350..
- 11 Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India* (New Delhi: Rupa and Co., 1991), 60.
- 12 Boesche, Roger, Kautilya's Arthashtra on War and Diplomacy in Ancient India, *The Journal of Military History*, Volume 67, Number 1, January 2003, P-11.

Kautilya's Relevance for India's Foreign Policy

Alok Kumar Gupta

Classical texts continue to be intellectually stimulating and ever inspiring across time and carry politico-strategic significance. It is often said that after Plato and Aristotle, the western world has failed to produce any new ideas. Accordingly, all new theories and ideas that have come after these two giant philosophers are treated as footnote of Plato and Aristotle. India too is no exception to this rule. India too possesses a broad spectrum of endogenous politico-cultural resources. The Indian classical literature with politico-strategic tinge ranges from Idealism in the philosophy of Buddha, Ashoka, and Gandhi to 'realism' in the philosophy of Kautilya.¹ China too has its own classical traditions and Sun Tzu is a name to be recon with alongside Confucius. The fact remains that the Chinese foreign and defence policy is based on Sun Tzu's realist philosophy as enunciated in *The Art of War*. India's foreign policy in the same tone and tenor does not follow its own philosophy belonging to realist traditions as enunciated by Kautilya² in his magnum opus *Arthashastra*.³ Though, sometime due recognition is accorded to Kautilya by the strategic analyst both within policy-making and strategic community, it is hardly adhered to in practice. Therefore, this paper is an attempt to explore those principles of Kautilya which could have direct as well as indirect interface with foreign policy formulation and response by India. Author's objective is to discuss the relevance of principles enunciated by Kautilya for contemporary India's foreign policy.

(A) Political Realism of Kautilya

Kautilya's *Arthashastra*⁴ is basically a text that deals with statecraft and inter-state relations. *Arthashastra* deliberates quite at length about foreign policy and the ways and means to conduct inter-state relations that it could well be termed a "Treatise on International Relations" in

modern parlance. He could well be recognised as the founder of the theory of 'political realism'. However, the author is under the impression that Kautilya has remained conspicuously absent from political discourse in India and elsewhere in the world. Some research has been done along with attempts to include Kautilya's *Arthashastra* as a topic of deliberations in class-room environment; but for mere sake of knowledge that is largely at the level of theory and philosophy. A systematic study of Indian ancient texts from the point of view of identifying the main ingredients of Indian strategic thought has not been done adequately. Indian texts are still not part of global political science or international relations discourse. It has also been found missing from the foreign policy discourse. The empirical values of the text as well as its philosophy has hardly been emphasised and thus it continues to be confined in the academic world alone, that too only to a limited extent. This has happened in spite of the fact that scholars like Max Weber and Machiavelli seems to have been greatly influenced by the philosophy and Weber makes direct reference to Kautilya. Yet there are only few Indian or foreign universities that teach these texts as a part of security and strategic studies. People know and discuss Plato, Aristotle, Marx and Machiavelli but rarely Kautilya.⁵ There may be several reasons for the same. However, the classical texts and treatises require new commentaries and interpretations in the modern context or in context with changing times. Author thus intends a critical investigation of the *Arthashastra* with an objective of exploring its relevance for contemporary circumstances especially in the field of foreign policy.

(i) Principles of Foreign Policy in *Arthashastra*: The Context

Kautilya's thinking dates back to nearly 2,500 years ago, and is a testament to the pinnacle of human excellence in intellect and imagination. It is a practical manual of instruction for Kings. The first five books deal with administration, while the next eight cover foreign affairs and defence. The last two books dwell upon miscellaneous issues. The text was written in times when the subcontinent was divided into a number of small and mutually hostile states. Therefore, it was necessary for a king to not only protect his state but also deal with hostile kings and expand his territory. Unity and integrity which is the strength of any state was the immediate casualty which became the avowed aim and objective of Kautilya. *Arthashastra* deliberates on

statecraft which has largely three dimensions: first is the *saptanga* theory of state that attributes seven *prakrits* or 'elements of the state' which are king, his minister, the country, the fortified city, the treasury, the army and the ally; second is the theory of the "circle of kings" or the *rajamandala* theory, which is essentially a description of alliances a king has to make with friendly states to deal with the enemy state and his friends. The book also deals with three kinds of power, namely, 'the power of knowledge', 'power of treasure', and 'power of army'.⁶The problem of the defence of the state was also interlinked with its foreign relations and policies, according to Kautilya.

(ii) *Shadgunyas*⁷ Theory of Kautilya—Six Attributes of Foreign Policy:

Shadgunyas are a classification of six different policies outlined by Kautilya as a framework of foreign policy pivotal on the differential power level of the states, which operate through four principal mechanisms, the *chaturupayas*. The latter constitutes the modes of diplomatic exercise whereas the former represent policy principles guiding the overall range of action. The six ways as prescribed by Kautilya towards conducting foreign policy are:⁸

- (i) ***Sandhi (Agreement for peace)***: This is a principle that suggests making peace with a stronger King. This may be treated as the policy of peace.
- (ii) ***Samsraya (Bandwagoning)***: This principle guides a ruler to seek shelter when depleted in power. This is the policy of taking refuge.
- (iii) ***Dvaidhibhava (Duplicity)***: Equally important is the principle of following a dual policy of making peace with a stronger king and war with a weaker king. Therefore, this is a double-cross policy of peace treaty with one king and hostility with another at the same time.
- (iv) ***Vigraha (War)***: This principle suggests that a king should make war when prospering. This is suggestive of a policy of hostility.
- (v) ***Yana (Limited offensives or marches)***: It means a ruler should organize its marching only when is in possession of excellent qualities. This is the policy of marching on an expedition.
- (vi) ***Asana (Indifference or neutrality)***: This is translated to mean that a ruler must stay quiet when the enemy is equal in strength. Therefore, this is a policy of remaining quiet, but on keen watch and alert.

Sadhgunya is the cornerstone of the Kautilyan scheme of diplomacy. The first three are prescribed for weaker states against stronger states, the next two benefit stronger parties and the last is reserved for states of equal power. These six principles are further sub-divided to elaborate on different circumstances and actors involved. The only two policies of peace and war were diversified by Kautilya into six-fold classifications as there were different situations at the time and Kautilya desired Magadha to become the strongest kingdom in the Indian sub-continent by reducing the potential strength of other rulers. This is something which has been missing from the foreign policy mix of India, in spite of the fact that the India is being bled by both the hostile neighbours Pakistan and China, since their coming into existence. One of them is seemingly weak and other strong vis-à-vis India. Therefore, India is in dire need of an apt strategy to make a balance in its relations as both its hostile neighbours are bosom-friends.

The practical application of the six principles is through various contextual combinations and permutations of the four *upayas*, which are as follows:

- (i) *Sama* (Conciliation):
- (ii) *Dana* (Gift):
- (iii) *Danda* (Coercion):
- (iv) *Bheda* (Dissension):

These *upayas* are methods that are subject to political expediency and optimal utility in the conduct of foreign policy of a country. Therefore, it is incumbent upon any ruler to adopt any or all of these methods while conducting its foreign relations to maximize upon its national interests and threat to territorial and strategic security. India quite often has been ignoring the dictates of Kautilya as high level of idealism still continues to be the mainstay of its foreign policy. Its neighbour China and Pakistan have demonstrated ample instances of following all the four methods while conducting their relations with India as well as many other countries of the world. India is very slow at adopting coercion or dissension as a method of conducting foreign relations while her neighbours are not. Decision-making mechanism as well as political will have been found lacking at the time of need for formulating policy response, especially amidst crisis situations. It has also been alleged that what India gained on ground during most

wars with both these neighbours lost on the negotiating table. This speaks volume about the weakness of Indian diplomacy and conduct of foreign policy.

The formula of *sadgunya* was associated with the theory of 'Circle of Kings', which was constituted of the following twelve categories of Kings:⁹ (1) The would be conqueror—*vijigisu*. Here it is important to learn the in India's immediate vicinity China is an expansionist power. Pakistan too could be categorised as one as it has been obsessed with territory of Kashmir since independence. The same is lacking in case of India. (2) The enemy whose territory was contiguous to that of serial number one. Both China and Pakistan have a small contiguous border and India has long border with both these enemies. (3) An ally whose territory was contiguous to that of serial number two. India has an ally in Russia whose some part of boundary is common with China. (4) The enemy's ally whose territory was immediately beyond serial number four. If this is to be considered India has no enemy except China and Pakistan in any part of the world. However, many of the states of the world are common ally of both India on the one hand and Pakistan and China on the other. (5) The ally of serial number one's ally with territory beyond that of serial number four. It could be sufficient to mention here that most of the smaller allies of both India and China are tilted more towards China, given their economic interests. It is most obviously in case of Indian sub-continent. (6) The ally of the enemy's all beyond serial number five. (7) The enemy in the rear of serial number one (8) The ally of serial number one in the rear with the territory behind that of serial number seven (9) The ally of serial number seven behind serial number eight (10) The ally of serial number eight behind serial number nine (11) the middle king with the territory adjoining those of serial numbers one and two and stronger than either of these (12) The king laying outside or indifferent or neutral King more powerful that serial number one, two and eleven. This scheme of Kautilya was based on the experience everywhere that two neighbouring states with a common enemy tend to be allies. The would-be conquering King *vijigisu* who was contemplating the expansion of his dominion, was regarded as the centre of a number of states which he was supposed to overcome in his quest for suzerainty. Though a complex idea and would not conform in its entirety with the actual state of India or any other state; yet the *mandala* theory sets-in principles and strategies to safeguards

territorial boundary of a nation-state in the modern world. Its contemporary relevance is in terms of character of a state. A state which presents itself as a soft-state based on idealist principles of international relations could always be under threat. Therefore, the character of an expansionist state is a symbol of strength based on principles of realism and always helps a state to keep its enemy at a bay. Moreover, a country must keep a close watch on all those states and rulers which falls in one of the categories within the *mandala* theory and if possible should enter into alliance accordingly. Therefore, India's foreign policy choice could be shaped in that direction so that its enemy are deterred enough to take a cue on its' seems. These computations and permutations were resilient and depended on various situations prevalent at the time of forging allies. However, the idea is hypothetical with great potency and relevant when certain state endeavoured to establish supremacy over a number of neighbouring states.¹⁰

Kautilya also deliberates at length on systems of envoy (*duta*) or ambassadors to foreign states and has delineated his tasks. He suggested that the envoys must also be deployed as spy with powers to foment insurgency and instability within the states in which they are placed. Modern international politics are replete with such acts being done by different states. India may have been alleged of doing so in some cases but such a policy has never been an effective part of its diplomacy. Indian foreign policy makers may adopt it as it acts as a silent poison for the state which is trying to act smart with India. However, it must not be done at the cost of common and innocent population as it may contribute to human rights violation. Yet, it sounds an effective mechanism for making an enemy weak from inside and diluting its confidence.

Kautilya on War

War has also been regarded as an instrument of conducting foreign policy by other means. A state's defence is the most important priority for a King or ruler. The defence of the state was based on forts and the army. In his fortified capital of the state, where the king, if hard pressed by strong enemy, could entrench himself and withstand a siege over a long period, during which diplomatic moves could be made to ease the enemy's presence and avert a calamity.¹ What it indicates is that first necessity for ruler is to put his own house in order by entrenching his citadel of powers, i.e. capital. Therefore, this sounds the most important

learning for Indian policy makers. It is futile to keep shouting and blaming time and again about the threat perceptions from Pakistan and other hostile neighbours, in the wake of terroristic activities on Indian Territory. Indian policy-makers first should attempt at evolving a strong mechanism for ensuring proper and adequate security through psychological instruments of deterrence and installation of military safeguards.

Arthashastra is particularly rich on the army's composition, war preparedness and war fighting. The role of intelligence and craft of spying is well-developed and can teach a trick or two to modern spymasters. The most fascinating content of the text under study is the four kinds of war as enunciated in the *Arthashastra*, namely the *Kutayudha* (tactical fighting), *mantrayudha* (diplomatic war), *prakashayudha* (open war) and *tushnimityudha* (secret agents' war). Foreign and defence policy has a strong interface and both are interconnected in a manner that one may conclude, 'one begets the other'. War strategies are very much parts of defence policy of the state, which is largely contextual. It means a state may adopt the particular kinds of war as relevant to situations. The way India adopted and executed the surgical strike against Pakistan in September 2016 in direct response to Pakistan sponsored terrorist attack on Army camp at Uri, is well in line of political realism of Kautilya as he recommended for it in view of particular kind of neighbour and enemy. Such policy becomes an imperative instrument of defence and foreign policy given the nature of Pakistan as a source of constant and continuous nuisance by manufacturing and infiltrating terrorist to disturb peace within India. Such endeavours of an enemy in the neighbourhood could be well managed through concealed war (secret agents' war) as enunciated by Kautilya. Therefore, policy makers in India need to consider the same as an integrated part of foreign and defence policy; but without disseminating the strategy-related knowledge about it in the public domain. This seems to be the most relevant option in the wake of development in the field of waging a proxy war by Pakistan on Indian Territory.

Concept of Security: Kautilya and Its Relevance

Concept of security though has undergone a change; the relevance of military security and security of the physical territory of a nation-state continues to be in the place of primacy in most discourses on

security. The western discourse on peace and security is premised upon the belief that security or in other words military security is the precondition for peace, whereas the Indian discourse rests upon the belief that peace can be attained even without establishing the primacy of military hardware. Therefore, for India, peace is both means and end; on the contrary western thinkers see peace merely as a goal attainable by achieving a high degree of military self-reliance. However, this fallacy of belief has led to war and conflict everywhere in the world. Kautilya who has been viewed as one of the first realist thinkers also echoes this Indian belief system and does not overstate the importance of military hardware for a state and therefore, his seven elements of State (*Saptanga* Theory) lays equal importance on all seven.¹² Kautilya recommended the construction of series of forts all along the territorial borders of which the most important were one each in the principle direction. The protection was secured by water, desert, mountain, or deep forest. Kautilya envisaged three types of conquests: (i) conquests for the sake of glory and expanding territory; (ii) conquest out of greed, and (3) demonical conquest out of avaricious greed for land, money, women-folk etc, and only favoured the first. This is relevant in the sense that India may not grab the territory for the sake of greed and glory but may do so for bargaining. In spite of the fact, that China grabbed Indian territory in Aksai Chin on the north-west of Kashmir in Ladakh region; late prime minister Indira Gandhi entered into relations with China to normalise the hostilities by saying that 'we cannot march on Peking' to impress that maturity in relations must be given way against futility of alienation. China adopted a policy of grabbing Indian Territory on one side to bargain on the other side. China today is considered as an expansionist state. However, the fact remains that it has hardly ever fought an expansionist war but its inner military strength always projects a character like the same. It largely uses its strength to deter its neighbours from becoming adventurist against China. India too could have adopted a posture on the lines of Kautilya's advocacy for the least if not on the lines of China. The same could be made possible only with military build-up. Therefore, India requires growing its economy at a galloping speed to generate enough wealth so that it can strengthen its defence. China did it and has been doing it in the present.

Relevance for Contemporary Foreign Policy

Arthashastra as it exists today may not be applicable to contemporary circumstance and the given geo-political of different region; international order; nature of diplomacy where economic interests is at the centre of foreign policy; growing interdependence among the nation-states of the world. However, there are portions and underlying principles that are based on human psychology and have universal applications. The contemporary relevance of the text could be better developed if a comparative study is attempted with other non-India texts such as Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* and Machiavelli's *Prince* and how these texts are being used or have been used to bring strength to its defence, diplomacy and foreign policy. India's foreign policy today is at a crossroad where it needs to strike a balance between to hostile neighbours China and Pakistan to reap economic benefits without compromising on its strategic interests and security; two major powers of the world United States and Russia to get grants, commerce, and military hardware without losing the commitment and trust of either; Islamic nation states of West and Central Asia on the one hand and Israel on the other to contain any Islamic backlash back home with oil and get the armaments from Israel at the same time. Therefore, given the tough circumstances and complex situations in the prevailing international and regional order a pragmatic approach with high inputs of realism is the need of the hour. Dictates of Kautilya continues to be relevant to handle the such complex situations as present concerns are similar to those of the then Magadha empire i.e. Unity and Integrity of the vast territory with progress, peace and prosperity within.

Conclusion

Pragmatism and ethics are quite antithetical to each other. Philosophers have either been on the side of ethics or pragmatism. Therefore, there continues to be a dilemma when it comes to statecraft before most policy-makers. However, the bottom-line of any policy must be to ensure peace, prosperity and liberty of citizens; but not at the cost of violation of human rights of others. Therefore, the morality and ethics could be adhered to even when one becomes pragmatic or a realist. Works from classical antiquity are needed to be appropriated and understood for their profound philosophical insights as well as required to be developed as a cognitive tool for analysing the present

and anticipating the future. Ancient diplomatic tradition that was set in by Kautilya is characterised by a ruthlessly realistic state system; therefore it advocates that foreign relations be determined by gross self-interest rather than by ethical considerations. The Pakistani military studies Kautilya to understand the supposedly devious Indian mind. This is oversimplification and a gross distortion of Kautilya because in popular imagination Kautilya is compared with Machiavelli for ruthlessness and unethical conduct. *Arthashastra* is a treatise that encapsulates in many ways even the complexity of current world. This is because the problems that existed then persist in a more widespread with different dimensions and in magnified manner in the contemporary world. The *Arthashastra* must be adapted to suit contemporary geopolitical realities.

The biggest merit of *Arthasasthra* is that its teachings are intended to benefit all types of kings or rulers i.e. weak, strong, and ambitious and that is what makes it increasingly comprehensive and relevant as it is not a treatise on general principles, but a work concerned with recommending practical policies in any conceivable situation that could arise in actual political life. Its realism still continues to be unique, for its teaching is still relevant in the contemporary foreign-relations. A micro-level analysis of most wars of the world suggests that Kautilya's political teachings and principles have been applied and may be at times with some modifications. Therefore, Indian foreign policy makers need to learn and put into practice the preaching of Kautilya in the national interest and ensuring the territorial and individual security. The bottom-line of the philosophy is that morality and ethics must not be allowed to intrude when politics are considered, and they are to be pursued towards enemies of the state when they jeopardize its security and independence.

REFRENECES

- 1 Though in 1992, American Scholar George Tanham stirred up a controversy when he charged in an essay that Indians lacked tradition of strategic thinking. Many Indian scholars countered him pointing out that India had a rich tradition of strategic thinking quoted in venerated ancient texts such as the Ramayana, Mahabharata, Arthashastra, Thirukiral and the Panchantantra belonging to different ages. For details see Arvind Gupta, "Need for a

Moderan Artha-shasthra", *The Indian Express*, April 14, 2014.

- 2 Kautilya is variously referred as Vishnugupta or Chanakya (370—283BC).
- 3 *Arthashastra* was written by Kautilya in 321 BC in Magadha. The Book said to deal with issues of state, society, economy, administration, law and justice, internal security, defence, diplomacy, foreign policy and warfare.
- 4 *Arthashastra* is composed of 15 sections each devoted to a specific aspect of government.
- 5 Arvind Gupta, "Need for a Moderan Arthashastra", *The Indian Express*, April 14, 2014.
- 6 As quoted in Arvind Gupta, "Need for a Moderan Arthashastra", *The Indian Express*, April 14, 2014.
- 7 This term is also mentioned as *sadgunya* in many other texts. This formula was associated with the theory of "Circle of Kings", which was constituted by twelve categories of Kings.
- 8 As quoted by Shounak Set, "Ancient Wisdom for the Modern World: Revisiting Kautilya and his *Arthashastra* in the Third Millennium", *Strategic Analysis*, 2015, Vol.39, No.6, p.712.
- 9 M.B. Chande, *Kautilyan Arthashastra*, (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2004), p.63.
- 10 Ibid, no. 9, p.64.
- 11 Ibid, no. 9, p.61.
- 12 As mentioned in the "Talk by Michael Liebig on "Relevance of Kautilya's Arthashastra for Modern Political Science", February 13, 2014. Available on *Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses*.

Influence of Kautilya on Modi's Foreign Policy : Indo-US Relation

Amulya K Tripathy

Roshni Kujur

This paper will try to analyse how Kautilya's concept of foreign policy works in 21 Century Foreign Policy i.e particularly in Modi's Foreign Relations with US. We have tried to discuss here because, in spite of bitter relations of Modi with America, as the reason was open, Modi started a new dimension in relations with US. Kautilya says "Pragna Sukhe Ragna Sukhi" (Happiness of people is Happiness of King). So Kautilya (Chanakya)'s philosophy has better impact on Modi's American policy. Modi considered the interest of Country and above all interest of people of India.

Kautilya on Foreign Policy

Since, according to Kautilya, the ultimate goal of the king is the conquest of the World, it is essential for him to chalk out a successful foreign policy based on a pragmatic approach to the different problems at issue.

In order to determine the kind of policy to be adopted in each case, foreign rulers were classified by Kautilya under four heads, namely, enemies (Ari), friends (Mitra), mediators (Madhyama), and neutrals (Udasma). Inimical and friendly rulers, again, were each divided into two kinds, natural and artificial. A king and his immediate neighbour were, according to Kautilya, natural enemies to each other. Abul Fazl, describing the Hindu system of public administration said; "The Prince whose territory adjoined to his, although he might be friendly in appearance, yet ought not to be trusted ; he was always be prepared to oppose any sudden attack from that quarter. A king who attempted to give trouble to another king without reasonable cause was an artificial enemy of that king. The ruler whose territory was separated

from that of another ruler by the territory of an enemy, and whose friendship had come down from father and grand-father was a natural friend. The best kind of friend, according to Kautilya, was he who was constant, noble, straight forward, and whose friendship had been inherited from father and grandfather.

A ruler whose friendship was courted for the sake of the protection of life and property was an acquired friend. The ruler whose territory was situated close to that of a king and his wicked enemy, and who was capable of helping both the kings or of resisting either of them, was a mediatory king. The ruler whose territory was situated between the territories of two rival kings, and who was powerful enough to help or resist either of them or a mediatory king, was neutral. The distinction between a neutral and a mediatory King was not at all clear. Perhaps, the term Udasina (neutral) was applied to a King who remained passive in regard to both the contending parties, while the 'Madhyama King was one who exerted his influence to bring about a reconciliation. The third and fifth States form a Madhyama," said Kautilya, "were likely to be friendly, and the second, fourth, and sixth States were likely to be inimical to him. If the Madhyama king be on good terms with both these classes of States, a ruler had to be friendly with him; otherwise he was to ally himself with the second class of States.¹

The neighbouring kings belonged to one or other of four classes, namely, rearward enemy (parshnigraha), rearward friend (akranda), ally of a rearward enemy (parshnigrahasara), and ally of a rearward friend (akrandasara) lied next beyond the one last mentioned, he was to enter into alliance; but no connection was to be formed with those who are more remote.² A great deal about Circles of States (mandala) in the literature of Ancient India is available. A Circle consisted of three kings, a ruler, his friend, and his friend's friend. As each of these kings was supposed to possess six elements of State, namely, the king, minister, country, fort, treasury, and army. Thus a Circle consisted of eighteen elements. Foreign rulers being of four kinds, there were thus four primary Circles of States, twelve kings, and seventy- two elements of States.³

A powerful and wise king had always tried to make himself the centre (nabhi) of the Circle and to make the friendly powers the spokes of the wheel (nemi).⁴

The attitude of a ruler towards foreign rulers depended upon the special circumstances of each case. He was supposed to adopt one or other of six sorts of policy, namely, peace (sandhi), war (vigraha), neutrality (asana), preparedness for war (yana), alliance (samsraya), and double dealing (dvaidhibhava).

In Kautilya's view expediency was to be the main consideration in foreign policy. "If a king," said Kautilya, "was weaker than his neighbour, he had to adopt a peaceful policy ; but if he was superior in strength to his rival he was to make war. That this policy actually governed the actions of statesmen for long ages was shown by the fact that Abul Fazl, writing in the sixteenth century, spoke of the foreign policy of the Hindus in these words "With those who were his equals in power, he took care to maintain peace and friendship, and from those who were weaker than himself he exacted tribute. If any monarch was more powerful than himself, he continually strived to sow dissension among his troops; and if he was not able to do this, prudently purchased his friendship."⁵

As a practical statesman and a realist, Kautilya realised that every state acts in order to enhance its power and self-interest; therefore moral, ethical or religious obligation does not have any scope in the international politics. "War and peace are considered solely from the point of view of the profit."⁶ Kautilya assumes that every move of the king desirous for victory towards its ally or enemy should have to be based on its own interests. As Bruce Rich says, "Kautilya's foreign policy was the ruthless real politik, intrigue and deception... Kautilya cold blooded realism and treachery with some remarkable enlightened policies" . Most scholars of political history, especially Westerners, blame Kautilya for his so called immoral

Kautilya on Diplomacy

Kautilya believed that nations acted in their political, economic and military self-interest. He thought that foreign policy or diplomacy will be practised as long as the self-interest of the State was served because every State acts in a way to maximize the power and self interest. He thought that the world was in such a state that a kingdom was either at war or was preparing for a war and diplomacy was yet another weapon used in this constant warfare. He believed that diplomacy is a series of actions taken by a kingdom such that it gains

strength and eventually conquers the nation with which diplomatic ties were created. He also believed that treaties should be made in such a way that King benefits and serves the self-interest of the Kingdom.

NDA Government-1998-2004

Soon after Atal Bihari Vajpayee became Indian Prime Minister, he authorised nuclear weapons testing at Pokharan. The US strongly condemned this testing, promised sanctions, and voted in favour of a UN Security Council Resolution condemning the tests. President Bill Clinton imposed economic sanctions on India, including cutting off all military and economic aid, freezing loans by American banks to state-owned Indian Companies, prohibiting loans to the Indian government for all except food purchases, prohibiting American aerospace technology and uranium exports to India, and requiring the US to oppose all loans requests by India to International lending agencies.⁷

2004-2014 UPA I & II governments

During the tenure of the George W. Bush administration, relations between India and the United States were seen to have blossomed, primarily over common concerns regarding growing Islamic extremism, energy security, and climate change.^[48] George W. Bush commented, "India is a great example of democracy. It is very devout, has diverse religious heads, but everyone is comfortable about their religion. The world needs India".⁸ Fareed Zakaria, in his book *The Post-American World*, described George W. Bush as "being the most pro-Indian president in American history."⁹

Modi's Foreign Policy With United States

After a historic election victory, Narendra Modi was sworn in as India's 15th prime minister on Monday, May 26, ending two terms of rule by the Nehru-Gandhi dynasty. Modi's political vehicle, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), advocates a strong India that can resist pressure from world powers or regional rivals. Indeed, when in power previously, it was a BJP-led government under Atal Bihari Vajpayee that made India into a nuclear power and underlined its independence by refusing to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Observing the Modi's US visit, Ashley J Tellis said, It is important

that both sides have an honest conversation about the kind of relationship they seek, says the author, a leading authority on Indo-US relations.

Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's forthcoming visit to Washington will provide India and the United States with a golden opportunity to repair their faltering partnership. Bilateral relations have deteriorated in recent years because of poor policy choices in India on nuclear liability, taxation, and trade. More importantly, India's recent political paralysis and crumbling economic growth have suppressed the opportunities for more robust commercial ties. In these circumstances, the latter-day approach to India pursued by the administration of US President Barack Obama has not helped. By permitting sectoral interests to define the content of US engagement with India, Washington has allowed a pernicious transactionalism to gradually replace the strategic vision that previously guided the evolution of bilateral relations. This mistake was compounded by the obsessive complaints of senior US government officials about India's economic policies.

If Modi's private remarks to visiting American officials recently are any indication, the Indian prime minister seeks to end this stagnation. But his approach, which seemingly centers on soliciting huge international investments for important, high-profile projects at home, offers poor prospects for any deep US involvement that would quickly resuscitate joint cooperation between the two countries.¹⁰

At the moment, these concerns remain speculative. Modi's national campaign focused on growth and governance. He has publicly denounced extreme anti-Muslim statements proffered by some of his supporters. And the last period of BJP governance at the federal level, from 1998-2004, offers an instructive precedent. Though the BJP established them as a national force in the early 1990s through appeals to religion — such as a truck kitted out like a chariot of a Hindu god for a campaign about temple-building — their term in government was marked by a different ethos. Under Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee, the BJP moderated its most extreme wing, further liberalized the Indian economy, and transformed relations with the United States. This may become Modi's legacy as well, should he rein in the Religious nationalists and keep his own sights focused on his campaign promises of Economic growth and surajya, or "good governance." And this is

where Washington can best meet Modi — on the pragmatic common ground important to his Administration, and to the United States.

Getting the economic right

Modi seeks to right the wrongs which have slowed India's growth and kept India near the bottom of the World Bank's Doing Business index — in 2013, India ranked 134 out of 189, below Yemen. The BJP platform focuses on infrastructure, foreign direct investment, intellectual property rights, manufacturing, and restoring India to its pre-modern-era primacy as a center of global trade. This trade-led political slate represents the best opening in some years to expand economic ties. New Delhi sees the United States developing trade deals across Asia and Europe, and wonders where it fits. Signalling these paths to broadened economic ties will restore confidence in India that the United States has a strategic goal in sight. Getting India on a path towards the hugely important TPP will underscore the priority Americans place on ties with India, on track to become the world's third-largest economy by 2025. It will also create a more constructive atmosphere in which both governments can continue working on current market-access frictions.

Filling the void in Afghanistan

The U.S. and NATO troop drawdowns in late 2014 create great uncertainty for India. New Delhi fears that once the international presence departs from Afghanistan, the Taliban and related groups — like the Haqqani network or the Lashkar-e-Taiba, both designated terrorist organizations under U.N. and U.S. authorities — will refocus more forcefully on Indian targets. India has played a critical role providing development and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan since the turn of the century, emerging as its fifth-largest bilateral donor. It is also the region's dominant economic power, with companies willing and able to explore opportunities in Afghanistan, and the business knowledge networks to provide trade linkages for a country that desperately needs to develop its own sustainable economy. India stands out as the country most capable of providing ongoing assistance, development partnership, technology transfer, education, and business connectivity appropriate for Afghanistan's greatest needs. It has also, in response to requests from Kabul, begun to provide security sector assistance such as training, and funding Afghan equipment purchases

from Russia. The United States should begin to consult much more intensively with New Delhi as the drawdown continues, pulling India into conversations akin to those of a close NATO partner. Washington should also focus urgently on the unresolved problem of Pakistan as a terrorist safe haven, including the egregious example of Lashkar-e-Taiba chief Hafiz Saeed — about whom the United States in 2012 authorized an award of up to \$10 million for information leading to his arrest — openly holding rallies across Pakistan.

Visa Problem Issue

Visas have emerged as a central friction in the U.S.-India relationship, because New Delhi and the Indian IT services sector sees them as a market access barrier in the United States. This is a shame, because the growth in people-to-people contact has been one of the most successful aspects of the changed relationship between New Delhi and Washington. To keep up with the visa demand over the past decade, the United States has invested more than \$100 million into building larger consulate facilities across India. Of all the H-1B visas (for highly skilled temporary workers) issued worldwide, 64 percent go to Indian citizens; China is second, with a mere 8 percent. From Washington's perspective, it's hard to see how Indians could perceive such a dominant position as constrained by barriers. But it's also true that the total number of H-1B visas available has shrunk since its high point at the end of the Clinton administration. As the new Indian government settles into New Delhi, this pragmatic agenda, building on campaign promises critical to India and the United States will reinforce the larger strategic importance of a strong U.S.-India relationship. While the jury may be out for some time on how Modi will govern India, the urgent need to regain a collaborative spirit on the economic front should be at the top of Washington's inbox. As U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan proceeds, India should be at the forefront of U.S. consultation to ensure sustainable stability for the region.

Finally, given the difficulties advancing comprehensive immigration reform in Congress, there are some concrete steps the Obama administration can take to alleviate several frictions related to visa issues. Each of these would result in meaningful progress for both sides, and would advance U.S. national interests.

Modi's Mission in United States

A New Agenda On the final day of Prime Minister Narendra Modi's visit to the US, that country on Tuesday extended its Defence Cooperation Agreement with India by another 10 years. The pact, which was to expire in June next year, will now be in force till 2025.

The development follows India's decision to increase the foreign direct investment (FDI) cap for the defence sector from 26 per cent to 49 per cent. The issue was taken up at Modi's extensive meeting with US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, before the prime minister's summit-level talks with President Obama at the Oval Room of the White House. The pact, New Framework for the US-India Defence Relationship, was signed in June 28, 2005 by then defence minister (now President) Pranab Mukherjee and his American counterpart Donald Rumsfeld. The Indian Cabinet is yet to approve Rs 15,000 crore worth of US defence deals, including one for sale of 22 AH-64E Apache attack choppers, 15 Chinook heavylift Helicopters and the Javelin anti-tank guided missiles. American defence Equipment makers like General Electric and Boeing had met Modi a day earlier and Expressed their desire to expand operations in India.

Civil Nuclear Agreement

On the civil nuclear agreement between the two countries, an India-US group is to address all implementation issues for speeding up deployment of American nuclear reactors in India. The agreement on this had hit a roadblock in 2010, when India rolled out a nuclear liability law. For his summit talks with Obama, Modi drove straight from Blair House, where he was lodged, to the famous West Wing of the White House. The talks were first in a restrictive format and later at a delegation level.

At his joint media briefing with Obama after the meeting, Modi said both sides were "committed to taking forward the civil nuclear partnership agreement. We are serious about resolving at the earliest the issues related to civil nuclear energy cooperation. This is important for India to meet its energy security needs."

This was Modi's second meeting with the US President since taking charge as India's prime minister. On Monday, the two leaders had discussed bilateral issues over a private dinner in an informal setting.

The body language of both leaders looked relaxed after delegation-level talks, with Obama sipping a drink occasionally and Modi wearing a constant wide grin.

After the meeting on Tuesday, Modi took everyone by surprise by addressing the media, jointly with Obama, in Hindi. During his visit to the US, the prime minister had earlier addressed the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in Hindi.

On economic ties, Modi hinted that the government was going for further economic and policy reforms that would help in "rapid growth" of bilateral trade and investment partnership. Both sides discussed the recent standoff over the World Trade Organization's (WTO's) trade facilitation agreement (TFA). Modi revealed he had frank discussions with Obama and expected the US' support in addressing India's concerns over public stockholding for food security. In a definitive step, Modi also sought easy access for Indian services firms in the American market. At the time of going to press, Modi and Obama were expected to issue a joint statement on strategic ties between their two countries. Later in the day, Modi is scheduled to address the US-India Business Council.

Obama's visit as Guest for Indian Republic Day shows a new venture of Modi's foreign policy with United States. It is beyond expectations, in spite of past embarrassed relations of Modi with US. But on the other hand, Obama administration informed it's old ally Pakistan the same day after accepting invitation of India that, Obama will visit Pakistan too. It shows Obama Administration's weakness with Pakistan.

Obama visit, a sign of progress

US President Barack Obama said today the United States could be India's "best partner," as he wrapped up a three-day visit to New Delhi by highlighting the shared values of the world's biggest democracies. Speaking to an audience of young people, the US president reiterated that the relationship between Washington and New Delhi "can be one of the defining partnerships of this century."¹¹

Relations between the two countries haven't always been smooth. Another reason this visit is significant is that it symbolizes a rapid improvement in U.S.-India ties, which were nearly undone at the end of 2013 over a row involving Devyani Khobragade, India's deputy

consul general in New York. Accused of visa fraud and underpaying her house-keeper, she was arrested and strip-searched by U.S. law enforcement, sparking angry protests and diplomatic retaliations from India.

It appeared unlikely that Obama's visit would result in major policy breakthroughs on the issues that will dominate his agenda with Modi. But the mere fact that the talks were happening was being viewed as a sign of progress given the recent tensions that have marred relations between the U.S. and India.

The relationship hit rock bottom in 2013 when Indian Deputy Consul General Devyani Khobragade was arrested and strip-searched in New York over allegations that she lied on visa forms to bring her maid to the U.S. while paying her a pittance. Her treatment caused outrage in New Delhi and India retaliated against U.S. diplomats.

Ties between the U.S. and India have been steadily improving since Modi took office last May. He and Obama met for the first time late last year in Washington, and officials from both countries say they quickly developed an easy chemistry.

That came as something of a surprise to regional analysts given Modi's difficult history with the U.S. He was denied a visa to the U.S. in 2005, three years after religious riots killed more than 1,000 Muslims in the Indian state where he was the top elected official¹².

In White House Blog on Obama's visit it is said, The President and Prime Minister Modi pledged to enhance U.S.-Indian cooperation on our mutual climate and clean energy goals. From our highly successful U.S.-India Partnership to Advance Clean Energy (PACE) umbrella program to technical work on emerging technologies, the U.S. and India made important progress on combating climate change.

The agreements include:· Enhancing bilateral climate change cooperation to achieve a successful and ambition agreement in Paris this year.

- Cooperating on Hydrofluorocarbons to make concrete progress in the Montreal Protocol this year
- Expanding PACE-R, the U.S.-India Joint Clean Energy Research and Development Center, to extend funding for research on solar

energy, energy efficiency, and advanced biofuels. Launching air quality cooperation to help urban residents reduce their exposure to harmful levels of air pollution. Further the U.S. and India agreed on to combat climate change here.

True Global Partners: Incentivizing Trade and Investment

Under President Obama, trade between the two countries has increased by about 60 percent to nearly \$100 billion a year — a record high. But that's still hundreds of billions less than the trade we do with China. "We've got to do better," the President said, speaking at a U.S.-India Business Council Summit in New Delhi. So today, the President announced a series of additional steps that will generate more than \$4 billion in trade and investment with India while supporting thousands of jobs in both countries:

- The Export-Import Bank will commit up to \$1 billion in financing to support "Made-in-America" exports to India.
- OPIC will support lending to small and medium businesses across India that will result in more than \$1 billion in loans in underserved rural and urban markets.

The U.S. Trade and Development Agency will aim to leverage nearly \$2 billion in Investments in renewable energy in India.¹³

The Obama visit : A Sign of Development?

U.S. President Barack Obama's two day visit to India can be summarised through meaningful issues that dampened trade, investment and strategic relations between the world's largest democracies. In this flash, we look beyond the much publicized 'bear-hug' to list four positive areas from the Obama visit and their economic implications for India.

Civil nuclear deal: a 'break-through' but yet to workout.

The two nations resolved a long standing deadlock on the implementation of a 2008 civil nuclear deal, which was hamstrung by India's enactment of a liability law that exposed US nuclear plant vendors to excessive legal proceedings. Under the new arrangement, suppliers would be indemnified against unlimited liability through an insurance pool. If successfully implemented, renewed investments by US vendors would help in reducing India's widening energy deficit and aid infrastructure growth.

Cooperation towards strengthening India's defense capabilities – The two leaders endorsed efforts to enhance collaboration in defense technology transfer and co-development. India still imports an unreasonably high share (70%) of its defense equipment needs, a bulk of which (76%) come from Russia followed by the US (7%). Thus, steps to upgrade India's domestic defense industry are imperative. In this context, policy efforts, including recent lifting of foreign investment limits in defense (49% from 26%) and deeper Indo-US defense ties bode well for India's domestic defense sector and the economy in general.

Commitment to invest USD 4 billion in India – focus on renewable energy sector. The pledge includes - 1) USD 1 billion in financing by the U.S. Export-Import Bank to export 'Made in America' products, 2) USD 1 bn to be lent by U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation to small and medium enterprises in rural India, and 3) USD 2 bn committed by U.S. Trade and Development Agency for renewable energy. Meeting unmet demand for electricity in rural India, which constitutes 47% of 1.2 billion population, through renewable sources can greatly reduce India's kerosene subsidy bill and minimize resource intensity of the economy. Share of renewable energy in India's total installed power capacity has jumped from just 2% in 2002 to 13% currently. While greater foreign investments would help boost India's renewable energy sector further, it needs to be complemented by government efforts to tackle regulatory barriers, resolve land acquisition issues, ease infrastructure constraints and mitigate storage and distribution losses.

India has other options beyond cooperation with China. (Barack Obama's visit to India, 2015)

President Barack Obama became the first US president to be the chief guest of the 66th Republic Day celebrations of India held on 26 January 2015.¹⁴ India and the US held their first ever bilateral dialogue on the UN and multilateral issues in the spirit of the "Delhi Declaration of Friendship" that strengthens and expands the two countries' relationship as part of the Post-2015 Development Agenda.¹⁵

Modi's visit to America, 2015

Prime Minister Narendra Modi toured the Silicon Valley and met

with entrepreneurs - several of whom are persons of Indian origin - involved in successful microelectronics, digital communications and biotechnology start-ups to promote the NDA government's *Make in India* initiative.¹⁶ Modi left the U.S. West Coast and travelled to New York for the 2015 UN General Assembly meeting where he had bilateral discussions with US President Barack Obama.

Modi's visit to America, 2016

Prime Minister Narendra Modi while visiting the United States addressed a joint session of Congress highlighting the common traits of both democracies and long-term friendship between the two countries.¹⁷ In a speech lasting more than 45 minutes, Mr. Modi drew on parallels between the two countries and addressed a variety of issues where the two countries have worked together in the past and where the future course of action would lie.¹⁸

Diplomatic interpretations of Mr. Obama's visit centered on US efforts to make India its south Asian anchor and a strategic counterweight to China in its 'pivot Asia' strategy. This notwithstanding, we expect stronger links with the US – the only bright spot in the developed world today – to help India improve its trade balance at least bilaterally. This would contrast with its rapidly deteriorating trade deficit with China, which recorded a huge USD 31 bn in 2013.

U.S. President's short visit to India certainly has long term positive implications for India, especially so given that the Modi government has kept up the tempo on wide ranging reforms since its landslide victory last May. That said, most reforms have been enacted through executive action while legislation remains a significant obstacle for the new Government given its lack of majority in the upper house of Indian parliament. This would weigh on India's ability to push through difficult structural reforms across land acquisition, labor, mining and taxation, which require legislative approval.

"I think Modi surprised everyone by, with very little hesitation, embracing the United States," said Milan Vaishnav, a South Asia expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "To give credit where credit is due, the Obama administration stepped in very quickly after his election to signal that he was willing to do business."

Obama also had a good rapport with former Indian Prime Minister

Manmohan Singh. However, U.S. officials expressed some frustration that their personal warmth never Translated into policy breakthroughs.

Though in NDA-II rule Modi has started the US policy in a new look, but all UPA policies are being followed. In spite of that, Modi is keen to progress on every aspect of Indo-US relations. From the visit of Obama too, it is evidenced a secular India can serve better in Domestic as well International affairs.

It is evident from the visit of both leaders to each other's country and signed agreement for a steady progress in relations. Apart from international and regional compulsion, both leaders came in close ties leaving the past behind.

It seems Modi's foreign policy is based on Kautilya's concept of foreign policy, particularly with America. Modi followed Kautilya for the National Interest, in spite of his personnel humiliation (Faced when Modi was CM of Gujrat) by America.

REFERENCES

1. Kautilya Arthashastra, Book VIII, Chapter 9.
2. Ibid, Book VI, Chapter 9.
3. Ibid; Book VI, Chapter 2.
4. Ibid; Book VII, Chapter 2.
5. H. Blochmann and (tr.) Ain-i-Akbari , op.cit., p. 497.
6. Dikshitar, V.R. Ramchandra. 1987. *War in Ancient India*. New Delhi Motilal Banarasidas
7. **Jump up**^ "*Clinton Imposes Full Sanctions On India*". *Business Standard*. 1998-05-14. Retrieved 2013-12-17.
8. **Jump up** The world needs India: Bush 3 March 2006
9. **Jump up** Zakaria, Fareed, *The Post-American World*, 2008 Cahapter VII, pp. 225-226
10. Tellis, Ashley J ,What Modi must do in the US to reset the relationship, Washington D.C. September 27, 2014 Last Updated at 00:24 IST
11. Obama, Barack, President, US and India Can be best Partner, Jan, 27th, 2015

12. Time Magazine, 23 Jan, 2015
13. (White House Blog, Jan 26, 2015)
14. Jump up "Obama to be chief guest at Republic Day celebrations". Thomson Reuters. Reuters. 11 January 2015. Retrieved 11 January 2015.
15. Jump up "India, US hold first ever bilateral dialogue on UN, multilateral issues". Firstpost. 2015-02-19. Retrieved 2015-12-30.
16. Jump up "Mr. Modi in Silicon Valley". The Hindu. 29 September 2015.
17. Jump up "PM Narendra Modi's speech in US Congress: Read the full text". 2016-06-09. Retrieved 2016-07-30.
18. Jump up PMO India (2016-06-08), FULL SPEECH: PM addresses joint meeting of U.S. Congress in Washington DC

Russia-China Relations and Its Implications for India: A Kautilyan Perspective

Deepak Yadav

“Every neighboring state is an enemy and the enemy’s enemy is a friend.” – Kautilya

The title “Arthashastra” is often translated to “the science of politics”, but the book *Arthashastra* has a broader scope. It includes books on the nature of government, law, civil and criminal court systems, ethics, economics, markets and trade, the methods for screening ministers, diplomacy, theories on war, nature of peace, and the duties and obligations of a king. The text incorporates Hindu philosophy, includes ancient economic and cultural details on agriculture, mineralogy, mining and metals, animal husbandry, medicine, forests and wildlife.

Kautilya, in the *Arthashastra*, suggests that the state must always be adequately fortified, its armed forces prepared and resourced to defend itself against acts of war. Kautilya favors peace over war, because he asserts that in most situations, peace is more conducive to creation of wealth, prosperity and security of the people. *Arthashastra* defines the value of peace and the term peace means “effort to achieve the results of work undertaken is industry, and absence of disturbance to the enjoyment of the results achieved from work is peace”. All means to win a war are appropriate in the *Arthashastra*, including assassination of enemy leaders, sowing discord in its leadership, engagement of covert men and women in the pursuit of military objectives and as weapons of war, deployment of accepted superstitions and propaganda to bolster one’s own troops or to demoralize enemy soldiers, as well as open hostilities by deploying kingdom’s armed forces. After success in a war by the victorious just

and noble state, the text argues for humane treatment of conquered soldiers and subjects.

American scholar Joseph Nye argues: With the collapse of the Soviet Union, that de facto US-China alliance ended, and a China-Russia rapprochement began. In 1992, the two countries declared that they were pursuing a “constructive partnership”; in 1996, they progressed toward a “strategic partnership”; and in 2001, they signed a treaty of “friendship and cooperation.”

Russia being the largest country and China being the most populous country on the planet, both collectively are undoubtedly the two major powers of the international system. Russia being the successor of erstwhile Soviet Union wishes to regain the role once Soviet Union enjoyed whereas China being a communist country is also showing signs of new ambitions based on her history, population and military power and also her emergence as an important international economic actor. Relations between Moscow and Beijing have gone full circle in the past half century, from alliance to containment and now to strategic partnership.

To understand the ebbs and flows in Moscow’s China policy it is necessary to look into the Soviet history. History which is characterized as chronicle of the past provides the solid base for building up future relationships. In International Relations, there is no permanent ‘friend or foe’, today’s bitter enemy can become tomorrow’s staunchest ally. It is interest which runs supreme, and Russia and China are not exceptions to it. Despite being communist countries both Soviet Union and China counted each other as enemy number one and targeted each other with their nuclear weapons. But today Russia and China no longer consider each other as enemy and both countries have developed “very deep” relations in the strategic field.

China has the largest population in the world, while Russia is the largest nation in terms of territory. Both are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. Obviously, the significance of Sino-Russian relations extends far beyond the interests of the two nations. It also affects the stability of Asia and the world at large.

Soviet-China relations before disintegration of USSR were characterized by a number of ups and downs. In February 1950 just

four months after establishment of the PRC the two countries signed the treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Cooperation. The first half of the 1950s was the honeymoon period. However, by the late 1950s differences in national interest and ideology emerged leading to serious disputes in early 1960s which developed in to acute conflict and border clashes in 1969. Hence in the late 1960s and 1970s the USSR regarded China as one of its main rivals and stationed approximately one million troops and one third of its SS-20 intermediate-range ballistic missile along the Sino-Soviet border, threatening to make a 'surgical' first strike on China, nuclear bases. Under serious threat, China had to prepare for a military intrusion from north. However, in 1980s two countries came to realization that these were not in the interests of either side and they made effort to alleviate the situation. These efforts resulted in the normalization of the relations during a state visit to Beijing by the then Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in May 1989. (Qimao, 1999, pp.206-207).

However, the tense relationship of two communist giants eased with the rise of Gorbachev as the Secretary General of CPSU in 1985. He made epoch making changes in the Soviet history by introducing 'Perestroika' and 'Glasnost'. Some have described him in Soviet history as 'reformer in hurry'. In the realm of international relations he introduced 'New Thinking' which stressed on a deideoelgised foreign policy.

In the words of Gorbachev, 'New Thinking' stood for

"We need normal international conditions for our internal progress. But we want a world free of war, without arms races, nuclear weapons and violence, not only because this is an optimal condition for our internal development."
(Gorbachev, 1987: 10-12).²

Under the slogan of 'New Thinking' Gorbachev's foreign policy was based on shared moral and ethical principles to solve global problems rather than on Marxist-Leninist concept of irreconcilable conflict between capitalism and communism. The historic meeting between Deng and Gorbachev lead to resolution of many outstanding problems between the two. The border dispute was resolved by demarcating the Usuri River; trade was opened up and threat perceptions to a large extent eliminated.

While relations were improving between the two countries, the Soviet Union itself collapsed in December 1991. It was a historical event of global significance. Relations between the two neighbours, Russia and China could not therefore, escape the global effects of this historical event. (Imam, 2001:97-100).³

In the initial years after the disintegration of Soviet Union, Russian leaders did everything to become part of the prosperous capitalist world but they got disappointed with their cold response. The bubble of “Common European Home” and “One World from Vancouver to Vladivostok” busted very soon. Disillusioned Russia turned her face towards the Third World, and Asia which had been a natural ally of the erstwhile Soviet Union again got prominence among the policy makers. So in the changed circumstances and policies countries like China, India, Iran got the top priority in Russian foreign policy list.

Soon, Andrei Kozyrev (pro-West Foreign Minister) was replaced by an academician Yevgeny Primakov (pro-Third World) as Russia's new foreign minister who tried to balance between the East and the West. In December 1998, he made an official visit to India. Primakov visited India at the time when India was internationally isolated after conducting five nuclear tests a few months back. He proposed to formulate a triangle between three major Eurasian countries Russia-China-India to counter US hegemony and unilateralism in the world politics. According to him ‘Russia favours the creation of a Moscow-Beijing-Delhi triangle and also it would be a good idea.’⁴ on 15 September 1992 President Yeltsin signed the “Order of Russian Federation's Relations with China” and reaffirmed that -

- a) there is only one China;
- b) the PRC government is the sole legal representative of China;
- c) Taiwan is the part of China; and
- d) Russia will never establish official relation with Taiwan.⁵

On the question of separatism, religious extremism and terrorism both countries share common view today. In March 1995, Chinese president Jiang Zemin visited Moscow to participate in the celebration of 50th anniversary of victory over Fascism. In an agreement between the two, Russia reiterated its support to China on Taiwan issue and on its part, China extended its full support to Russia in dealing with the Chechnya problem.⁶

Both Russia and China are opposed to US hegemonic policies and favour a multi-polar world order with different power centers. In April 1997 Chinese president Jiang Zemin paid another visit to Moscow on April 23 and the two countries issued a joint statement on the multipolarisation of the world and establishment of new international order. The statement rejected hegemony and power politics, and stated that 'Cold War' mentality must also be abandoned and bloc politics opposed. They called for preservation of the Anti Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 between Soviet Union and USA and they supported lifting the UN Security Council sanctions against Saddam Husain regime in Iraq.

Russia and China shared views on increasing numbers of international issues in the light of the challenge from the USA and its allies. In the first year after the collapse of Soviet Union, Russia adopted a pro-western foreign policy, hoping for economic aid from the west and for recognition as a strong power and an equal partner of the USA. Soon, however, Russia was deeply disappointed by the level of western aid. Moreover, it faced fierce competition from the west over the sphere of influence in the newly independent states. These realities forced Russia to switch to an 'Omni-directional' or 'two headed eagle' (Russia's national emblem) policy, pursuing relations with countries of both the East and the West. Especially after 1995, under heavy pressure from NATO's eastward expansion led by the USA, Russia attached greater importance to its relations with China, India and other Asian countries. Russia termed Asian countries as 'natural allies', among which China got the top priority. Despite odd relationship in the past both countries evolved consensus on various national and international issues.

i) Areas of Common Concern between Russia and China

On the question of separatism, religious extremism and terrorism both countries share common view today. In March 1995, Chinese president Jiang Zemin visited Moscow to participate in the celebration of 50th anniversary of victory over Fascism. In an agreement between the two, Russia reiterated its support to China on Taiwan issue and on its part, China extended its full support to Russia in dealing with the Chechnya problem.

Both Russia and China are opposed to US hegemonic policies and

favour a multi-polar world order with different power centers. In April 1997 Chinese president Zemin paid another visit to Moscow on April 23 and the two countries issued a joint statement on the multipolarisation of the world and establishment of new international order. The statement rejected hegemony and power politics, and stated that 'Cold War' mentality must also be abandoned and bloc politics opposed. They called for preservation of the Anti Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 between Soviet Union and USA and they supported lifting the UN Security Council sanctions against Saddam Husain regime in Iraq.

On 24 November 1998, when Jiang Zemin paid another crucial visit to Russia, the Russian side reaffirmed its "four nos" position. The basic thrust of which was - no support for any conception of 'Taiwan's independence; no acceptance of the position of 'two Chinas' or 'one China and one Taiwan'; no support for Taiwan's participation in the UNO or other international organizations in which only sovereign states participated; and no sales of weapon to Taiwan.⁷

NATO bombing on Yugoslavia from March end to mid June 1999 without getting any authorization from the UN Security Council sent shock waves in both Russia and China and tended to bring together the two in joint opposition of NATO action. NATO's intervention on 'humanitarian ground' was an ominous development. Being multi-ethnic and multi-religious states, both Russia and China have their own separatist movements, Russia in Chechnya and China in Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang province. Being a Slav country, Yugoslavia was traditionally friend of Russia and attack on it, aroused Russian sentiments in the form of massive protests in Moscow.⁸

Both Russia and China have greater common ground to chalk out their strategy to deal with outside world compare to the issues on which they are at odds. Russo-Chinese link is built on a number of shared concerns which includes:

- The struggle against US led unipolar hegemonism;
- Unilateral humanitarian interventionism by passing UN;
- Islamic extremism and secessionism;
- Opposition to NATO enlargement and inter-reference in the internal matters;
- Opposition to NMD(National Missile Defence) and TMD (Theatre

Missile Defence);

- Opposition to US withdrawal from ABM Treaty of 1972
- Restructuring of UN
- Opposition to US led NATO forces to stay longer in the Central Asian region;
- Near mutual acceptance of Russia's hegemony as a guarantor of order in Eurasia
- Strengthening the SCO
- Working together in the multilateral forums like WTO etc.

The Russian and Chinese economies are among the ten fastest growing economies in the world. Both have vast potentials to become the economic super power. Russian oil and gas pipelines are the life lines for the Western Europe. Russia is the second largest producer of crude oil after Saudi Arabia and it has the largest gas reserves. Whereas China is the energy hungry country with abundant cheap labour and have cutting edge in manufacturing industry. Both countries have ample scope to get benefitted from each other's expertise.

Russian arms sale consists major portion in Russo-Chinese trade. Russian defence industries are facing financial crunch in order to remain competitive in highly volatile defence equipment market to find its buyers. Here China can play vital role to meet much needed financial crunch by using its huge foreign exchange reserves with other countries like India and Iran. China is the largest arms buyer from Russia. China has acquired many advanced weaponry from Russia like SU-30 MKK fighter planes, Akula Class nuclear submarines etc. which have provided advantage to the Chinese armed forces.

The Putin-Hu declaration on the 'New World Order' in 21st Century on July 1, 2005 provided a sound base for further converting the relations between the two countries. Both agreed that 'All countries of the world must strictly abide by the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs of each other, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence. Both attacked US 'double standards' in the war against terrorism (though without mentioning).

The declaration of 'New World Order in 21st Century' confirms that relations between two 'headed eagle' and 'dragon' have reached on its height. Both countries have gone very far and deep in their defence

translations and no longer count each other as enemies. Their defence personnel, scientists, students are getting training in each other's establishments. Russia is building up nuclear reactors in China and has offered partnership in the state in the state owned space agency GLONASS which itself indicates the comfort level in their ever flourishing bilateral relations.

One of the prime reasons for developing close ties between Moscow and Beijing in the US factor, the common cause of concern for the both countries. US's continuous military and economic support to Taiwan and its huge military presence poses grave threat to the Chinese sovereignty. USA has also agreed to deploy TMD technology to Taiwan, which may virtually neutralize Chinese missile capabilities and would disturb the strategic balance in the region.

Russia is consistently under immense pressure from western human rights groups and media on the issue of human rights violations in the Chechnya war. These groups had virtually shut their eyes on Moscow Theatre tragedy and Beslan School crisis in which hundreds of Russian people lost their lives. It shows as if these human rights groups and media people are acting at the behest of their respective governments to settle their political goals with Moscow. When the issue of human rights violations by US forces comes from Iraq or Afghanistan, these groups keep their mouth shut.

To neutralize these double standards on terrorism, both Russia and China call for implementation of UN charter and International Laws globally without any fear or favour. The most frequent violator of international laws, Israel always go unpunished due to overt and covert support from the USA but a single incidence of Tianmen Square in China made her virtually untouchable in the international politics.

Initially there was some opposition within the Russian establishment to the entry of the US troops in Central Asia, an area of traditional Russian influence. However, subsequently, Moscow decided to allow air corridors, the use of its bases for the search and secure operations as well as sharing of intelligence regarding the terrorist networks operating in Afghanistan. Uzbekistan offered its airspace and bases to the US troops ahead of other CARs, whereas Moscow preferred to maintain the façade of coordinated stand of all the CIS states.

Kyrgyzstan claimed that the granting of Manas air base was coordinated in advance with its partners in the CIS Collective Security Treaty.

Manas airbase of Kyrgyzstan is just 200 miles away from Chinese territory from where US troops can keep their eye on Chinese troop movements. Presence of US troops in such a close to Chinese border made security expert in Beijing uncomfortable. Beside military bases in Pakistan and Kyrgyzstan, US acquired military bases in Baghram and Kandahar in Afghanistan and bases of Khanabad in Uzbekistan.

Development of closer ties between Russia and US, especially after coming of Obama regime is causing concerns in Beijing. Before Obama regime, Bush administration worked closely with Russia especially after September 2001 terrorist attack.

After the September 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington and subsequent military action taken by US and NATO against Al-Queda and Talibans have radically altered the geopolitical situation in Central Asian Region. Russia and Central Asian republics acquired a prominence place in the US military strategy in Afghanistan military bases in Baghram and Kandahar in Afghanistan and the bases of Khanabad in Uzbekistan. It is believed that these facilities helped US military to quickly establish air superiority thought Central Asia and even to the Middle East. It is believed that in offering bases to the USA, the Central Asian States sought security against the threat of terrorist attacks as well as gain maneuvering space vis-à-vis Russia and China. CARs hoped to gain financially from the US presence.

The impact of post-September 11 developments on China has been the mixed one. China gained in so far as combating international terrorism became the number one task of the US policy. Prior to it economically and militarily growing China was increasingly being projected as emerging strategic rival of sole super power. China reluctantly, joined the international community in supporting the US war against terror but with certain conditions. China wanted UNSC to play central role in the war against terrorism as a guarantee against the US unilateralism. In fact China insisted that struggle against terrorism also includes the 'East Turkistan' terrorist forces or the Uighur separatist movement in Xinjiang province.

There is no doubt that the prospects of a prolonged US military

presence in Central Asian region are not welcome to either Russia or China. Post September 11 developments in the region are seem as a set back to SCO, because SCO was created to forge Russia – China partnership in the Central Asia for jointly maintaining peace, stability and economic cooperation in the region and keep a check on the Western influence in the region.

Russian and Chinese interests also converge on the issue of eastward expansion of NATO. First time ever NATO crossed the border of a non-NATO member country i.e. Afghanistan in the name of fight against terrorism. Both Russia and China opposed the bombing on Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia in 1999. Also the US B-2 bombers dropped bomb on Chinese embassy in Belgrade causing many casualties. These incidences proved beyond doubt that US led NATO forces are crossing their granted mandate in the name of fight against terrorism and in the name of humanitarian intervention. Russia and China have their own set of problems in Chechnya and Xinjiang respectively.

At the time when NATO bombing was on, the 50th anniversary celebrations of the founding of NATO took place in Washington in which all the former Soviet republics with exception of Russia participated. What aroused the further Russian and Chinese concern and even the concern in countries like India was the enunciation of new strategies doctrine of NATO that permitted use of force by it in regions beyond the areas of its traditional responsibility comprising the territories of its member states. So, now NATO forces could be used anywhere.

Against such unilateral hegemonism of the US and NATO. Russia-China wants a multipolar world with many power centres. The declaration between Yeltsin and Jiang Zemin in 1997 openly talked about establishment of multipolar world based on principles of Panchsheel. Both call for respect of State sovereignty, equality of states eschewing of pursuit of hegemony, non-interference in internal affairs of other states, an equitable and just economic order and the strengthening of UN. Both Russia and China also seeks to work closely with NAM and champion the cause of third world.

The major bone of contention in the smooth relation was border dispute which is now solved. China has not only settled in border

dispute with Russia but also with the Central Asian Republics in a peaceful manner. With the border dispute gone there is no any serious issues left between Russia and China to doubt each other's intention.

Peaceful solution of Korean Peninsula problem is also in the priority list of Russia and China. The proposed NMD system of the USA is expressly aimed at providing defence against the 'rogue' states like Iran, Iraq and North Korea etc. The launch of Pyongyang's rocket over Japan in 1998 provided justification to US for such apprehensions. Russia and China therefore, have sought to minimize the perception of North-Korean threat. They favour a rapprochement between North and South Korea and one between US and North Korea.

To counter the eastward expansion of NATO and with drawl of US from ABM Treaty of 1972, President Putin made an overture to European Union and NATO to reach some compromise solution. He called upon to EU and NATO to join forces with Moscow and set up a joint anti-missile shield during his visit to Rome on 5th June, 2000. He said that such a system will avoid creating problems linked to an imbalance in the equilibrium of forces and ensures 100 percent security to European countries.

As far as economic ties between Russia and China are concerned, it lag behind political, diplomatic, strategic and military ties. It is apparent that the two countries are also to create economic interdependence. The economies of the two countries are mutually complementary. Russia is the major producer and supplier of energy while China is energy hungry and its needs are growing. Russia's main exports apart from defense equipments include fertilizer, steel, timber and machinery, while its main imports are consumer goods and food items.

There are some major pre-requisites for further growth in the scale and diversifications of Russo-Chinese economic collaboration. These are implementing joint programmes in the fuel and energy sector; stepping up cooperation in the field of investment; involving Russian companies in the strategy of accelerated development of China's western region; expanding cooperation between the two countries' border region and cooperation in the manufacturing sector and joint mastering of high technologies.

By strengthening trade with China, Russia will try to reduce its shortage of light industrial goods and electronics, create an economic infrastructure using cheap Chinese labour in the less developed areas of Russian Far East. Russia will also be able to reduce the financial crunch of its arms manufacturing units by selling weapons to China which includes more than \$2 billion every year. Russia can also benefit by sending part of its well educated labour force to China to help create high technology industries and reduce the chronic unemployment among highly educated youths.

On the other hand China will get benefitted by sending a certain amount of its unskilled labour force to Russia to work in the understaffed industries. The excess of labour force available in China is about 200 million. This arrangement will reduce some burden of unemployment among Chinese people. In addition, China will have a chance to participate in the economic opening of oil fields resources in Russian Far East and Siberia.

ii) Divergent Views between Russia and China

A Russo-China border issues of considerable sensitivity concerns the extensive Chinese migration much of it illegal in to Russian territory. The demographic imbalance along the border with 150 million Chinese crowded in the North Eastern part of China and only 7 million Russians in the vast bordering territories of Siberia and the Far East has been a source of concern for Soviet and Russian citizens, officials and journalists for many years.

Moscow is unhappy with China's massive production of copycat versions of Russian weapons. Russian arms manufacturers have been taken by surprise with the sheer speed and scale of China's copycat capabilities. Often, Chinese dealers say they want to buy Russian arms, begin negotiations, and ask as many technical questions as possible. They then take photos and videos of the weapons, request all available documents, and repeatedly come back to the table to discuss technical issues.

Another trouble spot in China's Xinjiang province, whose population is ethnically kin to that of the neighbouring post-Soviet states, is troubled by sporadic anti-Beijing rebellious that could potentially spark a cross-border "liberation war". From that perspective

even with respect to the near future by closely associating with China and by selling it arms, Russia risks upsetting the delicate military balance in Asia and even being drawn in to China's territorial disputes with Taiwan, Vietnam, Japan, and ultimately the U.S.⁹

At a more generalized level, there exists a cultural divide that frequently obscures and undermines commonalities of interests. Many Russians who even advocate strategic partnerships, subscribe to the image of Russia as a "civilizational barrier" against the barbarian, 'East'. Although these days the principle danger is seen as Islamic radicalism emanating from the South, the very concept of Russian as a guardian of 'western' values inhibits rapprochement with China. It fosters a superiority complex that many Chinese find unwarranted in a state they view as economically backward, militantly crippled and of diminishing international influence.¹⁰

The burden of historical and civilizational prejudices, an increasingly dominant West-centrism in Moscow and Beijing and the Russian anxieties regarding China's rise as the next superpower continue. Within this overall dynamic, three issue areas will bear particular attention i.e., (i) development over the Angarsk-Nakhodka oil pipeline; (ii) security management on the Korean peninsula; and (iii) strategic projections in former Soviet central Asia.¹¹

In Central Asia, Moscow is engaged in much more activist project i.e., re-establishing itself in the traditional sphere of influence. Here Russia sees itself as a regional hegemon, a position it is reluctant to cede. However, China's geographical proximity to Central Asia and considerable security and economic interests there mean that it will not simply 'go away'. As Russia seeks to reassert its presence and influence in the region, and China attempts to maximize its economic stake Central Asia looms as perhaps the most likely theatre for renewed bilateral tensions.¹²

Implications for India

Geographically, India sits in the middle of the SAARC region comprising 80% of land area, population, GDP and other indices. The next largest member is Pakistan, having only 10 to 11 % share of these indices is a distant second. Others are even smaller. India shares land borders or maritime boundaries with all SAARC nations, (including

Afghanistan, through Pak occupied Kashmir). Except Pakistan and Afghanistan, no other member country shares borders with one another, except India. India's military capabilities are greater and both India and Pakistan are nuclear-weapon powers. This asymmetry and historical burden brings with it sensitivities, fears and complexes, despite Indian reluctance sometimes to leverage its size and strength in our external relations.

On the security front, India is determined to work with its neighbours, as well as major powers in the world, to defeat the scourge of terrorism and violent extremism. Historically, extra regional powers have complicated relations between countries in South Asia. India has given a significant push to foster connectivity and promoted mutual confidence in multiple areas, including trade and investment. Leverage India's economic growth into win-win arrangements with our neighbours has been a major plank of India's neighbourhood policy. For example, India's electricity grid is now connected to the grids of Bangladesh, Bhutan and Nepal. It is possible that Pakistan's grid may also be connected, if the Pakistan government can take the plunge. Prime Minister Narendra Modi, during his first official visit abroad to Bhutan, said that a strong India is good for the region.

India's interest lies in the security, stability and economic development of Afghanistan. It is the country beyond India's hostile neighbor. India's commitment to Afghanistan has been reflected in the Strategic Partnership that was signed last year. In Afghanistan, India's assistance towards developmental projects is about USD 2 billion. The Afghan Parliament complex, the strategic Zaranj-Delaram Road, Pul-e-Khumri power station and transmission line to Kabul, the Salma dam and several hospitals, roads and schools have been built with Indian assistance. India has also pitched in with capacity building and training of the Afghan Armed forces. India has also engaged with the Istanbul Process and with regional powers like China, Russia and the Central Asian countries to help Afghanistan. India's abiding interest is to helping build Afghan institutions and capacities in order to deal with threats of terrorism, religious extremism and other centrifugal tendencies. Pakistan has always been suspicious of India's role in Afghanistan and has organized terrorist attacks by its proxies on our Embassy and Consulates. India's positive role in Afghanistan has the support of the

Afghan people who have consistently put India at the top of the list of countries they like most and put Pakistan as the least liked country.

India on its side is also willing to engage in great power politics and is looking for international recognition it has been deprived since independence. Nehru wrote movingly of India's desire and its destiny to play a major role in the world politics. He hoped that it would not be military role, but one based on sound moral values. Today although there exists no "white paper" enunciating the objectives of the country's foreign policy, India still strives towards this goal. The most spectacular example of this new assertiveness, largely founded on the self-confidence generated by the relative success of the nuclear tests, is the claim for a permanent seat at the UNSC.

On the issue of triangle, it is only India that seems to be least under pressure to pursue this triangle. India has to carefully weigh its policy options and maintain a delicate balance between promoting strategic triangle and strengthening its engagement with the USA. Individually both Russia and China have maintained good relationship with the US and their trade volume are increasing rapidly with the US.

Fear persists at the bilateral level as well. To some Chinese analysts Russia still represents a potential threat and vice-versa is also true. Both Russia and India presume that in the short and medium term, China may pursue the policy of peace, but in the long term equations may change. China's overt and covert support to Pakistani nuclear and missile development programme pose a great security danger for India.

India-Russia-China can do some sensible things together in the military and geopolitical realm. There is very little prospect that they are going to be allies or even thoroughgoing strategic performers. Moreover there are number of areas where protocol, discussions and agreements might be reached which would enhance their security and contribute to the security of Asia. If the idea of triangle between them mean anything, it is probably means a relatively modest set of understanding on which their view coverage.

The Eurasian security in future will depend a lot on how these three largest countries harmonize their relationships. They represent world's most populous segment, rich with natural resources and are

on a fast track to emerge as leading global economic power. The June 2, 2005 concluded meeting at Vladivostok recently solely for this purpose indicate that future of triangle is very promising and the picture will be clearer in the time to come. At the same time the future of triangle rests with how India and China solve their own long standing problem of border disputes.

To conclude, therefore, if Asia has to make any positive contribution towards the evolution of new global order and if world has to evolve an adequately representative framework for international security then, increasingly mutual cooperation of these three Asian powers amongst themselves and also their cooperation with other major players remains the most critical pre-requisite to all initiative; in building the future world order.

Russia, China and India have great historical experience of dealing with such Western influences and preserving their Asian identity despite all challenges. The fundamentals of strategic triangle seem robust and clear and effort must be made to make it effective As of today Russia-India-China stand together in their support for evolving 'just and rational' new international order with democratization of international politics and multipolarization. Also all three have been suffering from transnational and cross-border terrorism and have not been comfortable with unipolar world led by the US. The trilateral cooperation among themselves holds the key of 'triangle' and how these three Asian giants resolve their internal disputes would be the deciding factor in the emergence of 'Eurasian triangle'. Russian and Chinese interests in Central Asia seems smooth but with growing Chinese influence in the region is the cause of concern for Russia. China has already surpassed Germany to become third largest economy in the world. China's fast growing economy needs continuous energy supply for which Central Asia is its natural choice. Russia treats Central Asia as its backyard and interests of both countries seems to be at odds here.

REFERENCES

1. Qimao, Chen (1999), "Sino-Russian Relationship after the Break Up of the Soviet Union" in Chaufrin Gennady (eds.), *Russia and Asia: Emerging Security Agenda*, New York: SIPRA, OUP.

2. Gorbachev, Mikhail (1987), *“Perestroika: New Thinking for our Country and the World”*, London: Collins. pp. 123-128.
3. Imam, Zafar(2001), *“Foreign Policy of Russia, 1991-2000”* New Delhi, New Horizon Publishers.pp.23-27.
4. *Summary of World Broadcasting /SU/3416 B/5*, December 22, 1998.
5. Chufrin, G. (1999), *“Russia and Asia: The emerging Security Agenda”*, New York: Sipri Oxford University Press.pp.292-296.
6. Ibid.
7. Jingjie, L. (2000), “Pillars of the Sino-Russian Partnership”, *Orbis*, 44(4): 527-539.
8. Saiget, Robert J. (2000), *“China, Russia beef up cooperation on Ethnic Separatism, Taiwan, Terrorism”*, Hong Kong: AFP.
9. Moltz, Clay (1995), “Regional Tensions in Russo-China Rapprochement”, *Asian Survey*, 35(36): pp.23-54.
10. Menon, Rajan and Charles E. Ziegler (2002), “The Balance of Power and US Foreign Policy Interest in the Russian Far East” in Thorton J and Ziegler E.C. (eds.), *Russia’s Far East a region at risk*, London; University of a Washington Press,pp.17-23.
11. Lo, Bobo (2004), “Long Sunset of Strategic Partnership: Russia’s Evolving China Policy”, *International Affairs*, 50(2): 295-309.
12. Shaumian, T.L. (2003), “Geopolitical Changes in Central Asia and Positions of Russia, China and India” *China Report*, 38(3): 361-363.

India's Conflict-Cooperation Spectrum in The Indian Ocean through The Kautilyan Prism

C.S. Anuradha

The periodic examination of a nation state's interaction in its geostrategic milieu is vital for preparation to meet rising challenges as well as anticipate future ones. Being a significant player in the Indian Ocean region, India's performance in the abovesaid criteria is imperative. In the Asian century, India's economic growth is appreciable and its spillover effects in other areas are expected. The strategic environment of this all-weather ocean region will be an integral factor in India's security calculus. Adapting to dynamic processes or altering courses of action of others through one's pre-emption or reaction need to be calibrated.

Mere historical or chronological review would not suffice as this might ignore important patterns of behavior or neglect the identification of linkage between apparently disparate events or decisions. The help of a theoretical construct would be beneficial here. The ancient Indian statecraft text of *Arthashastra* by Kautilya is used to understand India's Indian Ocean interactions better. The treatise has often served as a reference point for explaining concepts and practices in fields as varied as war, leadership, management¹, and political economy. The relevance of the work has been time and again reiterated.

Arthashastra's USP

Authored by Kautilya also known as Chanakya, the Arthashastra is a comprehensive guide to polity and statecraft. Meant as a prescriptive text for a would-be conqueror, or Vijigishu, the text advised the king on a variety of subjects from economy to administration to foreign policy and war making. It is said that the counsel of this Prime Minister enabled Chandragupta Maurya to establish a large empire. The aim of the book

was to shore up national security by maximizing power and wealth including resources of a state. A literal translation of the Sanskrit word *Artha* is “material wealth”. Hence it could be looked as a study in economics. Indeed Clement Tisdell rates it as “the most sophisticated and broadly based” one on economic philosophy until Adam Smith published *The Wealth of Nations*.² Bosche termed it the “science of politics.”³

Arthasastra emphasised the need for a pragmatic and adaptable foreign policy that is exercised after a precise evaluation of the state’s strengths and weaknesses including power, military and economy. Thus Arthasastra provides the means to use Comprehensive national power in furthering a state’s foreign policy objectives⁴.

He conceived of a matrix of states that surround the “would-be conqueror” or *Vijigishu* as being a mandala or circle of states each with its own friendly and rival attitude towards the state in question. Characterising the states as enemies and friends he traces alternate layers of friends and foes who surround the *Vijigishu*. He then suggested appropriate methods of foreign policy that needs to be followed in each of the cases.

The neighbouring states remained Ari (Enemy) and their contiguous neighbours were Mitra (friend) of the *Vijigishu*. There were also more powerful states that can favour either the state or its enemy. There are also neutral states (*Udasina and madhyama*) that are more powerful than the *Vijigishu* and the Ari. It is the relative power among these states that would determine the type of foreign policy *Shadgunya* that is followed. These are Sandhi, Vighraha, Asana, Dvaidhibhava, Samsraya and Yana. The first one is Sandhi or conciliation or peace can be either comprehensive or piecemeal. This is mostly with countries that are either equal or stronger than the state in question. The following table (**Table 1**) gives the different modes of cooperation that could be adopted which are categorised according to the nature or objective of the agreements.

Table 1 Sandhi — Accommodation & Cooperation in International Relations

SANDHI	MEANING
Karmasandhi	Cooperation and Exchange in areas of military products and knowledge.
Bhoomisandhi	Transfers and Exchanges of land, use of certain natural resources like water.
Hiranyasandhi	Wealth transfer of tangible and intangible wealth.
Anayasitsandhi	Agreement and Cooperation to colonize others, economically or politically.
Mitrasandhi	Cooperation without any expectation of reciprocation except, perhaps, goodwill. (Mitra=friend).

Source: As given in Coates Caton *The Ultimate Pragmatist: Kautilya's Philosophy on SMART Power in National Security* <http://isme.tamu.edu/ISME10/Coates-Caton10.doc>

The next is Vighraha or hostility towards other powers. This policy is adopted especially in the case of weaker states. Asana refers to policy of indifference that might be issue specific or temporary. Dvaidhibava is the policy of double dealing. Samsraya is the policy of according protection to a weaker state, the likes of which India followed in helping in the creation of Bangladesh. Yana is the policy of overt attack on another state presumably weak. Kautilya talked of four tools to implement these foreign policy options namely Sama, Dhana Bheda and Danda.

Indian Ocean neighbourhood

For India, clearly the western neighbours seem to fit the circle of states pattern where the immediate neighbour in Pakistan exhibits inimical interests against India. The partition itself was a *Bhoomisandhi* which means transfer of land. India has had adversarial relations with this country. When the liberation of Bangladesh War happened in 1971, it was a clear decision to fight a war after full preparedness and readiness at an appropriate time. This falls under the category of a *Prakashayuddha* or open conflict as advised by Kautilya. The prospect of an assured victory made this a winnable war that every *Vijigishu* must aim for according to Kautilya. Currently, there are debates on adopting

Kutayuddha or indirect and deceptive war against Pakistan for the alleged support to terrorism.

In Pakistan's neighbour Afghanistan, India has a long-time friend with whom India maintains cordial relations and is a principal participant in the reconstruction efforts of this war-torn state. The next Indian Ocean state in focus is Iran which continued to maintain friendly relations with Pakistan ever since her partition from India in 1947. The Islamic republic of Iran also supported Pakistan in its conflicts with India. So it could earlier be seen as an *Ari-Mitra* (Enemy's friend). However, Pakistan's growing alliance with US and the support lent to Taliban in the Afghan issue, brought rifts in the relations. India has continued to build relations with Iran, the latest effort being the \$500 million that India has pledged towards the construction of the Chabahar port that would serve as a strategically important link in India's attempt at expanding her contact with the Central Asian republics. This is an illustration of the Kautilyan dictum of *Hiranyasandhi* or transfer of wealth both tangible and intangible using the tool of *dhana*. Befriending the enemy's friend is another method of forging better foreign relations according to Arthashastra. Kautilya emphasises the need to maintain relations with your neighbour's neighbour as he is a potential ally especially if he is as strong as the state in focus.

Iraq, is a country with which India has for long had amicable relations. But now with the ISIS crisis India has to wait and watch the situation carefully. In the regional big power of Saudi Arabia an erstwhile supporter of Pakistan, India is extending Mitrasandhi. Increasing influence with these countries that are seen to be friends of the enemy is a direct implementation of the Kautilyan prescript.

Saudi Arabia an important state in the Gulf region and has been helpful in Pakistan's efforts at funding the nuclear program as well as other diplomatic support. Though the state must be termed an *Ari-mitra* or friend of the enemy, there is now opportunity for India to forge better ties with this Islamic country. India is a major oil importer of the resource-rich kingdom. With the Iran situation changed, Saudi now has competition in the oil trade and waning customer base with China reducing energy import from it. Together with the cap on oil production and pricing, the Saudis face the difficult choice of allying with a friend's enemy. Pakistani refusal to assist Saudi military campaign in Yemen⁵ is

another reason that must be exploited to the hilt by India. Gaining more influence in the Gulf region would be significant.

The state adjoining Saudi Arabia is Israel which is seen as an enemy's enemy and hence friend. India has now had Karmasandhi relations with this small but significant country. India continues to be the world's largest arms importer.⁶ In fact, Israel has become one of India's largest arms suppliers. The latest acquisitions for India from the Persian Gulf state include anti-tank guided missile systems, precision guided bombs, target tools for Sukhoi aircraft.⁷ It even assists in training Indian Special Forces in counter terror operations. Egypt is another country with historical relations with India. Most of the countries on the Indian Ocean littoral in Africa maintain cordial relations with India. The state of Somalia is an issue as this is a failed state with the pirates and now rebel groups gaining more control. With settlement of Indian diaspora in these countries there is a need to maintain close relations with them.

The African mainland has seen age-old ties with India that was enhanced by the Indians who migrated to these countries for trade and education. The Indian support for decolonisation of the African continent forged strong bonds between the two ancient lands. India enjoyed cordial relations with many of the states. The Chinese foray into Africa ostensibly for development assistance needs to be countered. India has established a listening post in Madagascar. It is also continuously patrolling the Indian Ocean shores off Africa including Seychelles, Mozambique and Mauritius.⁸ The African island country of Mauritius has been offered assistance in military equipment in the form of reconnaissance aircraft as well as joint patrolling of the Indian Ocean waters around the island country.⁹ Even in other countries the establishment of radar stations for coastal patrol by India is a significant move to establish closer ties with countries as Indian Ocean is a vital region for India. In the adoption of *Dana* in the form of Lines of credit and assistance in human resource capacity building and offer of cheaper technology assistance in vital areas of agriculture, information technology, pharmaceutical and health, India has furthered the cause of strategic ties with the region.¹⁰

For non traditional threats arising and facing the Indian Ocean region, India has strengthened its naval presence and reinforced the fighting capacity of its forces. The drastic fall in piracy incidents in this region is also due to the successes India has had in pursuing and quelling pirate menace in these waters. South Africa is another big power in the region

with which India has special ties. The BRICS alliance includes South Africa too. The island neighbours of Maldives and Sri Lanka are also to be included in India's security grid when you make estimates of regional influence and concern. The unresolved issues of fishing in Sri Lankan waters by Tamilnadu fishermen in particular and the domestic conditions in Maldives warrant continued interaction with these countries.

On the other side, India has a stronger power in China the *Parsnigraha* (rear enemy) and hence her seeking to firm up ties with US and even Russia indicate an attempt to balance Chinese influence in the region. Chinese incursion in 1962 could not be warded off individually and so India sought help from the United States. This is in keeping with the prescription in Arthashastra's Chapter VI on Foreign policy "whoever is devoid of necessary strength to defend himself shall seek the protection of another."¹ Gaining access to the Indian Ocean is a vital objective for an energy-deficient and growing economy like China and she has already implemented projects and plans to obtain such a foothold in the region through the development of maritime infrastructure for other littoral states like Pakistan, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Maldives. This attempt is also seen as an encircling tactic. China is today India's largest trading partner and there are talks of India joining the Maritime silk route initiative proposed by China. However India needs to be ever vigilant of antagonistic tendencies in doubtful powers and the imperative of avoiding situations that would warrant outright conflictual stance against equally strong or stronger powers.

India has made efforts in the South China Sea by forging military relations and commercial ties with Southeast Asian nations in general and China's smaller adversary in Vietnam in particular. Trying to maintain friendly relations with contiguous neighbours of enemies is a principal advise offered by Kautilya. Diversification of energy sources has also been one area of interest for India's widening scope of relations with China's neighbours.¹² With Southeast Asian countries, India's relations are generally amicable. Chanakya instructs the king to cement ties with geographical neighbours of enemies and in that sense India has attempted to maintain cordial and in most cases close relations with ASEAN nations through *Sandi* or *Samsraya*. The Chinese augmentation of presence in the region has also seen India respond with establishment of a triservice command in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.¹³ This area is astride the sea lanes leading to the choke point of Malacca Straits

underscoring the strategic importance of the islands and the need to deal with non traditional threats like marine pollution, oil spills that could occur here.

In the Indian Ocean region where India's strategic and commercial interests lie, India's bilateral relations have spanned the entire conflict-cooperation spectrum with the emphasis more on the cooperation range including military exchanges, cooperative agreements, specific areas of interaction and cultivation of friendly relations. All this can also be seen as integral of India's maintenance of a balance of power in the region in her favour.

Conclusion

India's position in the Indian Ocean is one of strength and potential. But there are several issues of concern including the emergence of non traditional security threats like arms smuggling, trafficking, piracy, and environmental effects. These call for waging of an indirect war either by addressing the root of the problem or stemming the support it receives from other competitive countries. This entails employment of SMART power both hard and soft, be it outright military mechanisms like navy or, the softer option of diplomacy which would alter opinions and provide India with adequate choice of means and the manner of response to each of the above mentioned in the Indian Ocean region in particular. The phrase "Smart power" was coined by former US Defence official, Joseph Nye, is a combination of hard and soft power—i.e., the employment of both military and diplomacy tools.¹⁴

Since open war or conflict is not a preferred foreign policy option in today's world, competition and cooperation are more often adopted. However, the traditional threats are still present and hence military preparedness needs to be part of any policy making attempt. In countries like China, India faces competition for areas of influence and benefit. For many states that are less strong, India is sought as either a balancer or an assurer of support and help. There is also the interplay for extra regional powers in the Indian Ocean region. From the above discussion it is evident that the geostrategic situation in India's neighbourhood warrants varied responses after a careful evaluation of threats and concerns as well as India's abilities to deal with them. The article thus proves the validity of the Kautilyan dictates especially in foreign policy options and practices. The need to constantly check the rise of the enemy or contender and

carefully moving the pawns on the strategic chessboard to either appropriately counter the action or curtail it through one's own pre-emption or reaction is derivative of the Kautilyan concord. The befriending of erstwhile friends of enemies or creating a wedge in an atmosphere of disillusion or discord amongst them ascribes to Arthasastra prescriptions. It would be imperative for India to examine the indigenous statecraft treatise in greater depth to derive relevant lessons in foreign policy making and implementation in particular and state governance in general.

At a time when India seeks to gain enhanced status in the world, her focus must be in maintaining power and influence and building new areas of friendship and cooperation while equipping adequately to counter challenges to the above. Augmented research on Arthasastra might help throw new light on this pressing endeavour for India in her dealings with the Indian Ocean region.¹⁵

REFERENCES

- 1 For an exposition on how corporations behave see, Coates Caton, The Ultimate Pragmatist: Kautilya's Philosophy on SMART Power in National Security <http://isme.tamu.edu/ISME10/Coates-Caton10.doc>
- 2 Clement Tisdell, A western perspective on Kautilya's 'Arthasastra': Does it provide a basis for economic science? *Working papers on Economic theory, Applications and Issues*, No 18, January 2003 p.5 <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/90523/2/WP%2018.pdf>
- 3 As cited in Satish Karad , Perspectives of Kautilya's Foreign Policy: An Ideal of State Affairs p.356 <http://files.hostgator.co.in/hostgator201172/file/2015020209.pdf>
- 4 For an in-depth understanding of this idea refer G.Adityakiran's Kautilya's Pioneering Exposition of Comprehensive National Power in the Arthashastra in P.K.Gautam, Saurabh Misra and Arvind Gupta eds., Indigenous Historical Knowledge :Kautilya and his Vocabulary, Vol I, IDSA and Pentagon Press, New Delhi 2015 p.45-59 http://www.idsa.in/system/files/book/book_IndigenousHistoricalKnowledge_Vol-I.pdf (accessed date October 21, 2016)
- 5 Bruce Reidel, Saudi Arabia tilt towards India, *Al-Monitor*, April 6, 2016 <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2016/04/saudi-arabia-tilt-india-pakistan-salman-iran.html>

- 6 India is world's largest importer of arms, *The Hindu Businessline* March 10, 2016
- 7 Franz Stefan Grady, Revealed: India Close to Signing \$3 Billion Defense Deal with Israel, *The Diplomat*, February 10, 2016 <http://thediplomat.com/2016/02/revealed-india-close-to-signing-3-billion-defense-deal-with-israel/>
- 8 <http://www.pambazuka.org/global-south/india%E2%80%93africa-relations-21st-century>
- 9 For a detailed account of Indo-Mauritius relations see, Ramakrishnan Ramani and Dr. Utham Kumar Jamadhagni, "Widening Horizons on the Indian Ocean Indo-Mauritius Relations" in **S. Manivasakan, ed., India and Southeast Asia in IOR: A crystal gazing**, Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Madras, 2013 p.166-185
- 10 Refer to Fantu Cheru and Cyril Obi, India-Africa relations in the 21st century: Genuine Partnership or a marriage of convenience?, *Pambazuka News*, September 14, 2011 <http://www.pambazuka.org/global-south/india%E2%80%93africa-relations-21st-century>
- 11 Shamasastri, *Arthashastra Text* English translation, p. 371 http://www.lib.cmb.ac.lk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Arthashastra_of_Chanakya_-_English.pdf
- 12 Dr. Munmun Majumdar, India's stakes in the South China Sea, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 3 No. 13; July 2013, http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_13_July_2013/28.pdf
- 13 S.Utham Kumar Jamdhagni, India- Southeast Asia Maritime partnership: Case of Indonesia in Manivasakan's ed, **Security Dynamics of India's future relations with Southeast Asian nations**, CSSEAS, University of Madras, 2012 p. 208
- 14 Coates Caton, n.2
- 15 The IDSA project on Indigenous historical knowledge that produced two volumes on what are the Insights the treatise could provide is one such attempt. P.K.Gautam in his article, *One year of Arthashastra : Response, Pedagogy and Research* in P.K.Gautam, Saurabh Mishra and Arvind Gupta eds., **Indigenous Historical knowledge Vol II**, Pentagon Press, New Delhi, 2016 , p. 106-120, explains in detail the stated objectives and achievements of the effort. http://www.idsa.in/system/files/book/indigenous-historical-knowledge_vol-II.pdf

Realism in Kautilya: influence on Indian strategic thinking

Nirmal Jindal

Kautilya was an ancient Indian scholar and statesman who was the first to contribute to the origin of Realism by making power the central point of theoretical framework. As student of international politics, we tend to perceive international politics through western lenses and try to understand international theories through western conception and Indian contribution has long been ignored. The purpose of this paper is to highlight the significance of Indian contribution to the theories of International politics with special reference to Kautilya who wrote Arthashastra in 300BCE, much before western scholars like Machiavelli, Hobbes, Thucydides and others had written. The paper also tends to explore the influence of Kautilya's realism on Indian strategic thinking and why some of his ideas are not applicable in the changed international scenario.

Kautilya's Arthashastra written in 300BCE almost 1800 prior to Machiavelli's 'The Prince', is an extraordinarily detailed manuscript on Statecraft. Henry Kissinger, in his book 'World Order' refers to the Arthashastra, a work that lays out the requirements of power, which is the dominant reality in politics. For Kissinger, the Arthashastra contained a realist vision of politics long before 'The Prince' which Kissinger deems 'a combination of Machiavelli and Clausewitz. Max Weber, the German sociologist called it truly radical Machiavellianism.¹ The Arthashastra is perceived as a masterpiece of statecraft, diplomacy, and strategy. It is an example of nonwestern literature that reflects realism and its relevance for foreign policy in the contemporary international politics. Kautilya wrote Arthashastra for Indian king, Chandragupta Maurya, whose empire was confronting the environment resembling a Westphalian Europe of many states that encompassed most of present day South Asia. Kautilya wrote

Arthashastra as a solution to this anarchical situation and played a leading role in assembling and administering this large empire.

International system

In Arthashastra, Kautilya has prescribed the rules of statecraft for successfully running a state and conducting international relations. Like Sunzi's Art of War, Kautilya's Arthashastra lays down certain rules that are relevant in different situations across eras. Arthashastra discusses a variety of military, political and economic subjects. The underlying basis of Arthashastra's prescriptions is the notion that reasons of state justify various actions and policies regardless of ethical norms. Pragmatism and utility are of key importance to Kautilya and morality has no place in political governance. In Arthashastra, Kautilya outlines the rules of governance, fundamentals of political organizations, details of treasury and accounting, auditing, regulations governing the civil servants, law, foreign policy, prescription for national defense and war. It was written specifically for the ruler as he felt that a ruler can defend his state and its population without a strong army and treasury. Kautilya emphasized on maximization of state power by exploiting its resources and power, by eliminating its enemy state. Those who help in this objective are friends, a state ought to stick to a prudent course, a ruler's behavior must appear just, a peace is preferable to war in attaining a goal.

Kautilya had focused on national interest, maximization of power, strong defense capabilities, diplomacy and war; most of these concepts were highlighted by western realist scholars like Machiavelli who also aimed to strengthen the power of king of Italy. Kautilya emphasized the significance of power in terms of goal attainment, leading to the development of an intricate set of rules where by conqueror could maintain not expand his domain. He also emphasized the significance of strong and powerful king as a solution to anarchical situation. He mentioned that power derived from three elements- power, knowledge, military strength and valour. He considered power both an end and a mean as power was essential both to survive and to protect and advance interest. It was only on the basis of Kautilya's political advice that India was unified by Chandragupta Maurya by expanding Mauryan empire from Modern day Iran to the west, conquering Afghanistan and all parts of Central Asia up to Bangladesh in the East. Kautilya had deliberate interest in political unification and consolidation of different

races and regions. However, his focus was only within the boundaries of South Asia and not beyond. In this context he differs from Western Realists as two world wars were fought for territorial expansion all over the world and western powers aimed at creating empires primarily to exploit these countries economically and committed serious atrocities on the colonial people. In this regard Kautilya differs as he wanted to expand only within the boundaries of Asia and believed in egalitarian society and also wanted that once a state is defeated, its population should be treated well.

Relevance of Kautilya's methods of foreign policy

Kautilya talked about foreign policy objective as enlargement of territory by conquest because he was writing at the time when Indian subcontinent had experienced invasion of Alexander the great in North West India. Invasion, violent competition and conquests among small polities causing anarchy was the context in which Kautilya had written his ideas to make Chandragupta a great king. Therefore Arthashastra is not only about effectively running a great empire but also creating one in a chaotic period. His main objective was to make ruler 'chakravartin' or universal monarch who can put an end to perpetual struggle of contending states and can lead his army to the farthest horizon unchallenged.

Arthashastra covers almost every aspect of statecraft including diplomacy. (2)The concept of Rajmandala provides a framework understanding and analyzing the behavior of nations in contemporary international relations. Unlike western perception that military strength is precondition of peace, Kautilya does not overstate the importance of military hardware for a state to attain peace. Clausewitz considered war an extension of domestic politics, on the contrary Kautilya argued that diplomacy is really a subtle act of war, a series of actions taken to weaken an enemy and gain advantages for oneself, all with an eye on eventual conquest. (3)For healthy and smooth functioning of state, he has given saptang theory.(4)For state survival in anarchical situation and its successful function in foreign affairs, Kautilya's views on Vijigishu, Rajmandala, Matsya nyaya were quite critical concepts to understand or explain the inter states relations during his time which hold significance even in the contemporary international politics. The world was facing Vijigishu (universal monarch) is one of disorder, anarchy and chaos. Given the absence of

international bodies of law that ensures every king's right to exist, irrespective of size, the vijigishu was truly living in the system of matsya nyaya, the law of fish where big one swallows the little one. Because size enhanced security, the objective was to consolidate one's own power at the expense of the other.

For vijigishu to survive in matsya nyaya system, it is imperative to understand king's position in the mandala system of states. The mandala literally means circle with a center or nucleus. which is in this case is vijigishu. The mandala is based on the geopolitical assumptions that vijigishi is center of mandala and his immediate neighbors is his ari or enemy and state next to the immediate neighbors is vijigishu's friend or mitra .In mandala Theory first immediate neighbours are enemies, next to that come friends and after friendly, unfriendly states. Usually friendly states wait till the vijigishu attacks an unfriendly state and then attack from the rear. In mandala system 2 actors play important role, madhyama (the middle kingdom) and udasina (the neutral kingdom.)The madhyama is situated on the border of vijigishu and unfriendly state and is capable of helping either. Udasina is located beyond the border of vijigishu and an in friendly state and is capable of helping, vijigishu, unfriendly state, madhyama states, together or individually, or of resisting any of them individually.

Kautilyas king could attain success in mandala system operating under system of matsya nyaya only by following 6 methods of foreign policy.

1. Sandhi (peace): any inferior nation can make peace with its stronger counterpart. Sandhi signifies treaty or agreement based on the perception that advantage can be derived from peace or war equally. In this situation one should prefer peace than war as war is a gamble and can cause unbearable losses. Peace is considered as temporary and a part of broader policy of lulling the enemy into complacency.
2. Vighraha (War): whoever is confident about its superiority and feels that situation is conducive can launch war. Kautilya identified three types of wars open warfare (normal war), treacherous warfare (using variety of ways to attack an enemy) and secret warfare (using secret agents and occult devices).
3. Asana (neutrality): any nation who thinks that no enemy can hurt or it is strong enough to hurt its enemy shall observe neutrality. The policy of neutrality is pragmatic and changes with

circumstances. There are three aspects of neutrality: stanza (keeping quiet), asana (withdrawal from hostility) and upekshana (taking no strategic steps).

4. Yana (March): whoever possessed of necessary means shall march against his enemy. It can compel the enemy into submission without actually fighting a war.
5. Samshraya (seeking alliance or shelter): whoever is devoid of necessary strength to defend him shall seek the protection of another through alliance.
6. Davidhibhava (double policy): whoever thinks that help is necessary to work out an end shall make peace with one and wage war with another. It can be interpreted as a policy to have peace with neighbor in order to peruse hostility towards the third party. In this scheme, peace with neighbor is temporary and conflict with it is inevitable. It is a policy of diplomatically inducing confidence in enemies and behaving aggressively in secret. (38)

According to Kautilya these methods can be used by king depending on the situation he is facing at a particular time. In order to use them effectively, he suggested some of the tools or instruments. George Modelsky refers to the four instruments as ruler's techniques to peruse his foreign policy successfully. These are SAMA (Conciliation), Dana (gifts), Danda (punishment), and BHEDA (dissension) Zimmer added three additional tools: Maya (deceit), upeksha (indifference), indrajala (magic or trickery in war). Imtiaz Ahmed listed five methods for effective foreign policy which are Sama, Dana, DANDA, Bheda and Maya indrajala.

Sama (conciliation) is used when ruler's success in dangerous situation is unlikely. The USSR used this policy when Gorbachev found it impossible to compete with the US and entered in conciliation by withdrawing from the cold war

Dana is used against inferior kings and discontented people in order to win them without bloodshed. The policy of foreign aid used by major powers is one of the most effective tools of foreign policy in the contemporary international politics.

Bheda (dissension): If Dana fails then the policy of sowing seeds of dissension is to be followed. The purpose of this tool is to create confusion and chaos in their enemy and neutralize their threat.

Maya Indrajala (Deceit or pretense) the ruler could take several measures to outsmart his enemy. This could range from the use of non-aggression pact or treaties to lull their enemies to the policies of wearing a mask of moral probity, religious righteousness or citing moral righteousness to mask one's

intentions and attain them through deceit and presence. The major players in international politics often use treaties or agreement to engage them in some kind of partnership to prevent them from any aggressive action that can be dangerous for the security of major powers.

Danda(punishment by open warfare) : If all the above mentioned methods fail to help the country to achieve its objectives and contain the enemy then the policy of coercion or open warfare is to be undertaken. This action has to be taken with careful and serious consideration depending on enemy's economic conditions in the level of popular support it enjoys. The US action against Gulf or Afghanistan can be analyzed with in this framework. (5)

Theory of Rajmandala

Arthashastra's most timeless observations on foreign policy and international relations are about the relations with the immediate neighbors (hostile) and relations with the nations neighboring these hostile nations. This theory is called the 'RAJMANDALA'. According to this theory, the circle of states, hostile states are those on the border of the ruler's state. In turn the states surrounding this set of hostile countries form another circle which is considered as natural allies. This theory reflects the enemy's enemy is a friend. Element of this logic is found in India's foreign policy.

Most of the South Asian countries encircling India perceive India as a major threat to their security due to its vast land, resources, population, secular and democratic political system. Though India tries to normalize its relations with most of the South Asian countries to stabilize its security and promote regional peace. One of the reasons, India's neighbors feel afraid of India is that it had intervened in some of these countries like Nepal, Bangladesh, and Srilanka, Maldives during crisis situations. India, primarily aimed to exclude the participation of extra regional powers in such crisis situations. Moreover, India record shows that it has no monopolizing tendencies because in most of the cases Indian forces withdrew from the areas after the mission was over and leaving these countries free and independent. In the changed international scenario when world is divided in regional groupings SAARC has failed due to the inimical relations of India and Pakistan as these are the two major countries in South Asia and the stability of the region and success of the regional organization depends on the behavior of these two. In case India and Pakistan normalize their relations rest of the South Asian countries will come around and it will contribute to Regional Peace and rsecurity.However India's

unlimited and constant efforts to normalize relations with Pakistan has not shown results as Pakistan's army survival depends on the issue of Kashmir between India and Pakistan and they want to keep it alive. Pakistan after nuclearisation of India and Pakistan can't resort to war therefore, they have been relying on terrorism as a mean to destabilize and weaken India. India is spending enormous amount to prepare to deal with Pakistan cross border terrorism and its response to Kargil and surgical strike in Pakistan in response to Uri attacks in Kashmir suggests that Pakistan is aware that they can't resort to war to resolve the issue of Kashmir, therefore resorted to the strategy of cross border and state sponsored terrorism. It prevents any possibility of normalizing relations between India and Pakistan. On international forums also Pakistan wants to keep this issue alive in order to malign India's image and also to equate with India. Earlier Pakistan tried to project Kashmir terrorism as fight of right for self-determination but after 9/11 attacks on the US and shelter to Osama in Pakistan has exposed Pakistan's hand in promoting terrorism. In this context, based on Mandala theory, India's relations with countries like Afghanistan and Japan can be categorized as natural allies against Pakistan and China respectively. The theory of Raj mandala can also be applied other regions like Europe, where France and Germany had inimical relations till 1945.

Relevance of use of force

Kautilya's view of human nature regards the possession of power and happiness of a king makes him superior to another. Therefore, king should always endeavor to augment his power and territory to the greatest extent possible. Such a view is similar to offensive realism in international politics which depicts states being power maximisers. The ultimate strategy of state is not to maintain a balance of power between states but to overcome the equilibrium in order to establish stability through hegemony. In this context one can try to understand the US policy to maintain hegemony to establish stability by checking the rising hegemons. In contemporary international politics, it is not possible to expand territories as it is against international law. To wage wars. In the contemporary international politics each country national borders are demarcated and each country acts as an independent actor. Therefore international politics has become democratic and law abiding. Nonetheless world has faced

several wars and the territorial disputes still remain unresolved which suggests that though each country gives priority to national interest and power maximization but traditional tool of war to achieve these objectives has become obsolete. War which was considered by Clausewitz and other realists an essential element or characteristic of international politics, no more valid. Therefore Kautilya's view that states have only permanent interests has universal value. However his view that states will do whatever necessary to pursue these interests, has certain limitations. In the contemporary international politics even major powers cannot behave absolutely the way they want. These nations have to motivate or mobilize the international opinion to execute their actions. The ideological expressions are often used to camouflage the real intent to get support of international community never major powers have to take an aggressive action to achieve their national interests. In the contemporary international politics, the major powers are trying to use global institutions for the global governance. Most of these institutions are governed by major powers and weaker or dependent countries have to accept these rules in order to prevent any possibility of punishment from the major powers. For instance WTO, World Bank and IMF are the tools of governance in the hand of major powers to promote their own national interest at the cost of other nations.

Most of the Kautilya's ideas are reflecting Realism discussed in the western discourse of international politics. Most of these ideas are still quite relevant and most of these tools are used by players of international politics even in the changed scenario. Since independence morality played significant role in India's foreign policy. India's policy of non-alignment, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, and peaceful settlement of disputes were the key tools to achieve peace in the international politics. India believed in democratic international politics in which each country should act as an independent actor in the field of international politics. It also championed the cause of nuclear disarmament. The westerners felt that there was direct contradiction between India's declaratory policy and action. India had been using force since its inception.

India's policy of non-alignment which was adopted by India to keep itself away from Super powers cold war politics. India's main objective was to safeguard her sovereignty through neutrality. It kept it away from wars in given weak strategic position vis-à-vis China. The

main objective was to have peaceful environment conducive for the economic and political development of the country. Non alignment was a strategy to use diplomatic and military means to gain influence despite military and material weakness. It was a cost effective and low risk strategy for newly born, under developed and insecure country likes India. It was a policy that became effective tool to have equal status with countries more powerful than India. In the post-cold war scenario, India has not abandoned its policy of non-alignment though it is not so effective.

In the post-cold war scenario, India rising economic and military power is becoming obvious. India's relations with US are getting strengthened due to the mutual interests of both the countries. India can negotiate for both strategic and international trade issues. It seeks permanent seat in the UN. These policies are product of India's perception of itself in a Matsyay nyaya system.

India had moved from its earlier policies due to the changed strategic environment in the region as well as the world around. Even immediately after independence, India had to use force in case of Hyderabad (1949), Junagad (1948), Goa (1961) and East Pakistan (1971) to maintain its territorial integrity. Even in the nuclear scenario, India had used its force in case of Kargil (1999) and also launched surgical strike on terrorist camps in Pakistan in response to Uri attacks (2016). It shows that India still follows Kautilya in its strategic culture as it considers use of force as relevant to maintain its territorial integrity. Therefore the world is still an anarchic arena where power is the ultimate guarantee of security.

Kautilya's theory of matsya nyaya, mandala, and shadguna are having significance for India even in the contemporary international politics. Kautilya's mandala theory reflects India's friendly relations with Afghanistan, Vietnam and Soviet Union and inimical relations with Pakistan and China while rubbing its shoulders with rich and powerful northern world. India is emerging as a major power in the world politics with vast land, resources, population, educated youth, sixth blue water navy, and sixth nuclear country in the world, aspiring permanent seat in the UN, securing its interest in Indian ocean that spanning from Gulf to South East Asia. Though Kautilya's views are not the only one shaping India's strategic culture, it is one of the important factors.

REFERENCES

1. Akhilesh Pilllamarri, Chanakya: India's truly Radical Machiavelli, Indian strategic Studies, January 29,2015
2. Talk by Michael Liebig on 'Relevance of Kautilya's Arthashastra for Modern Political Science" Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis, Feb. 13,2014
3. Boesche, Roger, Kautilya's Arthashastra on war and Diplomacy in Ancient India in 'the journal of Military History, vol. 67,no.1,January 2003, pp 9-37
4. Chttaranjan Roy, Kautilya: Saptanga, Dharma, And Mandala, in MP. Singh and Himanshu Roy, Indian Political Thought(ed), N.D., JNANADA PRAKASHAN, 1998
5. Rashed Uz Zaman, Kautilya: The Indian strategic thinker and Indian strategic culture, comparative strategy, national institute of public policy, 25: 231-247,2006

Contemporary Relevance of Kautilya's Mandala Theory and Concept of Diplomacy

Tridib Chakraborti

The history of ancient Indian political thought is of great significance and of practical utility for a clear understanding of the political wisdom of our ancestors. Kautilya, the great Indian social, political, military and economic master strategist of the 4th Century BC, remains an enigma in the world of international relations, political science, foreign policy and the other social sciences for his ideas of extreme realism and uncompromising shrewdness to preserve the welfare of the state and expansion of the kingdom. However, Kautilya's genius transcends the realm of politics and also acquires extreme significance in other fields such as economics, development studies and of course, military sciences. The chief advisor and mentor to the great emperor Chandragupta Maurya, Kautilya is one of the most intriguing figures in Indian history itself, his exact origins and lifetime among other facts remaining a matter under debate till this day among historians and archaeologists. Without the help of Kautilya, Chandragupta would perhaps never have become the emperor of Magadha. His magnum opus, the Arthashastra, is a comprehensive work which may be called one of the finest, if not the finest works of ancient Indian political and economic thought. Kautilya's contribution through Arthashastra had also, no doubt, added to the totality and continuity of the subject of Political Science and International Relations and remained a compendium of all the Arthashastras, which were composed by ancient writers for the acquisition and maintenance of the 'earth'.

Kautilya, also known as Chanakya, was an original thinker. His ideas were novel and he took political thought in ancient India to a new level. He was perhaps the first Indian thinker to take such a pragmatic and secular approach to realpolitik. According to Prof.

Jayantnuja Bandopadhyaya, Kautilya was even more sophisticated than the modern realists like Hans J. Morgenthau who were confused between means and end as compared to the Indian genius who clearly stated that happiness is the end and power is the means to it.¹ In fact, the discovery of the Arthashastra restored Indian prestige and comprehensively shut the mouths of the critics who had accused Indian Thought, political or otherwise to be devoid of rationalism and dichotomous, being solely based on religion, dharma and spiritual values and lacking in dialectics and materialistic values in contrast to Western Political Thought which was scientific, rational, followed dialectics etc. When it was known that Kautilya was the seventh person to have worked on the Arthashastra (meaning there were 6 before him), the western scholars got a bolt from the blue and had to admit that Indian Political thought could well be as if not more shrewd and materialistic. Kautilya's work was actually extremely value free, amoral and behavioural,² his latter concept developing in the West only after the Second World War. The uniqueness of Kautilya lies in the fact that unlike most thinkers on polity of his age, Chanakya was both a political thinker as well as a statesman. Not only did he give extensive treatises but also participated in the social and political revolutions of his age.³ Living in turbulent times in Indian history, Kautilya was able to prove his abilities and left a legacy that is followed and admired in awe by scholars and statesmen alike even two and a half millennia after his death. Being the shrewd realist that he was, he used many Machiavellian tactics (only that he preceded the Florentine by more than 1500 years) such as treachery, shrewdness, use of amoral strategies in statecraft for the betterment and expansion of the kingdom of the vijigishu (the conqueror). However, he also laid down a lot of ideas on the management of the economy, administration and guiding the ruler on how to rule. He has also been compared to Sun Tzu, the great Chinese military strategist and author of the "Art of War".

Kautilya's ideas on diplomacy and foreign policy have been clearly laid out in his work. His idea of realpolitik is known as his famous "mandala" theory. It is a master work of diplomacy and statecraft of the ancient world. Even after 2500 years of its writing, Kautilya's ideas and tactics continue to be used by statesmen and diplomats around the world today. The Arthashastra and the Mandala theory have a lot to teach us today in many ways and forms. It is not that Kautilya was not derided for his efforts. Even a millennium and half ago, Kautilya was a

highly controversial character. In the seventh century AD, Bana, one of the greatest of ancient Indian prose writers and adviser to one of the greatest of Indian kings, Harsha, expresses his contempt: "Is there anything that is righteous for those for whom the science of Kautilya, merciless in its precepts, rich in cruelty, is an authority . . . ?"⁴ Against this backdrop, the main purpose of this article is to explore and critically analyze the genius of Kautilya and try to understand the contemporary relevance of his ideas and the mandala theory.

Who Was Kautilya?

Kautilya (370-283BC), also known as Chanakya or Vishnugupta Sharma or just Vishnugupta, Dramila (among many other names) was born sometime in the 4th century BC, perhaps in 370 BC, although the dates are highly debatable among scholars. This is due to unavailability of sanguine sources and fixed records of his birth and death. Available sources are mainly second-hand and taken from Buddhist and Jain traditions. However, it is mutually agreed upon by most scholars that he lived around this period and was certainly the political guru of Chandragupta Maurya. In fact, the etymology of the name "Kautilya" itself has many arguments. One opinion is that it comes from the "Kutala" gotra or clan, to which he belonged. Others opine that Kautilya is a form of the Sanskrit word "kutila" meaning complex or shrewd. That way Kautilya would mean one who is "kutila". History and folklore has merged in case of Kautilya. Many stories, almost mythical have grown around him and his life, many of which even contradict one another. However, they all prove one thing: Kautilya was a great man, someone who had earned the respect of the people. He was the embodiment of wisdom to the common people and thus found the place of the wise man of the fables.

Born of a Brahmin family, Chanakya was probably a citizen of Magadha (though it is contested by many other views, like the Chozhiar Tamils who claim that Chanakya was a Dravidian and Dramila is the root of "Dravid", some say that he was a Keralite)⁵ and was educated in the University of Takshashila or Taxila, then a famous University in north-western India and now in present-day Pakistan. He remained connected to the state of Magadha through the commercial routes at the base of the Himalayas. In his early years he was tutored extensively in the Vedas. According to some, Chanakya memorized them completely at a very early age. However, he was more proficient in the

sciences and humanities. It is said that he taught mathematics, geography and science along with spiritual education. Chanakya taught subjects using the best of practical knowledge acquired from the teachers. However, he was most proficient in teaching military studies and diplomacy. The age of entering the University was sixteen. The branches of study most sought after around India at that time ranged from law, medicine, warfare and other disciplines. The celebrated scholars, Bhadrabhatta and Purushdutta were, according to many, taught by Kautilya.⁶

This was a time of great instability in North-West India. The kingdoms were weak and there was a continuous internecine war. Later there would be the Greek invasion by Alexander to deal with. Political turmoil in Western India at that time caused by Greek invasion forced Chanakya to leave the University environment for the city of Pataliputra (presently known as Patna, in the state of Bihar), which was ruled by the king of Magadha of the Nanda dynasty, Dhanananda. Although Chanakya initially prospered in his relations with the ruler, being a blunt, or realistic as many would prefer, person he was soon disliked by Dhanananda. Kautilya had become the President of Sungha/Sangha or Trust which controlled the Royal charity. Dhanananda removed Kautilya from the post without any reason and utterly insulted him.⁷ Humiliated, he promised to dethrone the emperor and obliterate the Nanda dynasty. At this juncture he met Chandragupta, a bright young man of royal blood. Under the guidance of Kautilya, Chandragupta defeated the Nanda King and established the famous Maurya Empire.

According to early texts, Chanakya was responsible for the education and later, policy guidance of Chandragupta. It was he who installed Chandragupta on the throne and thus brought to power the dynasty whose most illustrious ruler was Ashoka, Chandragupta's grandson. Chandragupta gained his first successes, soon after the death of Alexander the Great, in campaigns against some of the satraps of the Macedonian conqueror who had established them in west of the Indus⁸. It was through Kautilya's persistent guidance and strategy that Chandragupta was able to overrun the Greeks and other Indian rulers in North-West India. It is said that Chandragupta, accompanied by Kautilya had met Alexander during his stay in Punjab. It is quite possible that he learnt a thing or two from the Macedonian. Some believe that Chanakya admired Alexander and appreciated some of his tactics,

especially conquering one adjacent country after the other and becoming the overlord of a huge international system (the Macedonian empire). Prior to Chandragupta, Alexander could well have fitted the idea of Vijigishu. According to Greek historians, the young Chandragupta met Alexander, angered him, and was ordered to be killed but fled. A Pali work describes how Chandragupta and his minister Chanakya recruited an army from the disaffected people of the Punjab who had resisted Alexander and then overthrew the existing government of India.⁹ The Greek satraps Nicanor and Philippos were assassinated by spies working under Kautilya. "The assassinations of the Greek governors," wrote Radha Kumud Mookerji, "are not to be looked upon as mere accidents."¹⁰ When Alexander's empire was divided after his death in 323 BC, the Indus valley had already been lost to Chandragupta; Eudemus left India in 317 BC. Seleucus, the ruler of the eastern portion of the Greek empire, encountered Chandragupta in 305 BC and had to cede the Hindu Kush mountain area for 500 elephants, which enabled him to defeat Antigonus at Ipsus.¹¹ Meanwhile, Chandragupta had already overthrown the Nanda dynasty in 324 BC.

After the overthrow of the Nanda dynasty, Kautilya established himself as the chief minister of Emperor Chandragupta Maurya. Thereafter he sought to build upon and consolidate the imperial authority and expand the Mauryan kingdom. His masterpiece, the Arthashastra was written during this time. It was again under Kautilya's auspices that the Mauryan Empire was able to expand and bring most of the Indian subcontinent under its suzerainty. However, he was equally conscious of building a strong economy and consolidation of the domestic policy. Megasthenes, who was sent as the Greek ambassador to the court at Pataliputra, wrote a book on India (Indica). The Indica greatly praises Chandragupta's rule and Kautilya. According to him, Kautilya was the genius behind the wise and powerful Emperor Chandragupta. The Indica further states that, "a royal road of more than a thousand miles connected the northwestern territory with this capital. Megasthenes described how this vast empire was ruled by Chandragupta, who conducted public business and judged causes throughout his waking day. Provinces were ruled by governors and viceroys and the Emperor himself with the help of his council. An intelligence system, which included courtesans, reported to the king. Irrigation was regulated, and the army had more than 600,000 men;

but they were outnumbered by the farmers, whose work was respected even in wartime.”¹²

Kautilya wrote two main books, The Arthashastra (the more celebrated work), on war, diplomacy, economy and statecraft among other things for the ruler. The other book was called the *Niti Shastra*. The Niti Sashtra dealt as an advisory book to the Monarch on how to lead a balanced and virtuous life. The Arthashastra contains his famous “*Mandala*” theory, which was the main apparatus of his diplomatic stratagem. Kautilya is generally recognized as the first main thinker to have systematized the school of political thought known today as Political Realism. It was using the mandala theory that Kautilya was able to spread the Mauryan Empire to every nook and corner of the Indian subcontinent. When Chandragupta abdicated, the Mauryan Empire not only encompassed most of the Indian subcontinent, but also stretched to Gandhara, Kamboja (what is present day Afghanistan) and perhaps even into parts of Central Asia.

After ruling for about 30-40 years, Chandragupta renounced worldly life and lived as an ascetic at Sravana Belgola. Kautilya lived on in the capital, Pataliputra to guide his son Bindusara. Kautilya probably passed away in 283 BC. Again, there are many versions concerning the circumstances of his death.

A versatile genius, Kautilya did not only prescribe to the king on how to be a conqueror, but also how to make his kingdom strong and stable and keep the subjects stable. He also advises the king to be virtuous and reasonable. No doubt, Kautilya wanted the expansion of the empire with harsh or even devious measures. A number of authors have explored these domestic policies, but very few scholars have focused on Kautilya’s discussions of war and diplomacy. And yet, his analyses are fascinating and far-reaching, such as his wish to have his king become a world conqueror, his evaluation of which kingdoms are natural allies and which are inevitable enemies, his willingness to make treaties that he knew he would break, his doctrine of silent war or a war of assassination and contrived revolt against an unsuspecting king, his approval of secret agents who killed enemy leaders and sowed discord among them, his view of women as weapons of war, his use of religion and superstition to bolster his troops and demoralize enemy soldiers, his employment of the spread of disinformation, and his humane treatment of conquered soldiers and subjects. Most of the

above-mentioned concepts are unique and fascinating as they are intriguing, especially for his times. All these make Kautilya an interesting and educative person for a student of foreign policy even today. More importantly, even more than 2500 years after the writing of Arthashastra, we still find many of these tactics in use in contemporary politics, diplomacy and espionage. Thus, the Arthashastra and its Mandala theory remain relevant even today.

The Arthashastra

Literally translating, Arthashastra means “the Science of Wealth or Economics” or “how to acquire the earth” It was written sometime in the 4th-3rd century BC. The authorship of the Arthashastra has been a subject of debate among Indologists. However, no proof having been established that Chanakya Kautilya did not write it, little is to be gained here from pursuing the controversy. If he is accepted as the author, the work itself may be dated at about 300 B.C.¹³ In Arthashastra, Kautilya discussed in details the concept of Welfare State, the role of King, the Civil Service, Food and Agriculture, Industries, Control of Market, Law and Justice, Social Life, Food and Drink, Strategy, Selection and Training of Employees, Leadership Skills, Legal Systems, Accounting Systems, Taxation, Fiscal policies, Civil rules, Slaves and Labourers, Religion, Diplomacy etc. The entire contents of the Arthashastra were broadly divided into three groups: (i) Theory of Kingship; (ii) Theory of Law and Administration; and (iii) Theory of War and Diplomacy. It is a comprehensive masterpiece encompassing all aspects of state administration and foreign policy and also contains a lot of work based on the subjects of politics, economics and administration and also sociology.

The Arthashastra lost for around 2000 years when it was found in Mysore in 1904. It shot into the limelight with a Sanskrit manuscript was translated into English by Dr. R. Shamasastri in 1915. Kautilya's work, which in English translation is about 200,000 words long, covers a wide field and not all of it would today be of interest to students of politics. Key parts contain detailed provisions of civil and criminal law, or recommendations on military tactics or the use of magic. Others discuss the duties of various government officials, and as such are valuable as sources of information about the details of life in that period. On the other hand, the Arthashastra does not concern itself with questions of political philosophy and morality (what is the state, the

nature of political obligation) which have been the favourite topics of much of the more contemporary academic discussion of politics. Only about one-quarter of it deals with matters properly a part of International Relations. These parts, nevertheless (chiefly Books I, VI-IX, XII-XIII) still arouse interests of students and scholars around the world even today.¹⁴

The Arthasastra remains highly relevant even today. There are thousands of examples to give. In fact, the Kautilyan state has been called by many scholars as a welfare monarchy as the first objective of the king is to secure happiness for the subjects. The scope of the Arthasastra is humongous. The purpose of this article is to highlight Kautilya's Mandala theory and some of his ideas on war, diplomacy and foreign relations and how these concepts are still relevant today.

The Mandala Theory

The mandala system was a theoretical construction of states by Kautilya in his Arthasastra. The word "*mandala*" means circle in Sanskrit. It is a geographical concept of division of lands of the king (the *vijigishu*) and the neighboring kingdoms. It was "perhaps the first theoretical work on an ancient system of kings, kingdoms and empires in the intellectual history of mankind that can be considered to be analogous to a model of international relations."¹⁵ Kautilya's fundamental objective was to make the state, the Empire, that is, safer, stronger and expand the same. "Kautilya's work represented the dominant trend in ancient Indian political thinking, in so far as it regarded territorial conquest as a necessary political function of every monarch."¹⁶ Kautilya envisaged that the potential conqueror king (the *vijigishu*) could become the overlord of the international master system of politics if he followed the mandala theory. He has provided many strategies and methods to reach his ultimate goal. For Kautilya, the ultimate goal of the *vijigishu* is the attainment of happiness and welfare of the kingdom. Kautilya adds that this can be attained only from conquest. And to attain this goal, he must be prepared to do anything and everything, for nothing is superior to the welfare of the state. For Kautilya war is necessary and diplomacy is nothing but preparation for war. He said that "*A King who understands the true implication of diplomacy conquers the whole world.*"¹⁷

Kautilya also made an assumption that every immediate

neighboring state is an enemy, or at least the vijigishu should see his immediate neighbor as an enemy. On the other hand the state next to the neighbor's state will be the enemy of the enemy. Thus the third state will be a natural ally for the vijigishu. Thus alternate states are enemies of each other in Kautilya's mandala.

The Main Components of Mandala Notion

The Mandala theory is at the core of Kautilya's conceptualization of state affairs, which is the theory of supremacy. The enthralling discussions on Rajmandala i.e. 'the circle of kingdoms', on the theory of Shadguna, i.e. six fold policy or six measures, and on diplomacy, remarkably cover almost all of the aspects of foreign policy, which can be found relevant even today. Kautilya assumes the position of the state in geographical terms amidst a geographically contagious circle of other states. These circles are known as the mandalas. The players in the chessboard of the mandala theory are as follows:

1. **The Vijigishu:** The potential conqueror or the central king. Kautilya will call a king vijigishu if and only if he has the ambition as well as the potential strength to go on conquest. It is important to note that when one talks about the central king being the vijigishu, he is not the only one who is a vijigishu. Any and every other king in the mandalas who have similar ambitions and the potential strength may be called a vijigishu. Thus, it is not that there is only one vijigishu in the mandalas. In this concept, the border of the kingdom of the vijigishu is divided into two parts, the front and the rear.
2. **Ari:** The immediate neighbor in the front is the Ari, or the Enemy. As mentioned above, all neighboring states are enemies and the Ari is the enemy in the front.
3. **Mitra:** The next neighbour to the Ari, or the enemy of the enemy. Kautilya's foreign policy is based on the principle of "the enemy of the enemy is my friend". Mitra means friend or ally in Sanskrit. Mitra is the natural ally of the vijigishu.
4. **Ari Mitra:** The next state adjacent to the Mitra's front border; or the mitra's arch enemy is the Ari Mitra. Naturally the Ari Mitra is the ally of the ally of the Ari (enemy) and enemy of the Vijigishu.
5. **Mitra Mitra:** The next state adjacent to Ari Mitra (his arch enemy). He is naturally the Mitra's friend and the vijigishu's ally as well.
6. **Ari Mitra Mitra:** Ari Mitra Mitra is the friend of the Ari Mitra.

Naturally he is allied with the Ari and enemies with the vijigishu. These are the five kingdoms to the Vijigishu's front. The Vijigishu, Mitra and Mitra Mitra are friends. (Thus kingdoms 1, 3 and 5 are allies). On the other hand, Ari, Ari Mitra and Ari Mitra Mitra are friends. (Thus kingdoms 2, 4 and 6 are allies). Moreover, 1, 3 and 5 are enemies with 2, 4 and 6.

Besides this, the same pattern of mandalas applies to the vijigishu's rear borders,

7. The immediate neighbour (enemy) is the **Parashanigraha**.
8. The next kingdom, the ally in the rear is called the **Akranda**.
9. The friend of the enemy or the next kingdom in the rear is the **Parashanigrahasara**.
10. The friend's friend in the rear is the **Akrandasara**.

Therefore, in the rear too there is a similar alliance. The vijigishu is allied with 8 and 10. (1, 8 and 10 are in an alliance). Meanwhile (7 and 9 are allies and are opposed to the vijigishu)

In this pattern the opposing alliances must continually prepare for war and try to obliterate the enemies. As mentioned earlier, diplomacy for Kautilya is nothing but preparation for war. He also says that stances change alternatively in diplomacy due to changing conditions arising due to changing political circumstances. He also recognizes the existence of middle kingdoms or kingdoms not belonging to either of the alliances.

With these in mind, we may observe that there are two more kingdoms in the Kautilyan mandala.

11. The **Madhyama** or the intermediary. The madhyama king is defined as the one "who occupies a territory close to both the conqueror and his immediate enemy in front and who is capable of helping both kings, whether united or disunited, or of resisting either of them individually." Thus the madhyama king occupies a strategic position in Kautilya's mandala.
12. The **Udasina** or the neutral. The udasina king is defined as one "who is situated beyond the territory of any one of the above kings, and who is very powerful and capable of helping the enemy, the conqueror, the madhyama king together or individually or of resisting any of them individually."¹⁸

Kautilya then has divided neutrality into three categories:

1. **Sthana**: Keeping quiet or not saying or taking any action in response to the activities of the actions of the vijigishu or any of his friends or allies.

2. **Asana:** Withdrawal from hostility. It is when a king withdraws himself from any kind of hostility between any of the kings who are in the alliances.
3. **Upeksha:** Negligence. It can either be that the concerned king is not bothered about what the kings in the alliances are doing or intentionally not taking part in the diplomatic game.

The status of a particular king as an intermediary or as a neutral of any of the three types is not a matter of permanent character. It is solely a matter of expediency and depends entirely upon the judgment of the king of the intermediary ruler. The said ruler will take into account his own capabilities and interests vis-à-vis that of the other kings in the given environment in the given time and political conditions. Thus it all depends on the political situation and the judgment of the ruler.¹⁹

In fact, Kautilya believed that nations acted in their political, economic and military self-interest. He thought that foreign policy or diplomacy will be practiced as long as the self-interest of the state is served because every state acts in a way to maximize the power and self interest. He thought that the world was in such a state that a kingdom was either at war or was preparing for a war and diplomacy was yet another weapon used in this constant warfare. He believed that diplomacy is a series of actions taken by a kingdom such that it gains strength and eventually conquers the nation with which diplomatic ties were created. He also believed that treaties should be made in such a way that King benefits and serves the self-interest of the Kingdom.²⁰ This basically means that in the game of diplomacy, no position (ally or enemy) is permanent. When circumstances change, the diplomatic stance also has to change. For example, Vijigishu (state 1) is allied with state 3 (Mitra). Now if there is a war between the Mitra (state 3) and Ari (state 2 and arch enemy of Vijigishu) and Mitra conquers state 2 (Ari), a new situation will emerge. State 3 will become adjacent to state 1 (the vijigishu). Now adjacent kingdoms are the greatest threats according to Kautilya. Thus now, Mitra (state 3) will become the new enemy (the new Ari) for the Vijigishu. Similarly, the Vijigishu will have to change diplomatic stances with the other states in the mandala as well. The initial alliance with state 3 was to check and weaken state 2 which was then adjacent to and threatening the vijigishu. Now that the situation has changed, so have the stances. Just like Lord Acton said, "no permanent friends, no permanent enemies,

only permanent national interests.” Kautilya followed the same policy 2000 years before Lord Acton was born. Thus, be it friendship, enmity or neutrality, it is all transient and depends entirely on the circumstances and self interest of the willing rulers.

Therefore, the twelve kings constitute the Kautilyan international system. The vijigishu, his allies, the Mitra and the Mitra Mitra constitute a circle of a Mandala of states. Similarly, the Ari and his allies also constitute his own mandala of states. The madhyama king and the udasina king also have their own allies and along with them, they form their own mandalas. It is clear from his concept that there are three levels of analysis in the Kautilyan model of an international system. At the **first level**, there are four mandalas.

1. The Vijigishu’s circle of states
2. The Ari’s circle of states
3. The Madhyama’s circle if states
4. The Udasina’s circle of states

At the **second level** of the Kautilyan setup, there will be the independent kings who are allies with other kings in the circle. For example, the vijigishu, mitra and mitra mitra are the 3 independent kings in the 2nd level.

The **third level** is the lowest level. It is a system within the system by itself. It is that of the King and his kingdom. According to Kautilya, each king has 5 sovereign elements in his kingdom. Without these sovereign elements, a state cannot exist or be run. Moreover, the king is the centre and fountain head of all authority. The other 5 elements depend on the king’s diktat. Thus each state has 6 sovereign elements including the king. The six sovereign elements (including the king) are:

1. The king.
2. The ministers
3. The territory of the kingdom
4. The fort (military stronghold and base)
5. The treasury
6. The imperial army (the Kautilyan army is an imperial army and a standing army)

Therefore, each mandala in the political system consists of eighteen

(18) elements. ($6 \times 3 = 18$, 6 elements in each state and there are 3 states in a circle/mandala). And the international system will contain 72 ($18 \times 4 = 72$) elements.

The central dynamics of the Kautilya system take place when the Vijigishu's mandala (circle) gets into a conflict with the Ari's circle. However, the focus of the conflict remains on the vijigishu's circle. But again we must remember that, as mentioned earlier, any of the Kings in the system may emerge as the Vijigishu. It is not that only one king nourishes aspirations to become a vijigishu/conquerer.

The Six Forms of Diplomacy of the Kautilyan Model

Happiness is the ultimate goal and power is the means. This has been clearly elucidated by Chanakya in the Arthashastra. Now, to maximize happiness through the use and manipulation of greater power, Kautilya prescribes six forms of policies to be pursued by the vijigishu according to the needs, circumstances and objective. These six policies are to be used for the proper implementation of the mandala theory and suit the different circumstances arising at different political periods. The six policies are:

1. *Sandhi*: Peace, here defined with "agreement with pledges."
2. *Vigraha*: Offensive operation or war.
3. *Yana*: Parading or marching the army against the enemy or along the borders.
4. *Asana*: Showing indifference or neutrality
5. *Samasraya*: Alliance or friendship.
6. *Dvaidibhava*: Double dealing, i.e making peace with one and waging war with another.

Now each of these policies is also of various types and manners and their implementation varies accordingly as well.

Sandhi—Sandhi means alliance or accommodation, which means that kings seek to accommodate each other and do not resolve to hostile means. These *Sandhis* could be temporary or permanent and it depends on the environment and relative powers, situations and interests of the kings. The various sub-forms in this *sandhi* have been practiced by statesmen at different points of time in history. The different types of Sandhi are:

1. Hinasandhi: When the sandhi is defined in terms of a **Treaty of Peace**. Hinasandhi is further classified into three parts:

- a) **Dandopanata:** Where the army remains the main subject matter of the treaty. Example: START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) and SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation treaty) signed by the USA and USSR/Russian Federation are two examples of dandopanata treaties in modern times.
- b) **Kosapanata:** When the kosh or finance is the main subject matter of the treaty. When two countries sign a treaty regarding finance, draw a common budget, trade barrier removal or trade treaties, it may be referred to as kosapanata.
- c) **Desopanata:** When it is land or territory that is the main subject matter of the treaty. In 1903, when the French decided to give the British a free hand in Egypt while Britain agreed to recognize Morocco as a French protectorate, there was an exchange of land. This can be known as desopanata treaty.

2. When the Sandhi is used in form of an Alliance and the Treaties based on alliance are also of five types:

- a) **Mitrasandhi:** It is an alliance of friendship. It is an agreement with an ally on some definite terms and conditions. An example of Mitrasandhi from the modern day can be the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship in 1971. It was signed between India and the erstwhile USSR based on some definite terms and conditions. It was signed mainly to secure Soviet support in case of an American attack as USA had been an ally of Pakistan. It was agreed upon by India and USSR that if USA attacked India while backing Pakistan, USSR would help India.
- b) **Hiranyasandhi:** This is when two states sign an agreement for the purpose of accumulation of gold or finances, it is called hiranyasandhi.
- c) **Bhumisandhi:** It is when there is an alliance for land. When the signatories agree to acquisition of land, it is called bhumisandhi. Example: In Southeast Asia, Thailand occupied Cambodian territory by a treaty, unlike China.
- d) **Karmasandhi:** Agreement to use the army for common enterprises. There are quite a few examples of Karmasandhi. Otto von Bismarck had used karmasandhi against Austria when it was agreed upon to use both armies in the Schleiffen Plan and threaten Russia. Likewise in 1956, Britain and France sought to send forces to the Suez Canal to “protect it from Israel-Egypt conflict” and retain control over the canal which was nationalized by the Egyptian president, Nasser. The Indo-Sri Lankan treaty of 1988

can also be termed as *karmasandhi* where both India and Sri Lanka decided to use their armies for a common cause: to eliminate the LTTE.

- e) **Anavasitasandhi:** It is an agreement to help in colonizing an unsettled land. Example: the dispute over the Sabah islands between holders Malaysia and the Philippines. Britain's foreign policy of helping the USA in every foreign intervention and control may be called as some sort of *anavasitasandhi*.²¹

Vigraha—*Vigraha* means hostility shown to neighbour or a state. Kautilya strongly believed that the states are always at war and seek power and hence it is necessary to have hostile foreign policy towards few states which are either equal in power or subordinate in power.²² However, with reference to *vigraha*, Kautilya attaches more significance to a diplomatic struggle than an armed conflict. According to Kautilya, the neighbour must always be kept under a tirade of diplomatic attacks. There should be various reasons to start war. The usual causes for which states may enter war with each other are:

1. The desire to attain imperial status: The words speak for themselves. Wars of conquest have always been used to attain imperial status. It makes the king respected and feared in the *Mandala*.

2. The necessity of self preservation, protection on the state: Kautilya recommends war if there is a threat to the very existence of the state itself. He followed a prevention is better than cure approach. He asked the king to nip the problem in the bud by attacking rather than wait to be attacked. Example in modern day history, in 1967 Egypt and other Arab States surrounded Israel with their armies with the objective of obliterating Israel from the map. The Israelis decided to strike first rather than wait to be attacked. They won a remarkable victory of the numerically superior Arabs.

3. To acquire more territory and/or tributes: The reasons are obvious. Kings always sought to expand their territories to acquire more land and more resources. Conquering new territory also meant elimination of enemies and larger frontiers to defend the kingdom. The new lands act as a buffer between the state and other kingdoms.

4. The restoration of the Balance of Power: If the balance of power between the states is disturbed due to certain conditions (say for example if one state grows too powerful), a war may be pursued to reduce the situation back to equilibrium.

5. War in retaliation for raids on the kingdom's frontiers: It may be called "surgical operations." Sending a clear signal to the Ari that never to attack the kingdom again. For example, this principle has been applied occasionally by the Government of India, under the UPA and NDA (Modi) governments against the multiple terrorist groups operating from the Pakistan soil in Kashmir and

in the past years also against the terrorist groups operating from the Myanmar soil in the Northeastern States.

6. War waged to rescue the oppressed populations of a misruled state: According to Kautilya, a war may be waged by a king if he feels that his neighbour is oppressing his subjects or oppressed population would be loyal to him because of religious or sectarian ties. Example in modern history: The first Balkan war was fought mainly to “rescue oppressed Christians from Ottoman misrule.”

Kautilya has given an advice that if profits of kings under agreement are equal to all, a treaty of peace should be entered, if unequal war is advised. He also mentioned that before a war starts, an aspiring king should carefully assess the strength and weakness of himself and of his enemy. He should make alliance with another power in the event of danger. The ‘conquest of the earth’ may be the goal cherished by the sovereigns, but they will have to wait for favourable circumstances.

In victory, Kautilya suggested that vijigishu should declare himself to be entrusted with the task of restoring peace and for that prescribed pacification, reconciliation and settlement as a means. Besides this, Kautilya also mentioned three types of conquerors and they are as follows:

- a) Dharmavijaya:** When the conqueror behaves like a genuine king. It is when he does not oppress the conquered people. He invades, attains his objective and returns without any booty. Example: When India invaded Maldives in 1988 to rescue the ruler from a coup d’etat. The Indian Army went, eliminated the hostiles and came back.
- b) Lobhyavijaya:** To conquer for “*labh*” or profit. It is when a ruler invades a country to capture land, money and other resources. There are examples galore of this type of conquest. Any imperial conquest will be an example.
- c) Asuravijaya:** It is conquest for plunder, i.e. to take away everything, including land, money, resources, sons, women, etc. from the conquered territory and also by taking the life of the latter. *Asura* is the Sanskrit word for demons. Kautilya does not like Asuravijaya because he feels that it is not a behaviour befitting a wise king.

The Types of War or the Code of Warfare as prescribed by Kautilya

In the days of Kautilya, it would be probably a comment on the limits of ideology when it comes to applying it to practical matters that despite the strong “religious” base of Indian thinking, a strong school of realpolitik also appeared in India side by side with it. Thus,

ancient Indian thinkers produced two schools of war, diplomacy and interstate relations; the dharmayuddha (ethical warfare) school; and the kutayuddha (devious warfare) school. The two schools were, however, not mutually exclusive. The practitioners of each school were informed by the principles and methods of the other and practiced them.²³ Thus we see that two alternate but not mutually exclusive schools of warfare existed. Based on these, Kautilya laid out four types of warfare:

1. **Dharmayuddha:** It is just or ethical warfare. It is when war is carried out for a just cause, to do justice on behalf of the vijigishu. Example: wars carried out to punish the enemy as retaliation for raids.
2. **Prakashayuddha:** Open war. It is a full scale war fought in the broad daylight. We must remember that in Kautilya's time wars were fought only in the daylight. Attacking at night was considered dishonourable. The India-Pakistan War in 1971 can be cited as an example in this context.
3. **Kutayuddha:** Treacherous or guerrilla warfare. Kautilya calls guerrilla warfare treacherous because the guerrillas do not come out in the open and fight with regular armies. Plus they attack at night. However, Kautilya says that guerrilla warfare may be resorted to under special circumstances like when it is a matter of survival for the vijigishu in the wake of a very strong invader. Or when the rightful vijigishu has been dethroned, kutayuddha may be resorted to by him to overthrow the king. In fact, kutayuddha was resorted to by Chandragupta himself against the Greek rulers in the North West and the Nandas for a while before he became emperor. In modern times, there are plenty of examples of kutayuddha. Che Guevara, Mao Tse Tung, Vo Nguyen Giap, Augustinho Neto, etc all resorted to kutayuddha.
4. **Nimnayuddha:** It is low order warfare, fighting in trenches. It is highly dishonourable. It is when conspiracy and other perverted and lowly methods are used to gain military success.
5. **Akasayuddha:** It means aerial fighting. The Iraq- Kuwait and allied powers war in 1991 is a clear example of Akasayuddha and Prakasayuddha.

Yana—Yana means preparedness to march. An invading army could embark on a march after properly safeguarding its own states. The vijigishu should march only when he is confident that he would be able to destroy the enemy's works. If the conqueror finds his enemy

beset by troubles, his subjects disaffected and disunited, his kingdom ravaged by epidemic and other ills, then he may attack. He should also lead an expedition against the enemy in the front after making peace with the rear enemy. For example, the military preparations that India did before fighting the 1971 war against Pakistan to victory – training the Mukti Vahini, augmenting the Air Force and Army in east. Also as a case in the point is the preparation which Pakistani army regulars / mercenaries did before the 1999 Kargil war – building bunkers, stocking rations and carrying out logistical activities during winters.

Asana—Asana is a condition of armed neutrality or holding a post against an enemy. By asana, Kautilya envisaged a condition of armed neutrality. The nuclear explosion of India and Pakistan in 1998 and maintenance of Balance of Power in the South Asian region can be cited as an example in this context.

Samasraya—This is a policy of protection where a stronger state intervenes and shelters a weak state. Kautilya advocates this policy when a stronger state needs a shield to protect itself from an equal power it is good to use this policy of protection for a third state and use this alliance to defend against the potential enemy. In one sense the colonization was followed where European powers started controlling weak nations in Africa and Asia and thus strengthening their position against one another.²⁴ However, in the Kautilyan model, samasraya or alliance with a superior power is temporary in nature and ad hoc in basis. A few examples of samasraya are: the Panchasheel treaties between India and China and India and Myanmar, Treaty of mutual friendship between USA and Pakistan. The USA wanted to have a dependable ally in the region to check Soviet entry into the Persian Gulf via Iran. Also India had rejected alliance with the USA on grounds of non alignment. The Treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between India and USSR in 1971 and the Treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Vietnam in November 1978 are also examples of Samasraya. The former was signed by India to enlist Soviet safeguard in order to make sure that USA does not intervene in any war with Pakistan. It turned out to be prescient as USA was unable to help Pakistan out India fought the war of liberation of Bangladesh in December 1971. The latter treaty was signed by the USSR because USSR wanted to have a strong ally in South East Asia to counter their differences with China.

Dvaidibhava—Dvaidibhava means duplicity or double dealing or making peace with one and waging war with another. This type of strategy involving duplicity is recommended for larger and stronger states. For example, the Kauravas allied with their allies to make war on Pandavas and Pandavas allied with their allies to make war on Kauravas. Another example: Allies v/s Axis Powers in WW II – the UK, the USA and the USSR were key allies pitted against axis powers whereas Japan, Italy and Germany were Axis Powers pitted against the allies. Likewise, this was very much an integral part of Bismarck's foreign policies. Henry Kissinger of West Germany followed this strategy where he made alliance with China such that at no time Russia and China could become closer in ties than US and China. Kautilya advocated the same concept within his Mandala framework.²⁵ Kautilya further states that dvaidibhava has five categories:

1. **Mithyachitta**: To put a mithya or false face or apparent consciousness. Here, to dislike someone but pretend to be friendly.
2. **Mithyavachanasamyam**: To speak out one thing but have exactly the opposite in mind. Example: The Treaty of non aggression between Nazi Germany and Poland in 1933 in which Hitler said that he had no intention of ever attacking Poland. It was exactly the opposite as in September 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland to start the Second World War.
3. **Mithyakarana**: Doing something apparently for the good of another state but subverting the same to serve his own interests. Example: President Jayawardene tricked Rajiv Gandhi to get India involved in the LTTE crisis. India fell for the trap. It was the Indian army that had to deal with the war, the mess and refugee problems as well. Rajiv Gandhi paid with his life as LTTE managed to assassinate him. Jayawardene meanwhile managed to secure Sri Lankan safety through Indian blood. It was the Indians who fought their battle, for their interests.
4. **Ubhayavetana**: To secretly accept emoluments from the enemy while in service of his master. There were plenty of such defectors in the Cold War era. Such double agents made espionage very intriguing during that era.
5. **Yugmaprabhritaka**: To pretend to collect men and money for another expedition but on the other hand spend it on some other purpose of self interest. Example: in 1950, David Ben Gurion of Israel asked Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for one billion dollars as "compensation for Nazi atrocities on the Jews and their economic rehabilitation." However, he spent the money on buying arms to fight the Arabs.

Thus, having used these six forms of policies, the King must incessantly try to increase his sway over the mandalas and stop not until he conquers the whole world. The six forms of diplomacy are to be used in various permutations and combinations depending on the given time and situation, he must use them to gain the maximum benefits.

The Instruments of Diplomacy or Chatur Upayas

Kautilya prescribes the four upayas or ways to enforce the king's hegemony in the mandala. These are methods of persuasion and tacit measures to get the writ of the vijigishu running in the mandala and these are the ways to consolidate his rule. Kautilya realized these are recognized expedients, because as a realist thinker, he knows fully well that although trickery and deceit play important part in politics, diplomacy by trickery seldom helps a country to achieve its objective. The four upayas are:

Sama—It means a general attitude of friendliness and gullible persuasion, the way of polite argument, an approach based on reason and interest. Kautilya advises the vijigishu to follow this policy on the conquered ruler in order to secure his loyalty. The vijigishu must not go plundering. He must show respect to the conquered people, protect their villages, respect the women, and take care of their farms, forests, animals and livelihood. Through this policy, a weaker king can thus be brought under control. The annexation of Sikkim by India in 1975 can be cited as an example with reference to this means.

Dana—Dana means concession. Kautilya advised the stronger rulers to make concessions to the weaker rulers in an unequal alliance. The weaker kings can be brought into a fold of some sort of obligation and loyalty this way. In diplomacy, if the policy of Sama is successful but cannot produce the desired result in full, then Kautilya's advice is to follow the policy of Dana. It means nothing for nothing is the rule in diplomacy and for gaining an important object one should be prepared to pay something. This includes agreement involving loss, limitation of interest, withdrawal, and something advantageous to the other party in exchange for gaining one's own objective. The example in this context is— the USSR supplied India with Heavy Water in 1978 without any corresponding return. They did it even though the newly elected

Janata Party government was not as pro-Soviet as the Congress regime. This was done to win Indian sympathy towards the Russian cause.

Bheda—If neither persuasion nor compromise succeeds then Bheda is recommended by Kautilya. Bheda signifies the policy of divide and rule. Kautilya referred Bheda as an important adjunct to diplomacy through which even a strong king could be brought to his knees and a great power could be subdued. According to Kautilya, there are multiple ways of sowing seeds of dissensions, e.g. by instigating any of the neighbouring kings, a wild chief, a scion of enemy's family of an imprisoned prince. Films like Sholay, A Dirty Dozen and Shahenshah can be cited as examples in this context. Bheda was an important means for an ancient conqueror and even today, it is still used by many countries in order to promote their national interest. The British rulers ruled India for more than two hundred years by using this policy of divide and rule. They also applied this policy in Malaysia by employing divisions between Bumiputera on the one side and Chinese and Indians, on the other.

Danda—Finally, there is Danda or the use of force. Normal diplomacy includes a judicious blend of the first three methods. But if they fail, then Danda is to be applied. Danda means punitive measures. It means using force or other economic measures to punish another state and forcing it to yield to the vijigishu. Kautilya also says that it is in human nature that without Danda, there can be no obedience. In all ages, the application of physical force is irrefutably regarded as the most effective means to bring the desired results relating to inter-state relations. Therefore, it is not necessary to equate Danda with war. Danda was a diplomatic war and not an armed contest, rather a last alternative before the definite commencement of fighting. Kautilya then referred to 3 types of Danda:

1. **Sanctions:** For example, sanctions on Libya, South Africa are examples of sanctions in the recent past.
2. **Blockades:** example is Cuban Missile crisis
3. Refusal of Right to Passage, Bockade, Boycott, etc.

Other than these, Kautilya has also advised the vijigishu to make most of the devious ways to secure foreign interests and these include the use of spies, saboteurs and the lure of women to cause rupture and defection among enemy ranks.

Sub-methods of Diplomacy

Although the four upayas are the recognized devices for the application of six forms of foreign policy, Kautilya further mentioned three more methods of diplomacy, viz. Upeksha, Maya and Indrajala. Here Kautilya recognizes Upeksha, not as a separate policy, but as an aspect of Udasina. International law always respects neutral power. This was the ethics of ancient India's international law. No belligerent disturbed the king of indifferent attitude. So, it was the privilege of the weaker power to adopt the attitude of Upeksha and to hide his own weakness. That is why Kautilya presented the most practical advice that even when provoked, a weaker King should bear it and adopt the attitude of Upeksha. Maya, according to Kautilya is a baser kind of diplomacy and it embraces cunning and intrigue as its method. Maya is a method under Danda. Finally, Indrajala is the use of tricks for victory over the enemy.

The Role of Ambassadors in the Kautilyan Model

The ambassadors occupy a very important and admirable place in the Kautilyan model. An envoy or an agent was an important component for the success of diplomacy. An ambassador, through his supreme intelligence and personality, can change unfavourable conditions into favourable ones. The importance of this role is so vital that even Bhagwan Sri Krishna himself went to the Kaurava Court as an ambassador. In Arthashastra, Kautilya uses the word *duta* and he classified it into three categories:

- a) **Nisristartha:** It means one who possesses ministerial qualification and has the full powers of negotiation, also known as the Charge d'affairs.
- b) **Parimitartha:** It means one who possesses same qualification, less by one quarter and has been entrusted with a definite mission.
- c) **Sasanaharah:** It means one who is simply tasked to convey the royal message and take back the reply, possesses the same qualifications less by one half and is a conveyer of royal writs. The film *Goopy Gyen and Bhagha Bayen*, directed by Satyajit Ray can be cited as an example in this context.

In Arthashastra, Kautilya mentioned that the ambassador remained the most important module and he could assume any role for the benefit of his country. He was a spy in a legalized form and it was his

duty to survey the strength of the country to which he was assigned. He shall make friendship with enemy's officers, such as those in-charge of wild tracts of boundaries, of cities and of country parts. He shall also discover the size and area of the enemy's forts and of the state, as well as the strongholds of precious things and assailable and unassailable points. In Kautilyan model, there are two types of ambassadors:

1. **The Dyut or messenger:** All diplomatic messages are delivered by the dyuts.
2. **The Char or the Spy:** This is the most important type. The spy has to collect all the necessary information as well as carry out covert operations. Moreover, we also see that Kautilya has recommended that spies should also be spied upon. Counter-spying is very important in order to check defections and rely on the validity of information. A spy can be deployed to do various types of work. Although employed mainly to procure information, they can also be used to carry out assassinations, sabotage or rupture. The Arthashastra gives a clear account of how female agents can be used to cause personal troubles among enemies. For example a female agent can bewitch two enemy kings (who were friends) and propose to each of them. Kautilya had remarked, as just one possible tactic among many, to women as weapons of war, stating that "keepers of prostitutes should make the (enemy's) army chiefs infatuated with women possessed of great beauty and youth. When many or two of the chiefs feel passion for one woman, assassins should create quarrels among them." Secret agents can destroy high officers in the enemy army either with poison or with "love-winning medicines."²⁶ Now the two erstwhile friends would go to war against one another for the woman. This would weaken, if not eliminate two enemies at one go.

Requirements for a Good Spy

Kautilya has made certain recommendations as the attributes for good spies. He should not be addicted to wine and women. On the contrary he uses women to attract enemy spies and cause damage. Now the question is how should a good spy procure vital information? Besides this, Kautilya then referred the following as the places to collect vital information for the spies:

1. **The marketplace:** The talk of the general population gives a good idea of the prevalent public opinion. It gives leads about whether

the subjects are happy with the King or not. The market also gives a clear picture of the socio economic structure of the kingdom, whether it is prosperous or not. It also indicates the prices and other prevalent economic aspects of the regime.

2. **The temple area:** Religious spots are very important. All types of people go there. More so if the times are bad. Thus a lot of important information can be collected from the temple area.
3. **Astrologers:** When people pass through bad times, they are more inclined towards astrologers. Thus we see that if lots of people are going to astrologers, the omens are bad, implying the people may be passing through a bad time. It may have political implications.
4. **Widows:** Widows are the most pitied upon in the Hindu society. They can be used to innocuously procure a lot of information that might come in handy. Likewise, the guise of a widow is also very apt for a spy as a widow will not be suspected of being a spy.

Kautilya also lists the various guises in which a spy can operate

1. **Fraudulent disciple:** disciples are men of religion and will not be suspected easily
2. **Farmers:** They have the access to a lot of the information as far as crop growing is concerned. The guise of a peasant may turn out to be a vital source of information for the spies regarding food reserves of the enemy king.
3. **Merchants:** Merchants can slip in easily among foreign territories and gain access to market information very easily.
4. **Palmists and astrologers:** People go them when they are passing through bad times. Hence gullible information can easily be collected from them. This is an example of an astrologer could be used to defeat/weaken/eliminate a king: One should arrange for a secret agent, disguised as an astrologer, to tell a high officer that he has all the marks of a king, now it would be easier for the spy to instigate him against his ruler. This might just lead to civil war.
5. **A cook or a waiter:** A spy in the guise of a cook or a waiter can approach a general or high official and tell him that the king asked him to poison him but the cook decided not follow the king's order on moral grounds. This would lead to the general losing faith in his king and believing that the king wants to kill him because he feels that he is a conspirator. Such a general will not be expected to remain loyal to the king anymore.

6. Widows: They are sympathized in the Hindu society. Thus it would be highly unlikely for a widow to be suspected as a spy. Moreover, it would be extremely difficult for the authorities to crack down on widows.
7. Beggars: They are again hard to detect and can find information on the streets. They are also not paid much attention, a perfect guise for covert actions.

Kautilya further mentioned in a discussion about sowing dissensions among oligarchies, where he suggested that “assassins should start quarrels by injuring objects, cattle or men at night,” “should stir up princelings enjoying low comforts with (a longing for) superior comforts,” and “should start quarrels among the followers of the chiefs in the oligarchy by praising the opponents in brothels and taverns.”²⁷ The goals of these endeavours were constantly to “sow discord” and to foment and inflame “mutual hatred, enmity and strife.”²⁸ Kautilya then prescribed that to procure genuine information, there were also spies to spy on the spies. They were not to know each other except when cooperation was necessary. According to him, the spies were regarded as highly indispensable and their work was of highest importance and this is evident from the fact that Kautilya has devoted as many as four chapters to this concept. Kautilya then highlighted the pivotal role of the ambassador and clearly mentioned that the ambassador once he receives the necessary information from Dyat and Char, he is to send his reports home in a cipher code, following which the vijigishu is to decide which of the six policies he is to applied or follow.

Which States to Attack?

We have seen the six tools of Kautilyan diplomacy and also the four methods or upayas of implementing the same. Now, the question arises, how to systematically start attacking? Which states are to be attacked first? Answering these questions, Kautilya says that expansion by a prosperous kingdom was inevitable, natural, and good, and as a consequence, moral considerations did not enter into his deliberations, only what counted was what was for the good of the kingdom.²⁹ If a king can win, then he should go to war. Before making any offensive man oeuvre, he should assess two things, his own strength vis-à-vis that of his enemy (that is precisely why reconnaissance is so important) and the prevalent geographical conditions. As Kangle says,

the Arthashastra “preaches an ideal of conquest.”³⁰ But the question that who should be attacked is not an ethical question. The decision takes only careful calculation and observes the principle that a king should attack weakness. Certain states are vulnerable. If a state is unjust, then its people will welcome a deliverer from a tyrannical king; if a kingdom is weakened from a poor economy, or if a state has experienced some kind of calamity ranging from fires to flood or famine, then a king “should make war and march against him.”³¹ As Dr. Rajendra Prasad says, Kautilya believed that “whenever an enemy king is in trouble, and his subjects are exploited, oppressed, impoverished and disunited, he should be immediately attacked after one proclamation of war.”³²

Carrying out the War Effort

On making war, Kautilya makes many careful observations. Kautilya thought there was a “science” of warfare, presumably part of a larger science of politics. The Commandant of the Army, he suggested, should be “trained in the science of all (kinds of) fights and weapons, (and) renowned for riding on elephants, horses or in chariots.”³³ Just as Machiavelli advised his Prince to attend to matters of warfare constantly, so did Kautilya advise the king not to leave military matters entirely to others: “Infantry, cavalry, chariots and elephants should carry out practice in the arts outside (the city) at sun-rise. . . . The king should constantly attend to that, and should frequently inspect their arts.”³⁴ Just as the king’s agents spied on officials in the state bureaucracy, so too must the king have spies to assess the loyalty of soldiers. What greater threat is there to a king than having a military coup remove him from power? Kautilya recommended that “secret agents, prostitutes, artisans and actors as well as elders of the army should ascertain with diligence, the loyalty or disloyalty of soldiers.”³⁵ He was wary of the fact that the army could take part in internecine squabbles and could use its arsenal to overthrow the king. Thus the armed forces must perpetually remain under the King’s control and be loyal.

In his section on foreign policy, Kautilya wrote a startling sentence: “Of war, there is open war, concealed war and silent war.”³⁶ Open war is obvious, and concealed war is what we call guerrilla warfare, but silent war is a kind of fighting that no other thinker I know of has discussed. Silent war is a kind of warfare with another kingdom in

which the king and his ministers—and unknowingly, the people—all act publicly as if they were at peace with the opposing kingdom, but all the while secret agents and spies are assassinating important leaders in the other kingdom, creating divisions among key ministers and classes, and spreading propaganda and disinformation. The three types of war have already been discussed. According to Kautilya, “Open war is fighting at the place and time indicated; creating fright, sudden assault, striking when there is error or a calamity, giving way and striking in one place, are types of concealed warfare; that which concerns secret practices and instigations through secret agents is the mark of silent war.”³⁷ In silent warfare, secrecy is paramount, and the king can prevail only by “maintaining secrecy when striking again and again.”³⁸ This entire concept of secret war was apparently original with Kautilya.³⁹ Open warfare, Kautilya declared, is “most righteous,”⁴⁰ but he was willing to use any and all kinds of warfare to achieve consolidation and expansion of the kingdom. There is no question of morality here—other than the general good of one’s kingdom—but only of strategy. Kautilya advised the king that “When he is superior in troops, when secret instigations are made (in the enemy’s camp), when precautions are taken about the season, (and) when he is on land suitable to himself, he should engage in an open fight. In the reverse case, (he should resort to) concealed fighting.”⁴¹ How different all this is from the image of war, certainly exaggerated, found in the Hindu epics, the Mahabharata, or the Ramayana, of the central figure being the great hero in the chariot who frightened all before him.⁴²

Thus, we see that Kautilya was a proponent of a welfare state but definitely encouraged war for preserving the power of the state. He thought that the possession of power and happiness in a state makes a king superior; hence a king should always strive to augment his power. This actually coincides with Weber’s view that there is no morality in international politics which means that states must be at war all the time. Kautilya though did not state this explicitly, but we can infer that he did presume that war is natural for a state.⁴³ On the other hand, he like Thomas Hobbes believed the goal of science was power. He said that, “*Power is strength and strength changes the minds*,” hence he used power as a tool to control his society as well as his enemies. He also believed that it is the King’s duty to seek material gain, spiritual good and pleasures. In this he again clearly comes out as a realist and also shows that he does believe in ethics of

responsibility.⁴⁴ Kautilya thought that for a King to attain these three goals, he must create wealth, have armies and should conquer the kingdoms and enlarge the size of his state. This is quite interesting because he in a way does believe that a state's superiority is in its military and economic might which is what later philosophers and rulers have followed.⁴⁵

Hence, we see that Kautilya gives us a good view of how to manage the state. We have analyzed how Kautilya believes in the power game and has given a perfect theory on how to aggrandize power through various means. "Truly radical 'Machiavellianism,' in the popular sense of that word," Max Weber said in his famous lecture "Politics as a Vocation," and he further remarked "is classically expressed in Indian literature in the Arthashastra of Kautilya (written long before the birth of Christ, ostensibly in the time of Chandragupta [Maurya]): compared to it, Machiavelli's *The Prince* is harmless."⁴⁶ Truly, it was tough meat for the western political thinkers to digest on discovering that a more Machiavellian Machiavelli had existed in India almost 2000 years before the Florentine.

Kautilya's Mandala: Its Advantages, Disadvantages/limitations and Relevance in Contemporary Global Order

The mandala theory was the first model of an international political system. Although it was written more than 2000 years ago, it contains a high degree of sophistication. Kautilya has clearly defined the universal set of his international system, the boundaries of the four mandalas (circles of states) as well as the boundaries of the structural elements and the subsets. Kautilya has also shown a high degree of sophistication with regard to conceptualization and classification of the various levels and typographies of the system as well as of the policies.

According to Prof. Jayantanuja Bandopadhyaya, Kautilya's work even supersedes that of the modern realists like Hans J. Morgenthau who have muddled up the two. Kautilya clearly stated that happiness is the king's end and power is the means to acquire the same. Kautilya developed a value-free realist international relations model more than 1500 years before Machiavelli or any western scholar of his type did. Thus he may be called a pioneer in this regard. As illustrated with examples earlier, most of the aspects of Kautilyan diplomacy in the

mandala are found in modern day diplomacy in some way or the other. Be it espionage, or the six policies or the four upayas, all are in some way or the other relevant in today's world. Moreover, in Kautilya's model, there is no such concept of 'permanent friends' or enemy, because today's mitra may appear tomorrow as ari or enemy. This idea is quite pragmatic from the perspective of international relations.

However, like all theories in social sciences, critics have pointed out a few lacunae in the Kautilyan model.

First, Kautilya takes the concept of geographically contiguous states to be natural enemies as sacrosanct. However, whatever the situation in his days might have been, this assumption is not always correct. Neighbours can be enemies but this is not a fixed concept and does not apply all the time.

Secondly, Kautilya has been ambiguous in defining the role of the madhyama and udasina kings. They have been meticulously defined but little attention has been taken to describe their role in the political process. Kautilya says that the madhyama king is capable of helping the vijigishu, ari or resisting them. But he says nothing regarding how, when or in what way does he use his capabilities.

Thirdly, the Kautilyan model is highly unstable and in the long run, it is perhaps a self-destructing system. There will be no homeostasis or equilibrium in the international order because once the vijigishu embarks upon his military venture, he is going to be perpetually embroiled in unmitigated conflict. Equilibrium will never come back. Even if the vijigishu succeeds in establishing a world empire, he will be able to do so only by destroying all the other structural elements in the international system and replacing it by a world empire. Thus, the system remains self-destructive in its entirety.

Finally, the Kautilyan model does not pass the test of the theory of evolutionary survival. The inevitable self destruction is not evolutionary and the system does not satisfy the behavioural theory as evolutionary survival is the minimum systemic goal. The madhyama and udasina kings have been given no stabilizing role in the system which practically makes it redundant. In fact, the system lacks any kind of stabilizing force.⁴⁷

Despite these criticisms from the modern point of view, the Kautilyan model is a very interesting work of political science written more than 2000 years ago. Although the system on its own may be redundant in today's world, most of the ideas and concepts of the Kautilyan model are very much in use today. In fact, for centuries after Kautilya's death, statesmen in various places in various times and circumstances have used the Kautilyan ideas time and again unknowingly (example: Machiavelli and Bismarck did not know that they were using Kautilya's ideas). Thus we see how politically viable Kautilya is as a thinker. A small example can be given using his ideas of espionage. The best spies and security agents, Kautilya recommends, are orphans who are nurtured by the state. More than two millennia later, the KGB and Ceaucescu's Securitate in Romania would follow this principle; particularly in Cold War-era Romania, the most feared agents were those taken out of Romanian orphanages as children by the regime and raised in special hostels, ensuring their single-minded loyalty and implacable ruthlessness.⁴⁸ So, here is the true relevance of Kautilya today. Kautilya does not exist in a theory that is running the world. He exists in the political actions and strategems of the given day. In other words, he lives through diplomatic actions, not books.

Conclusion

The above discussion clearly reveals that studying Kautilya is an enriching and intellectually stimulating experience. The man has written on practically anything and everything on the subject. A comprehensive realist that he was, Kautilyan models may be used as they often are used to play international politics. A simple example would be in case of Kashmir, where Pakistan and China are allies in the mandala system. It is the perfect application of the Kautilyan model to trouble India.

Not only is it that Kautilya is relevant today but also it should be pointed out equally that we have a lot to learn from him. His life displays an eclectic mixture of calmness as well as shrewdness, ambition and aggression along with compassion and above all, the judicious use of strength. The other aspects of the Arthashastra speak of welfare of the kingdom. We must remember time and again that the king's main objective should be the welfare of his subjects.

Therefore, it can be said without any wavering that Kautilya's

comprehensive genius is an intellectual wonder which needs to be further read and tapped out for the intellectual nourishment of the mind. Unfortunately, Kautilya is not so popular among the common people outside India. Even in India, few know more about the man than the legends. We may safely assume that for the sake of betterment of academics, more people must be made to read Kautilya's Arthashastra and his innovative ideas.

REFERENCES

- 1 Jayantanuja Bandopadhyaya, *A General theory of International Relations*, Allied Publishers, 1993, p. 8.
- 2 *Ibid*, p. 8.
- 3 M. V. Krishna Rao, *Studies in Kautilya, Kautilya*, Mandali Publication, Mysore 1953, see Introduction
- 4 Bruce Rich, *To Uphold the World*, Beacon Press, Boston 2010, p. 67
- 5 For details see, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chanakya>, (accessed on 16 September, 2016).
- 6 *Ibid*.
- 7 For details see, <http://www.mapsofindia.com/who-is-who/history/Kautilya.html>, accessed on 18th September 2016)
- 8 George Modelski, *Kautilya: Foreign Policy and International System in the Ancient Hindu World*, The American Political Science Review, Vol. LVIII, September 1964.
- 9 For details see, <http://www.san.beck.org/EC10-Social.html>, (accessed on 18 September, 2016).
- 10 Radha Kumud Mookerji, *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times*, 4th ed, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988 1966), pp. 28-33.
- 11 For details see, <http://www.san.beck.org/EC10-Social.html>, (accessed on 16 September 2016).
- 12 *Ibid*.
- 13 George Modelski, n.8, p. 550.
- 14 *Ibid*.
- 15 For details see Jayantanuja Bandopadhyaya, *Kautilya's Mandala as an International System*, School of International Relations and Strategic Studies, Jadavpur University, Calcutta, 1991, pp. 1-13.

- 16 *Ibid*, p.1.
- 17 Roger D. Spegele, “Three forms of Political Realism”, *Political Studies*, Vol. 35, 1987, pp. 189-210.
- 18 Jayantanuja Bandopadhyaya, n.1, p. 3.
- 19 *Ibid*.
- 20 Pravin Chandrashekharan , *Kautilya: Politics, Ethics and Statecraft*, Munich Personal RePEe Archive (MPRA), May 2006
- 21 *Ibid*, p. 13.
- 22 *Ibid*.
- 23 For details see, http://ignca.nic.in/ks_41041.htm(accessed on 15 September 2016).
- 24 Pravin Chandrashekharan, n.20, p. 6.
- 25 *Ibid*, p.14.
- 26 *Kautilya, The Arthasastra*, 2d ed, ed. and trans. R. P. Kangle, Part II of The Kautiliya Arthasastra, Motilal Banardisass, Delhi, 1922. Please note that book 12, chapter 2, line 14, page 463; afterward referred as hereafter has been mentioned like this, 12.2.14: 463
- 27 *Ibid*, 1 1.16:455.
- 28 *Ibid*.
- 29 Roger Boesche, *Kautilya's "Arthaśāstra" on War and Diplomacy in Ancient India*, *The Journal of Military History*, Vol. 67, No. 1 ,January 2003, p. 28.
- 30 R. P. Kangle, *The Kautilya Arthasastra, A Study* Vol. 3, Motilal Banardisass, Delhi, 1992 1965), p. 263.
- 31 *Kautilya, The Arthasastra*, n.26, 7.4.15: 332-33.
- 32 Rajendra Prasad, *Politico-Geographical Analysis of the Arthasastra* , nter-India Publications, New Delhi, 1989, pp.58-60
- 33 *Kautilya, The Arthasastra*, n. 26, 2.33.9: 180.
- 34 *Ibid*, 5.3.35-36:304.
- 35 *Ibid*, 5.3.47: 305.
- 36 *Ibid*, 7.6.17: 339.
- 37 *Ibid*, 7.6.40-41: 342.
- 38 *Ibid*, 7.13.43: 366.
- 39 Bimal Kanti Majumder, *The Military System in Ancient India*, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 2nd edition, Calcutta, 1960, p.63.

- 40 Kautilya, The *Arthasastra*, n.26, 10.3.26: 440.
- 41 *Ibid*, 10.3.1-2: 438.
- 42 Majumdar, n. 30, p. 29.
- 43 Pravin Chandrashekharan, n.20, p. 6.
- 44 *Ibid*
- 45 *Ibid*
- 46 Max Weber, "*Politics as a Vocation*," in *Weber: Selections in Translation*, ed. W. G. Runciman, trans. Eric Matthews, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978, pp. 212-25 and 220
- 47 Jayantanuja Bandopadhyaya, n. 15, pp. 8-10.
- 48 Bruce Rich, *To Uphold the World: A Call for a New Global Ethic from Ancient India*, Beacon Press, Boston, 2010, p.67.

How the PM Governs: Directions and Issues in The Modi Government

RFI Smith and Sharif As-Saber

Abstract

This paper examines the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government elected in 2014 and the directions taken by it under the leadership of Prime Minister Narendra Modi. After a spectacularly effective election campaign, the Prime Minister has continued as the very public face and driver of the government. The paper examines how the government operates, what it has done, what it has not done, and issues that arise from its first two years. The paper's account of how the government operates is provisional. Hope and opportunity are invoked through repeated references to government intentions. But transformation is promised through little steps. Tensions remain between expectations and results and, more widely, between the measured pragmatism of the story of the government so far and the other stories that travel with it.

Introduction

This paper examines the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) government elected in 2014 and the directions taken by it under the leadership of Prime Minister Narendra Modi. After a spectacularly effective election campaign based on his personal dominance and the aspirations he invoked, the Prime Minister has continued as the very public face and driver of the government.

The paper examines how the government operates, what it has done, what it has not done, and issues that arise from its first two years. However, in doing so, it is useful to distinguish between at least five separate but overlapping post-election stories. The first is about the organisation and policies of the central government, which are the principal focus of the paper. The second is about the continuous

campaigning by the Prime Minister regarding the achievements of the government. The third is about the related state electoral campaigns directed by the president of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the major party in the NDA, Mr Amit Shah, who is also looking ahead to the next national elections in 2019. The fourth is about the cultural and religious campaigns by various parts of the *sangh parivar* (family of Hindu nationalist organisations) about which the Prime Minister has generally remained silent but with which a number of ministers have been associated and which are reflected also in Mr Shah's electoral strategies. The fifth is about the Prime Minister's energetic international diplomacy which has drawn enthusiastic responses from Non Resident Indians (NRIs), increased interest in India by foreign governments, but also aroused fears about foreign influence on Indian society. The stories do not fit easily together. Because they overlap as well as diverge they present analytical and narrative challenges. Further, different observers see different things.

For this reason the paper's account of how the government operates is provisional. It concludes that the record so far comprises careful macroeconomic management, with little emphasis on structural reform; modest but soundly based budgets; a mix of incremental and feasible projects; rebranding and adaptation of programs of the previous government, especially use of IT to deliver payments and services direct to citizens; ambitious initiatives, the feasibility of which has provoked debate; and bold claims and announcements which further extend doubts about feasibility. Hope and opportunity are invoked through repeated references to government intentions. Repeated reference is made, for example, to reform, transformation, performance, development, integrity, accountability, and transparency. However, so far, bold policy and management steps such as the introduction of a Goods and Services Tax are in a minority. Transformation is promised but through little steps. There will be no "big bang". In these circumstances tension between actions and claims attracts critical comment and speculation (see for example, Harikrishnan; Mayer).

Critics, especially economics commentators on the political right, propose more ambitious reforms which make structural changes in the economy and de-emphasise the role of the public sector. These include: advocacy of bolder, more market oriented programs to promote economic growth and employment; public sector reform to cut the

scope of the civil service and improve its capability; reform of budget processes and expenditure management; divestment of public sector business undertakings, especially those moribund and loss making; streamlining relationships between the central and state governments, especially in the regulation of business; and greater encouragement of foreign trade and investment (see, for example, Sharma, 2016 a; Dhume). Other critics present a profusion of viewpoints, including those of government supporters disappointed at the pace of change (see, for example, Singh, Muthuraman). A persistent suggestion is that the BJP, if not the government itself, is pushing forward on too wide a front, especially on the agendas of the *sangh parivar* (see, for example, Pradhan; Varadarajan; Das; Mukhopadhyay). It is feared that government achievements will be swamped by backwash from other stories. With the passage of time clearer views may emerge. But at this stage the record of what the government has done is counterpointed by lengthening lists of issues it has yet to address or on which it faces policy and political risks.

How The Government Operates

The government took office in an atmosphere of exceptional hope: hope that it would bring opportunities; and hope that Mr Modi would do for India what he was perceived as having done for Gujarat. Two catchphrases from the election campaign in 2014 flowed forward into government. The first was ‘together with all, development for all’ (*sabka saath sabka vikaas*, २०१४, २०१४). The second was: ‘minimum government, maximum governance’ (*nyoonatam sarkar adhikatam shaasan*, (M/B(\$ २०१४) २०१४). While the previous United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government had promised inclusive growth it suffered from divided leadership and ineffective delivery. In consequence ‘maximum governance’ held strong appeal because it promised drive. In Hindi the word for governance (*shaasan*, २०१४) is used also for administration and other terms such as kingship, dominion, rule, direction, edict, management and guidance. While debate continues about the meaning of ‘minimum government’ (it perhaps denotes the more prosaic ‘minimum bureaucratic prerogatives’), ‘maximum governance’ promised that Mr Modi would drive the government. He was expected to make the most effective use of the institutions and tools of government and bring alive the hopes of his supporters.

The Prime Minister leads the government through his personal authority and a small circle of close ministerial and official associates. As in Gujarat his approach is top down rather than bottom up and directive rather than negotiated (Kumar: 80-81). While Cabinet processes, Ministerial leadership and collaboration between Ministers are important, direction comes from the Prime Minister's personal contacts with senior civil servants and from an influential, well-resourced and largely merit-based Prime Minister's Office, with extensive reach into the civil service on the Prime Minister's behalf. Policy directions depend much on the Prime Ministers personal assessment of situations and opportunities. Standards are set by personal example; the Prime Minister's firm statements (Won't take bribes; won't let others take bribes either, *na khaunga, na khane dunga*, literally 'will not eat, will not let others eat', (>> , (>(G &B>) have cut high level participation in corrupt activities at the centre. Ministers are appointed at his discretion. Former mentors and ministers have found they can make no assumptions; similarly, as became clear when he reshuffled and expanded the ministry in mid-2016 (to a total of 76, including 26 in Cabinet) close personal relationships can be secondary to getting the job done. However, getting the job done is also not always enough. Track record in the *sangh parivar* is also an important criterion. So is not making waves in unwelcome ways.

A big ministry and a broad government agenda do not indicate a wide dispersion of discretion. The minister most often associated with Prime Ministerial decisions is the Finance Minister, Arun Jaitley. He has also appointed capable and energetic ministers in portfolios concerned with infrastructure. But the Prime Minister's closest associate is Amit Shah, elected president of the BJP with Modi's support, and a former ministerial colleague in Gujarat. At the top, government and party affairs mesh in a duumvirate. The emphasis on reform is common to both. For Mr Modi a key text is "reform, perform, transform" (Bharatiya Janata Party). For Mr Shah it is "to change the political culture of the whole country, the entire system" (French). The Prime Minister's energetic publicity about government activities (including social media posts and a "Narendra Modi App" in Hindi and English) runs parallel with Shah's continuous campaigning.

However the Prime Minister's public profile does not include regular participation in parliament (indeed he has been described as

a 'reluctant parliamentarian'—Ronojoy Sen: 790). Although when parliament is sitting he works from his parliamentary office, generally he leaves it to others to carry forward the business of the government and to respond to opposition attacks. While passing legislation in the *Lok Sabha* presents few difficulties for the government it has had difficulty in the *Rajya Sabha*. Securing passage of legislation in the upper house has been one of the key challenges in scaling up from governing a state, where there was no upper house, to governing the whole country. Despite its substantial majority in the lower house the government is in a minority in the *Rajya Sabha*. Extending representation by the BJP and its allies in the states has been therefore a particular priority. The method of indirect elections for the upper house and staggered terms for its members has allowed the government to use state elections to increase its upper house numbers.

In the absence of reliable numbers in the upper house, it has pursued three courses. First, it tried confrontation. However, despite its humiliatingly small representation in the lower house the Congress Party has had sufficient numbers in the upper house to block important legislation. Second, the government brought selected proposals into force without legislation by introducing ordinances (Ronojoy Sen: 780). However this procedure is cumbersome. Before an ordinance can be introduced at least one house of parliament has to be prorogued. An ordinance must then be converted into legislation within six weeks of the beginning of the next parliamentary session. In the absence of legislation, to keep the measure in force the whole process has to be repeated. Although using ordinances in this way is lawful and supported by precedents it raises questions about respect for parliament and the legitimacy of measures enacted. Moreover, as shown in the damaging controversy over the failed attempt to amend the *Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act (LARR) 2013*, it cannot provide a secure foundation for significant new measures, including ones intended to encourage business and economic growth (Kumar:113). Third, as will be examined below in relation to a constitutional amendment to allow introduction of a Goods and Services Tax (GST), the government has found that careful negotiation can achieve positive results.

Such negotiation includes not only opposition members in the upper house but also state governments. As a former chief minister,

the Prime Minister has made much of involving the states in national policy issues, providing them with more resources and allowing them space to chart their own way forward. He has invoked an approach to federalism that is both cooperative and competitive; cooperative in coming together to resolve national policy questions and competitive in allowing states to challenge and learn from each other with differing approaches to economic and social development. In the government's one major machinery of government change it has replaced the centrally directed Planning Commission with a Niti Aayog (National Institution for Transforming India, reflecting the Hindi for policy, *niiti*, (@\$?) designed to incorporate the states as equal partners in policy making with the central government. However, improving the management of intergovernmental relations remains a work in progress and the temptation for the centre to intervene in the affairs of state governments remains very much alive (DNA).

The Prime Minister's personal leadership of the civil service is central to much of what the government does. He meets with senior officials more than he does with ministers. For him the civil service is an important agent of change. He looks to the civil service to drive government programs. As Rajiv Kumar argues (Kumar: 167), he leads a 'developmental state'. Without promising an explicit agenda of administrative reforms he has nevertheless reoriented expectations about how the service is to operate and what it is to achieve. Officials are encouraged to discard roles as regulators and controllers and to become team players, innovators and experimenters. They are to engage with the people they serve. He and his key advisers focus hard on appointing effective civil servants to senior posts and ensuring that they achieve targets set. He takes a personal interest in ways of measuring performance. After a review of international practice for selecting senior officials, appointment procedures for recruiting officers from state cadres for posts at the centre were changed to take into account systematic feedback on demonstrated skills and integrity (Mahurka). When the government took office a number of senior officers elected to return to their state cadres, but closeness to the previous government has proved on its own not to be a barrier to significant appointments. However tenure cannot be taken for granted. If for whatever reason senior appointments do not work out, a prompt reshuffle takes place.

The government's approach to the civil service has attracted critique both for going too far and not going far enough. Concerns have been expressed that officers need time in place, especially to manage complex tasks, and protection for decisions that, although taken in good faith, do not turn out well (Chaturvedi). Concerns are also expressed that, despite the Prime Minister's public encouragement of frank advice, the prospect of transfer may inhibit frankness. On the other hand, some critics suggest that the Prime Minister depends too much on the civil service (Merchant). Those who prefer markets to governments argue further that the Prime Minister's faith in the public sector is misplaced and that investing so much effort in energising the public sector is misdirected. However, none of these views appears to have gained support within the government.

Overall, in the approach to office of the government, the preferences, style and capabilities of the Prime Minister himself predominate. He himself is the "Gujarat model" for which many voted (see Mukhopadhyay). Promises are bold: the government drives a crusade for change; multiple projects are initiated across a wide range of sectors; results are to be achieved through a more efficient and effective public sector; through direct communication with citizens by social media the Prime Minister provides information about government initiatives; in the same way he also provides channels for feedback and demonstrates his personal accountability. The complications of a complex society, a federal system with multiple dimensions of asymmetry, a civil service noted for rigidity, and the challenges of making good on government promises in an uncertain economic environment, domestically and internationally, are there to be overcome.

What The Government has Done

The government has faced persistent questions about intentions and impacts. For many specific initiatives, there are questions about focus, means and results. More generally questions arise about emerging policy patterns and about government capabilities. Particular questions include: the effectiveness of links between the domains of politics, policy and management; and how many small steps are needed to make a transformation. The discussion below explores these questions through examples drawn from economic management and budgeting; significant incremental projects, including adaptation of

projects from the previous government; and projects and sectors where links between ends and means are fuzzy. Questions about how the government meets voter expectations on three sensitive issues (opportunities and jobs; improved access to services and benefits; and control of the costs of living) underlie the discussion.

Economic Management and Budgeting

The government inherited a tight budget environment, a recent history of faltering growth and high inflation, and a flat but reviving economy. It began with two modest but fiscally prudent budgets and made a number of specific institutional and regulatory reforms, including liberalisation of foreign direct investment ceilings, pruning of regulations, making it easier to do business, initiatives to promote financial inclusion, and introduction of a bankruptcy law. Fiscal prudence, including subsidy rationalisation, combined with lower international oil prices enabled economic growth to rise beyond 7 per cent per year in 2016 (7.9 per cent in the first quarter: *Economist*, 2016). However, the Finance Minister acknowledged that sustained higher growth rates depended on international growth as well as on domestic measures and that reaching 9 to 10 per cent per year would be difficult (*Business Standard*, 2016a). In its third budget, delivered in February 2016, the government maintained fiscal discipline and continued to emphasise modest improvements in financial management (for example, subsidy rationalisation, streamlining of taxation processes, bank consolidation and bringing bad debt into the open). It also began to use the budget process to signal more clearly its policy priorities. Two stood out: development of infrastructure; and improvement in the welfare of the poorer sections of society, including struggling farmers. Three specific targets, designed to make hard lives easier, became clear: provision of electricity, roads, and cooking gas (*Business Standard*, 2016b; see also Kumar: 119-123). In particular, construction of infrastructure and provision of electricity are critical in the long run to creating jobs (Bardhan reported in Jahnvi Sen); for rural families, roads would provide access not only to markets and services but to jobs in nearby urban areas (Asher and Novosad).

More generally the government attached continuing priority to keeping inflation as low as possible (although during 2016 food prices remained a problem), faced the challenge of balancing fiscal and monetary policy, and juggled the tensions between inward looking

economic interests and the extent to which national economic performance was influenced by global economic integration. A key problem was that economic growth has not led to more jobs. The annual rate of growth in the workforce has exceeded the rate of job creation (Surabhi; Seetha). Capital intensive growth that led only to jobs for the highly qualified was not enough. Growth needed to be employment intensive. Agriculture generated less than 15 percent of GDP but was still the main employer of about half the workforce. To accommodate migration of employment away from agriculture it was estimated that the economy had “to generate ONE million new jobs each month for the foreseeable future” (Kumar: 172). It has been argued that generation of the required economic activity will require not just the stimulation of “animal spirits” in business but attention to the “deep institutional quagmire that has stymied the economy” (Mehta). While the budget acknowledged the need for institutional reform it foreshadowed smaller rather than larger initiatives. Whether and how such initiatives might lead to strategic improvements in capability, including in the Ministry of Finance, other economic ministries and regulatory institutions, remains to be seen.

Further, improving economic performance cannot be done by the centre alone. The states have a large say in attracting business investment, control project implementation of central schemes, and finance the bulk of public services. They also have rafts of regulations the application of which can help or hinder new developments. As the Finance Minister reportedly asked: “Would the Centre’s thrust on marginal, non-disruptive easing of regulation and increasing ease of doing business meet with equal efforts from the states?” (*Business Standard—Editorial Comment*). With acceptance by the government of the recommendations of the 14th Finance Commission to increase distribution to the states from the divisible pool of central tax revenue from 32 percent to 42 percent, the fiscal discretion of the states increased. For this reason how to include the states in national economic policy again became a critical question. The need for effective institutional mechanisms for “intergovernmental coordination, bargaining and conflict resolution” (Rao) became increasingly clear as did the need for budgeting and financial management systems that facilitated the analysis of funds transfers and expenditure.

Significant Increments of Change

Three significant changes are examined: replacement of the Planning Commission with the Niti Aayog; first steps towards a Goods and Services Tax (GST); and use of digital technology to provide cash entitlements and other benefits to citizens. The first two cases continue discussion of the management of intergovernmental relations. The third illustrates how the government sponsors multiple projects with potential to create cumulative impacts.

Niti Aayog

Creation of the Niti Aayog sent many signals. It ended the long era of central planning in which Planning Commission staff stood astride national investment discussions and “plan expenditure” tried to set strategic directions for the whole country—an approach that had drawn critique for some time (Bagchi). It promised the states a stake in national policy making; ambitiously its website states that it “facilitates the working together of the Union and States as equals” (Niti Aayog). And it promised a search for new ideas. Encouraged by the Prime Minister, it has embarked on a wide-ranging series of seminars designed to bring ministers and officials, state and central, into contact with highly qualified speakers, including international commentators as well as Aayog members and staff. Its governing council includes the Prime Minister as chairman and a distinguished economist as vice chairman, together with the Chief Ministers of all states (and territories with legislatures).

In his statements the Prime Minister has wrapped together around the role of the Aayog his aims for rapid transformation, institutional improvement, international engagement and collective engagement with new ideas. For example he has asked participants to use its seminars as means of generating new ideas on which governments can take action (Modi):

If we sit together, we will have the collective force to convert ideas into action. What we need is a collective opening of our minds, to let in new, global perspectives. To do this, we have to absorb new ideas collectively rather than individually. It requires a concerted effort.

While the direction of the new body has yet to crystallise it combines at least four roles: to expand the thinking of ministers and

civil servants (for example through the Transforming India Lecture series); to prepare a 15 year vision document supported by a seven year national development agenda and a dashboard for monitoring, evaluation and review (to come into effect from 2017-18 and to take into account global trends); to undertake inquiries on selected policy issues and make recommendations to government/s (for example on boosting the construction sector and on a model law on land leasing); and to provide a forum through which task groups of ministers and officials can resolve issues in which both the central and state governments have a stake (for example through subgroups of Chief Ministers, including one on rationalisation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes). In its approach to these roles it has already signalled a change in emphasis in policy assessment away from “infrastructure and inputs to performance and outcomes” (Aiyar).

However, for critics the Niti Aayog is only the most recent of a succession of less than fruitful attempts to construct an intergovernmental relations infrastructure. The Inter-State Council provided for in the constitution was rendered moribund by the Planning Commission. The National Development Council associated with the Planning Commission became a “speechmaking body” (Rao: 15). “Empowered Committees” of Chief Ministers set up to address state involvement in national projects have often failed to agree.

A common criticism of the Aayog is that, as it is not supported by either constitutional power or the power to allocate money, it is likely to suffer a similar fate (Kumar: 124, 187-188; Sengupta; Sen). On the other hand perhaps its most influential resource is the commitment of the Prime Minister. In federations the impact of a Prime Minister who can mobilise influential state leaders around things they can all agree on, while quarantining things on which they cannot, should not be underestimated. Many of the most pressing issues in federations are ones in which the centre and the states compete as well as collaborate. In the absence of institutions to manage this, problems tend to multiply. Potentially, the Aayog provides the Prime Minister and Chief Ministers with an appropriate forum. It is a meeting place where they can sift through issues to find those they really need to address. Then they can negotiate potential agendas to work on and set up task groups of ministers and officials to negotiate agreements. For example, on national economic policy, the states and the centre could

agree to collaborate on particular measures to improve performance but then compete about sharing the benefits. As the history of the proposal for a GST shows, this is likely to be a complex and drawn out process. But by making the Niti Aayog the forum for such negotiations the Prime Minister may provide the states with an invitation they cannot ignore.

Goods and Services Tax—first steps

The proposal for a Goods and Services Tax illustrates how working out the technical case for a significant change needs to be accompanied by strategies to make it happen politically and administratively. The proposal to subsume a plethora of central and state taxes in a GST in which both the centre and the states have a stake and thereby promote development of a national domestic economy began in 2000 under the NDA government led by AB Vajpayee. It continued under the United Progressive Alliance government from 2004 led by Manmohan Singh. But when in opposition both the BJP and Congress blocked it in parliament. During the protracted argument the proposal remained more or less the same. A national level GST and a state level GST covering the whole value chain for goods and services (with some exemptions) would replace excise and other imposts levied by the centre and Value Added and other taxes levied by the states. Cascading taxes (taxes on taxes), including taxes on goods crossing state borders (leading to queues of trucks at state borders and long delays on shipments within India in comparison with shipments abroad) would be removed. The GST would be paid only by the final consumer. Taxes on inputs to the final product or service would be refunded (but only if claimants registered and participated in the tax system). Losses from abolition of particular taxes were expected to be outweighed by improvements in efficiency, competitiveness and widening the tax base.

A threshold issue was the need for a constitutional amendment. The centre had limited powers to tax goods and the states had no power to tax services. To enable both levels of government to tax both goods and services legislation to amend the constitution was needed. Once passed in Delhi it would need to be ratified by at least half the legislatures in the states. However government demands that Congress allow the bill through the upper house because the BJP had an overwhelming majority in the lower house were rebuffed. After two years of frustration the Prime Minister and Finance Minister finally

began to negotiate (*Times of India*). First, they negotiated with the states. Once they had solid support (secured by promising to compensate states for revenue losses for five years) they began to negotiate with Congress. In this they had the advantage that in the recent indirect elections for the upper house Congress had lost sufficient votes to be sure that it could block the bill. After further concessions to Congress the bill passed both houses. It then received prompt ratification by the necessary number of states and an implementation date was set for 1 April 2017.

However much remains to be done (Biswas; see also Nilekani and Shah, chapter 8, especially pp137-141). A GST Council consisting of Finance Ministers needs to meet and agree on a rate of tax (in the region of 18 percent is proposed), taxes and charges to be subsumed, and exemptions (likely to include food because of political sensitivity and alcohol and petroleum because current high rates of taxation provide lucrative revenue streams). Legislation then needs to be passed at the centre and the states; a GST portal needs to be commissioned where taxpayers can register, make payments and submit returns; and businesses need to make appropriate preparations. Congress and states that fear they will incur revenue losses or lose discretion over taxes can be expected to look for bargaining points throughout the long chain of policy and administrative steps to full implementation. As the change will shift the incidence of taxation from manufacturing to consumption a lot of expectations will need to be adjusted. Passing the constitutional amendment is likely to have been only the first step.

Digital technology

The Prime Minister's enthusiasm for digital technology is reflected in the many-sided Digital India program. It sets out to build on and coordinate digital initiatives since the 1990s. It aims to enable citizens to develop digital skills, use them to communicate with government and to gain access to services. There are three broad directions: digital infrastructure; governance and services on demand; and digital empowerment of citizens. The program's nine pillars make clear its wide range: Broadband Highways; Universal Access to Mobile Connectivity; Public Internet Access Programme; e-Governance: Reforming Government Through Technology; e-Kranti (revolution)—Electronic Delivery of Services; Information for All; Electronics

Manufacturing; IT for Jobs; and Early Harvest Programmes(*Digital India*).

The foundation program for government to citizen transactions is *Aadhaar* ('>0: base, pillar, foundation). It was started by the Manmohan Singh government and criticised by the BJP in opposition. But in government Mr Modi has made it his own and provided it with legislative force. Its success has led to international interest (Swarajya Magazine). The *Aadhaar* project was led by Nandan Nilekani, an Infosys founder. It was run as a 'start up', a lean organisation within the civil service, with much of the work done by external vendors (Nilekani and Shah: 24). The project was based on the realisation that people value an ID as an "economic asset"(Nilekani and Shah: 9). It is a "thin" solution which on its own does nothing for people except say who they are. But through an identity card based on biometric data it provides an individual with proof of identity which can support multiple further applications. For people who have no other documentation it is a welcome relief. For women it can provide a measure of independence because it can be issued without the data of a male relative. Once people have a card, it is argued, they can participate in a wide range of transactions from which they would previously have been excluded. Further, transactions can be targeted and transparent.

Following implementation 900 million people could prove their identities online, in real time (Nilekani and Shah: 44). Time consuming journeys to government offices, standing in queues for hours and skimming of entitlements by officials were drastically cut. The government used *Aadhaar* in programs to provide 180 million new bank accounts under Jan Dhan Yojana (People Money Scheme, ((/ K(>) and enrol 100 million more people in life insurance schemes. It also used it to set up a wide range of information and transaction portals. In particular it used the program to provide more effective administration for kerosene and LPG subsidies and the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) scheme by making payments direct to participants' bank accounts. (Kumar: 120). However for schemes like MNREGA resolving payment problems for participants left many other steps unresolved, including allocation of "decent" work and correct calculation of payments due. Recent studies of the impacts of MNREGA have provided reminders about them

any local influences that single application online facilities do not at this stage mitigate (Reddy et al; Jacob; Lakha et al). Further, difficulties reported in the use of Aadhaar to distribute rations to eligible citizens have provided reminders that on line facilities need effective connectivity and point of sale equipment that can recognise biometric data (Bhatnagar). Directions to make production of an Aadhar card compulsory for access to certain services have added to these concerns (The Hindu; Nagarajan). Finally, criticism continues about the potential for misuse by the government of personal information gathered by a central government project (Bhardwaj; Thikavarappu).

Nevertheless, the government's use of digital technology is showing how targeted use of on line facilities can cut through or bypass frustrating obstacles in communication between official India and citizens.

These three initiatives—*Niti Aayog*, GST and Digital Technology—are substantial increments of change. Each has the potential to drive further changes—*Niti Aayog* in policy directions and intergovernmental relations, GST in creating a more open domestic economy, and Digital Technology in delivering benefits and services direct to citizens. However each is still a work in progress.

Beyond Increments—Linking Ends and Means

If examination of the examples above throws up questions about linking ends and means, examination of sectors in which multiple projects are afoot throws up even deeper ones. Three sectors are examined: urban development, agriculture and manufacturing. In each relationships between development of physical infrastructure and desired social and economic results emerge as significant. Experience in each suggests the limits of project based increments and the desirability of improved attention to how to define problems, tackle them, and manage complex changes from inception to implementation.

Urban development

Two projects—*Smart Cities* and *Swachh Bharat* (Clean India, 8M5M ->0\$) illustrate the many-sided issues that confront initiatives in urban development. In both projects investment in infrastructure—in *Smart Cities* digital technology to facilitate online services and in *Swachh*

Bharat) a wide range of clean up initiatives—is designed to lead to socially desirable outcomes. However, as argued in a classic paper on urban planning reflecting on US experience in the 1960s (Rittel and Webber) the move from improved infrastructure to improved social outcomes is notoriously difficult. The authors developed the notion of ‘wicked problems’. In such problems, issues and solutions can be defined in competing ways and proposed solutions may be symptoms of other problems. For these reasons urban interventions tend to lead to unanticipated consequences. More generally, in many fields policy work now tends to emphasise particular care in problem definition (for example, by disaggregating difficult issues into ‘tamer’ components) and acceptance that ‘wicked problems’ may need to be managed rather than resolved—and re-solved over and over again.

The ambitions of *Smart Cities* are bold. Harnessing technology is intended, for example, to drive economic growth, enable local area development, improve transparency and accountability, improve management of water and waste water, and enable intelligent traffic management systems (*Smart Cities* a). Projects in cities selected for participation are to be managed by a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), managed by a board with representation from central, state and local governments and a full time CEO. State and local governments will be required to provide substantial funds and be responsible for borrowings. Implementation of approved schemes may include private sector participation through joint ventures and public private partnerships (*Smart Cities* b).

Many specific projects are still at the stage of development. However questions about priorities and governance have been raised. When residents in cities have so many other problems to contend with the emphasis on digitisation is questioned. While the use of SPVs is intended to cut through institutional barriers at local level, many of these arise from unresolved difficulties in relationships between state and local government bodies. Questions arise about how SPVs can overcome the deep seated diffusion of responsibilities and resulting bottlenecks in existing institutional arrangements. Strengthening local governance institutions may be a more important priority (Ravi and Bhatia; Pai). So, despite the caveats above about ‘wicked problems’, may be improving roads, drainage and other basic infrastructure.

Swachh Bharat is another bold project. It builds on a project of the

previous government and includes many specific initiatives: building lavatories, improving the ability of women to participate in public activities through provision of public lavatories, cutting back open defecation, and eradicating manual scavenging (Ministry of Urban Development: 3; Jeffrey; Jeffrey and Doron). It is accompanied by much publicity, including politicians publicly wielding brooms and pledges by celebrities. However building lavatories through contractors is a major priority. It is assumed that once built lavatories will be maintained and used. But in a case of infrastructure meets social practice this is not necessarily the case. Reluctance to use lavatories reflects deeply embedded beliefs about ritual cleanliness. It reflects also rural habits of defecation in the fields, which provide housebound women with opportunities for socialising and safety in numbers while doing so. In these circumstances, projects run by civil servants, however energised, may not be the most effective paths to change (Bardhan reported in Jahnvi Sen). As Jeffrey (2015: 819) notes, success in this project “depends on sufficient numbers of motivated, thoughtful people achieving and sustaining tens of thousands of small-scale, locally-based changes”. The aim is clearer than the means. If *Swachh Bharat* does not confront a ‘wicked problem’ it does confront one where paradoxically, given the initiative’s emphasis on infrastructure, social practice inhibits ready acceptance of quite simple infrastructure (Vyas).

Agriculture and manufacturing

Agriculture and manufacturing share a need for structural change. If it seems strange to consider them together, it can be argued that existing projects may fall short of the structural changes from which both sectors would benefit. Pressing needs in both are also linked. Both need to improve productivity and competitiveness (Dabla-Norris and Kochhar: 157; Chandra). To do this both need to improve the application of technology and to have access to effective supply chains, domestically and internationally. As noted above, if rural workers are to find meaningful jobs outside agriculture, labour intensive manufacturing is needed. A market for land, effectively regulated, could allow manufacturing easier access to land and rural landholders who wished to get out of farming the opportunity to do so. More efficient agricultural production and marketing arrangements that allowed produce to move more freely from farms to end use would bring down the food cost component of urban wages. Agriculture and

manufacturing coexist, often uneasily, in burgeoning peri-urban areas. Provision of infrastructure for both needs to be coordinated. Where feasible, international standards and opportunities also need to be taken into consideration. However in both sectors strong interests with extractive rather than productive motivations hold well defended positions.

Existing projects for agriculture tend to focus on inputs, for example access to and conservation of water and balanced use of fertilizers (Kumar: 146). Agriculture is still valued for its culture and traditions and as a guarantee of self-sufficiency in food rather than as a “tradable sector” (Kumar: 203). Production is high cost, diversification from traditional crops has not taken place, inputs are not well managed, and the application of technology is uneven. It is an activity into which one is born. As the Prime Minister has acknowledged “Farmer’s son becomes a farmer out of helplessness and not by choice” (NDTV). However the vice chairman of Niti Aayog, Dr Arvind Panagariya has suggested that the appetite for choice may be growing: “farmers these days are just as aspirational as the angry urban salary earners” (Earl). In these circumstances it can be argued that a strategic approach to agricultural modernisation “is a necessary aspect of a growth strategy that seeks to maximise employment generation...business as usual will just not do.” (Kumar: 203). Improvements in the rural economy are needed to help drive demand in the wider economy.

In manufacturing the most prominent project is “Make in India”. It is described as “A major national initiative designed to facilitate investment; foster innovation; enhance skill development; protect intellectual property, and build best-in-class manufacturing infrastructure.” (*Make in India*). Five industrial corridors designed to encourage industrialization and planned urbanization (Smart Cities) have been launched. The corridors will be managed by a new development authority in conjunction with webs of arrangements with participating states. It is aimed to increase the share of manufacturing in GDP from 15-16 percent to 25 percent by 2022.

However the project evokes strong sentiments. Official enthusiasm is met with scepticism among commentators. Pranab Bardhan supports development of internationally competitive manufacturing but is dismissive of “Make in India” (Jahnavi Sen). As noted above he advocates greater attention to necessary infrastructure—electricity,

roads, connectivity—and substantial domestic public investment. He focuses also on encouraging small enterprises which employ less than 100 people and do not come within restrictive labour laws. Reform of these laws, much advocated in business circles, is considered at this stage a lesser priority than improvements in infrastructure. Kumar, who is less critical, nevertheless emphasises encouragement of small and medium enterprises, higher corporate investment in research and development, and reducing costs and uncertainty in land acquisition for manufacturing purposes. He recommends also lowering real wage costs and rationalizing labour laws. However, just as Bardhan downplayed the priority of labour law reform, Kumar advocates using existing provisions that avoid costly processes to acquire land. Acquisition of less than 100 acres does not fall within the ambit of these processes. Further, an inventory of government land, centre and states, would yield stocks of land which could be sold to businesses. Further Mihir Sharma (2016 b) worries that the project still reflects a backward looking mindset favouring “overt and covert protectionism” that ignores the need to “fit into global supply chains”.

While current initiatives are helpful, they cover only part of a strategic approach that would improve the economic impacts of agriculture and manufacturing. Focused attention is needed on investments, incentives and negotiations with relevant interests that facilitate

improvements in productivity and on the institutions, state as well as central, with capability to relate sectoral policies to national economic and social priorities. In this the choice of approaches to economic analysis will be important. Context and institutional capabilities are both critical (Fforde: 273). Also important are ways of thinking about global economic opportunities that recognise that arguments about specific proposals for open trade need to provide tangible benefits and be won in domestic political arenas (Rodrik: 248). Such attention would assist the country approach participation in the global economy, noted above as an important driver of growth, with more confidence.

Conclusions

The Modi government has generated, or in many cases re-engaged, a substantial agenda for change. It is about transformation.

It has provided a sense of direction; it has improved many government processes; and it has replaced lethargy with energy. But it is also about transformation through many small steps. The Prime Minister is reported as wanting to bring in new and bold ideas. But he is also reported as “convinced that the optimal reform strategy for India at this stage is to ensure successful implementation of existing programmes and ideas, rather than push the reform envelope to new areas, with uncertain outcomes” (Kumar: 121). Initiatives promise change but minimise prospects for disruption. However tensions remain between expectations and results and, more widely, between the measured pragmatism of the story of the government so far and the other stories that travel with it.

In this context four questions about how the government operates emerge: how effectively are projects defined and managed; when is a project approach appropriate and when is a more strategic, sectoral approach more appropriate; how effective are chosen routes to implementation; and will projects effectively implemented bring about intended transformations? In turn these questions lead to questions about capability. Is the centrally directed approach to government transposed from the Prime Minister’s experience in one state adaptable to the more complex environment of the national government; and can Prime Ministerial direction of selected civil servants secure effective implementation of the broad range of projects initiated?

One answer is that the Prime Minister’s personal drive, supported by the Prime Minister’s Office, the Niti Aayog and chosen senior civil servants will prevail. A second is that the government would benefit from a larger ministerial leadership team. A third is that greater attention is needed to reorganising the civil service, including not only central agencies such as the Cabinet Secretariat and the Ministry of Finance but also operating agencies that touch directly the lives of citizens, so that the service acquires the capabilities in policy and management necessary to support more effectively programs of change. And a fourth is that a radical adjustment of expectations about what the central government can do is needed and that any such adjustment should provide a greater role not only for the states but for market based policy instruments.

After only two years in government such questions and possible answers must remain open. But just as the Prime Minister’s ability to

learn on the job in Gujarat characterised his period as Chief Minister, the questions he asks and the answers he gives may be the ones which characterise the future operations of the government he leads.

REFERENCES

- 1 Aiyar, Yamini (2016) "Maximum government, minimum governance", *LiveMint*, 8 September 2016. <http://www.livemint.com/Opinion/zvfpsEcUj5ekp10SluXRXJ/Maximum-govt-minimum-governance.html> (access 8 September 2016).
- 2 Asher, S and P Novosad (2016) "Market Access and Structural Transformation: Evidence from Rural Roads in India". <http://cprindia.org/sites/default/files/events/Market%20Access%20and%20Structural%20Transformation.pdf> (access 1 September 2016).
- 3 Bagchi, Amaresh (2007 "Role of Planning and the Planning Commission in the New Indian Economy: Case for Review", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3 November.
- 4 Bhatnagar, Gaurav Vivek (2016) "Aadhaar-Based PDS Means Denial of Rations for Many, Jharkhand Study Shows", *The Wire*, 8 September 2016. <http://thewire.in/64756/jharkhand-aadhaar-pds-nfsa/> (access 9 September 2016).
- 5 Bharatiya Janata Party (2016) "The governance mantra of my government is clear - 'Reform, Perform, Transform' ", 15 August 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-UDjFj1_0zc (access 18 August 2016).
- 6 Bhardwaj, Kritika (2016) "The Mission Creep Behind the Aadhaar Project", *The Wire*, 2 September 2016. <http://thewire.in/63223/the-mission-creep-behind-the-uidais-centralisation-ideology/> (access 3 September 2016).
- 7 Biswas, Soutik (2016) "Why India's GST is one of the world's most complex tax reforms", *BBC News*, 4 August 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-36950205> (access 3 September 2016).
- 8 *Business Standard-editorial comment* (2016) "Low-hanging fruit", 16 May. http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/low-hanging-fruit-116051601181_1.html (access 1 September 2016).
- 9 *Business Standard* (2016) "Mr Jaitley delivers", 29 February. http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/mr-jaitley-delivers-116022901348_1.html (access 1 September 2016).

- 10 Chandra, Pankaj (2015) "Pivoting Indian Manufacturing Differently", *India Review*, vol.14(1).
- 11 Chaturvedi, BK (2015) "Four Problems Modi Must Fix to Win Back the Confidence of the Civil Service", *The Wire*, 5 September. <http://thewire.in/10010/four-problems-modi-must-fix-to-win-back-the-confidence-of-the-civil-service/> (access 22 August 2016).
- 12 Das, Gurcharan (2016) "The real threat to India is not Kanhaiya, it's lack of jobs", *Times of India*, 13 March. <http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/men-and-ideas/the-real-threat-to-india-is-not-kanhaiya-its-lack-of-jobs/> (access 14 March 2016).
- 13 Dabla-Norris, Era and Kalpana Kochhar (2015) "India: In Search of the Drivers of the Next Wave of Growth", *India Review*, vol.14 (1).
- 14 Dhume, Sadanand (2016) "India Awaits and Advocate of Reforms", *Wall Street Journal*, 17 March. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/india-awaits-an-advocate-of-reforms-1458233541> (access 17 March 2016).
- 15 Earl, Greg (2016) "Narendra Modi's rock star image loses its shine", *Australian Financial Review*, 2 March. <http://www.afr.com/news/world/narendra-modis-rock-star-image-loses-its-shine-20160301-gn7zlkx> (access 3 March 2016).
- 16 NDTV (2016) "PM Modi's First Obama-Style Townhall: live updates". <http://www.ndtv.com/india-news/pm-narendra-modis-obama-style-townhall-live-updates-1440928> (access 14 September 2016).
- 17 *Digital India*(2016) <http://www.digitalindia.gov.in/content/programme-pillars> and <http://www.digitalindia.gov.in/content/vision-and-vision-areas>(access 8 September 2016).
- 18 *DNA* (2016) "Congress seeks President's intervention to protect its state govts", 29 March. <http://www.dnaindia.com/india/report-congress-seeks-president-s-intervention-to-protect-its-state-govts-2195642> (access 15 September 2016).
- 19 *Economist* (2016) "India's economy: Two stumbles forward, one back", 25 June. <http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21701133-government-takes-long-winding-path-towards-reform-two-stumbles-forward-one> (access 1 September 2016).
- 20 Fforde, Adam (2013) *Understanding Development Economics*, London and New York, Routledge.
- 21 French, Patrick (2016) "The 'Shah' of BJP's game plan who wants to alter India's political culture", *Hindustan Times*, 17 July. <http://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/amit-shah-the-strategist-of-bjp-s-india-game-plan/story-Fr0sSiYHtTwhVxKBSjapsI.html> (access 18 August 2016).

- 22 Jacob, Suraj (2015) "What Do We Know About Village-Level Change and Stasis in India?", *India Review*, vol.14(4).
- 23 Jeffrey, Robin (2015) "Clean India! Symbols, Policies and Tensions", *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol.38 (4).
- 24 Jeffrey, Robin and Assa Doron (2016) "Technologies of *Swachh Bharat*: Machines and Methods for Cleaning India", National University of Singapore, ISAS Working Paper, No. 236.
- 25 Harikrishnan, Charmy (2016) "Rahul Gandhi should retire, BJP will be hegemonic force for next 15-20 years: Ramachandra Guha", *The Economic Times*, 26 September. <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/rahul-gandhi-should-retire-bjp-will-be-hegemonic-force-for-next-15-20-years-ramachandra-guha/articleshow/54499233.cms> (access 6 October 2016).
- 26 Kumar, Rajiv (2016) *Modi and His Challenges*, New Delhi, Bloomsbury.
- 27 Lakha, Salim: Durgam Rajasekhar and Ramachandra Manjula (2015) "Collusion,
- 28 Co-option and Capture: Social Accountability and Social Audits in Karnataka, India", *Oxford*
- 29 *Development Studies*, vol.43(3).
- 30 Mahurka, Uday (2016) "India's top babus face new Modi test", *India Today*, 23 June. <https://www.google.com.au/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Uday+Mahurka+India's+top+babus+face+new+Modi+test> (access 22 August 2016).
- 31 *Make in India* (2016) <http://www.makeinindia.com/home> (access 13 September 2016).
- 32 Mayer, Peter (2016) "Mixed record calls Modi's reform credentials into question", *Asian Currents*, <http://asaa.asn.au/mixed-record-calls-modis-reform-credentials-into-question/> (access 6 October 2016).
- 33 Mehta, Pratap Bhanu (2016) "Budget 2016: The triumph of centrism", *The Indian Express*, 1 March. <https://www.google.com.au/webhp?sourceid=chromeinstant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#safe=active&q=Budget+2016%3A+The+triumph+of+centrism> (access 6 October 2016).
- 34 Merchant, Minhaz (2016) "Budget 2016 is make-or-break for Jaitley", *DailyO*, 2 February. <http://www.dailyo.in/business/union-budget-2016-arun-jaitley-raghuram-rajan-orop-7th-pay-commission-rbi->

- [retro-tax-start-ups-fdi-india-inc/story/1/8783.html](#) (access 5 October 2016).
- 35 Ministry of Urban Development (2014) "Guidelines for Swachh Bharat Mission". http://swachhbharaturban.gov.in/writereaddata/SBM_Guideline.pdf (access 13 September 2016).
- 36 Modi, Narendra (2016) "PM's speech on the occasion of 'Transforming India' Lecture", 26 August. http://www.pmindia.gov.in/en/news_updates/pms-speech-on-the-occasion-of-transforming-india-lecture/?comment=disable (access 4 September 2016).
- 37 Muthuraman (2016) "Confessions of a Bhakt: Six Disappointments With The Modi Sarkar", *Swarajya*, 22 February 2016. <http://swarajyamag.com/ideas/confessions-of-a-bhakt-six-disappointments-with-the-modi-sarkar> (access 8 August 2016).
- 38 Mukhopadhyay, Nilanjan (2016) "The Union Budget For 2016 Is Ideological, Not Financial", *The Caravan*, 4 March. <http://www.caravanmagazine.in/vantage/union-budget-2016-ideological-not-financial> (access 5 March 2016).
- 39 NDTV (2016) "PM Modi's First Obama-Style Townhall: live updates", 6 August. <http://www.ndtv.com/india-news/pm-narendra-modis-obama-style-townhall-live-updates-1440928> (access 14 September 2016).
- 40 Nagarajan, Kedar (2016) "Five SC Orders Later, Aadhaar Requirement Continues to Haunt Many", *The Wire*, 19 September. <http://thewire.in/11065/five-sc-orders-later-aadhaar-requirement-continues-to-haunt-many/> (access 5 October 2016).
- 41 Nilekani, Nandan and Viral Shah (2015) *Rebooting India: Realizing a billion aspirations*, Gurgaon, Allen Lane.
- 42 Niti Aayog (2016) <http://niti.gov.in/> (access 1 September 2016).
- 43 Pai, Nitin (2016), "Bengaluru Mess Needs PM Modi's Intervention", NDTV, 31 July. <http://www.ndtv.com/opinion/why-is-bengaluru-flooded-it-is-an-orphan-1438312> (access 13 September 2016).
- 44 Pradhan, Sharad (2016) "The BJP's Defensiveness on 'Kairana Exodus' Exposes its Hindutva Agenda", *The Wire*, 15 June. <http://thewire.in/42897/hukum-singhs-defensiveness-on-the-kairana-exodus-exposes-the-bjps-hindutva-agenda/> (access 15 June 2016).
- 45 Rao, M Govinda (2016) "Making federalism work for India", *East Asia Forum Quarterly*, April-June.
- 46 Ravi, Shamika and Ankit Bhatia (2016) "For Smart Cities to Succeed, Strengthening Local Governance is a Must", *The Wire*, 3 August. <http://>

thewire.in/56022/smart-cities-to-succeed-need-to-strengthen-local-governance/ (access 3 August 2016).

- 47 Reddy, D. Narasimha; A. Amarender Reddy and M. C. S. Bantilan
48 (2014) “The Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment
49 Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on Rural Labor Markets and Agriculture”, *India Review*,
vol.13(3).
- 50 Rittel, Horst W and Melvin M Webber (1973) “Dilemmas in a General
Theory of Planning”, *Policy Sciences*,4.
- 51 Rodrik, Dani (2011) *The Globalization Paradox*, New York and
London, WW Norton.
- 52 Seetha (2016) “When It Comes to Jobs, ‘Achche Din’ Seem Elusive”,
Swarajya Magazine, 3 October. [http://swarajyamag.com/economy/
when-it-comes-to-jobs-achche-din-seem-elusive](http://swarajyamag.com/economy/when-it-comes-to-jobs-achche-din-seem-elusive) (access 6 October
2016).
- 53 Sen, Jahnvi (2016) “Interview: Pranab Bardhan on What the Modi
Government Has—and Hasn’t—Done So Far, *The Wire*, 26 July 2016.
<http://thewire.in/50661/pranab-bardhan-transcript/> (access 26 July
2016).
- 54 Sen, Ronojoy (2015) “House Matters: The BJP, Modi and Parliament”,
South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies, vol. 38(4).
- 55 Sengupta, Mitu (2015) “Modi Planning: What the NITI Aayog Suggests
about the Aspirations and Practices of the Modi Government”, *South
Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 38(4).
- 56 Sharma, Mihir (2016 a) “No, Mr Modi, you are not yet transforming
India”, *Business Standard*, 30 May. [http://www.business-
standard.com/article/opinion/mihir-sharma-no-mr-modi-you-are-
not-yet-transforming-india-116053000790_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/mihir-sharma-no-mr-modi-you-are-not-yet-transforming-india-116053000790_1.html) (access 30 May
2016).
- 57 Sharma, Mihir (2016 b) “A forward-looking Budget, finally”, *Business
Standard*, 3 March. [http://www.business-standard.com/article/
opinion/mihir-sharma-finally-a-forward-looking-budget-
116030300350_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/mihir-sharma-finally-a-forward-looking-budget-116030300350_1.html) (access 6 October 2016).
- 58 Singh, Tavleen (2016) “Fifth Column: Tinkering and tokenism”, *Indian
Express*, 8 May. [http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/
fifth-column-tinkering-and-tokenism-narendra-modi-2-years-tavleen-
singh-column-2789530/](http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/fifth-column-tinkering-and-tokenism-narendra-modi-2-years-tavleen-singh-column-2789530/) (access 14 September 2016).
- 59 *Smart Cities* (2016 a) [http://smartcities.gov.in/writereaddata/
What%20is%20Smart%20City.pdf](http://smartcities.gov.in/writereaddata/What%20is%20Smart%20City.pdf)

- 60 (access 11 September 2016).
- 61 *Smart Cities* (2016 b) <http://smartcities.gov.in/writereaddata/SPVs.pdf>(access 11 September 2016)
- 62 Surabhi (2016) “Dismal jobs scene blights GDP growth”, *The Hindu*, 4 September. <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/economy/dismal-jobs-scene-blights-gdp-growth/article9066503.ece> (access 4 September 2016).
- 63 Swarajya Magazine (2016) “After Aadhaar, India May Get to ‘Export’ Homegrown Payments Tech Platform”, 8 September. <http://swarajyamag.com/technology/after-aadhaar-india-may-get-to-export-homegrown-payments-tech-platform> (access 8 September 2016).
- 64 *The Hindu* (2016) “Aadhaar must for LPG subsidy after November”, 4 October. <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/aadhaar-must-for-lpg-subsidy-after-november/article9184823.ece> (access 5 October 2016).
- 65 Thikavarappu, Prashant Reddy (2016) “The Aadhaar Bill is Yet Another Legislation That Leaves Too Much Power With The Government At The Centre”, *Caravan*, 15 March. <http://www.caravanmagazine.in/vantage/aadhaar-bill-another-legislation-leaves-power-centre> (access 8 September 2016).
- 66 *Times of India* (2016) “First isolate, then negotiate: How India’s GST deal was done”, 10 August. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/First-isolate-then-negotiate-How-GST-deal-was-done/articleshow/53627846.cms>(access 8 September 2016).
- 67 Varadarajan, Tunku (2016) “Reverse Swing: Dear Mr Modi, more growth, less Hindutva”, *Indian Express*, 28 February. <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/narendra-modi-budget-india-hindutva-bjp/> (access 28 February 2016).
- 68 Vyas, Sangita (2016) “Not So Clean”, *The Indian Express*, 1 October. <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/swachh-bharat-mission-open-defecation-clean-india-public-toilets-3058838/> (access 6 October 2016).

Kautilya and Women Emancipation in Contemporary India

Shweta Singh

According to Samuel P. Huntington, in 1750, India had 22% of the global GDP. Today India possesses roughly 8% of global GDP. In the financial year of 2015-16, India has superseded China in terms of rate of annual growth with .3% and slated to sustain the tempo in foreseeable future. It has occurred first time after the adoption of LPG process by China in 1978 and by India in 1991. According to Goldman Saches if things will be stable, India is all set to achieve its prominence with 22% of global GDP by 2043.¹ We are aware about the fact that still we have over 200 million people, who live below the poverty line.

In 2005, the World Bank estimated that over 1.3 billion people—over one quarter of the world’s population—lived in extreme poverty, consuming less than \$1.25 a day in PPP terms. Nearly twice this number, or half the world’s population, lived on less than \$2.00 a day. By 2050, no country in the G20 will have more than 5 percent of the population living in extreme poverty, though significant portions of society will still be living on less than \$2.00 a day.²

Poverty rates are expected to decline significantly in Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, and Turkey, but growth in China and India—nations that were home to 48 percent of the world’s population living on \$1.25 a day in 2005—will be the driving force behind this shift. Over the past 25 years, over 600 million people emerged from poverty in China (excluding China, global poverty has actually increased since 1981); from 2005 to 2050, China and India will be responsible for lifting 600 million more people from the most extreme forms of poverty.³

For a stable society, we have to narrow down this existing gap. For that India has to reformulate its policies. Kautilya’s thoughts are

extremely relevant for making India as one of the important global power.

The mandate of this paper is to examine the status of women in contemporary India. Hillary Clinton was about to become President of the United States of America in 2016 but lost with narrow margin in November 2016. It is a black spot for the American society because since their inception in 1776 till date (240 years) they have not been able to elect women as their President. But India has already ruled by women as Prime Minister for 16 long years even in 20th century only. 21st Century is on but USA has failed to choose any women leader even after 240 years of its democratic experience despite their rhetoric of democracy and human rights.

There has been a debate that women political empowerment is the way of their all round empowerment. Including India almost all countries of South Asia is being ruled by women. Since 1991, till date Bangladesh is only ruled by women's. But women in Bangladesh are still one of the least empowered in the contemporary world. USA never had any women President since last 240 years but their HDI particularly of women is one of the unique at the global level. It also vindicates that political empowerment of women is not the guarantee of their economic empowerment. Without economic empowerment, political empowerment is incomplete because it has not been successful to reduce crimes against the women. Even in USA, adequate economic empowerment of women has not been fully successful to contain violence against them. Violence against women is a common phenomenon in contemporary world but it is more in developing countries including India. This paper is intended to highlight the issue and will try to search practical mechanisms to ensure equality to women in reference to Kautilyan perspective. In other words, it will seek help from Kautilya's set of opinions to improve the status of women in contemporary India.

According to Arjun Sengupta committee constituted by UPA-1 government in 2006, there are roughly 200 million unorganized workers in our country. Half of them are women as women constitute sizeable number of all strata of work force. There is discrimination against women in skilled sector also. In sum, women are under gamut of discriminations in our country. In other words, prevalence of poverty is more in women than man in India or elsewhere. Although in ancient

India, women were in privileged class but due to variety of factors their economic status has not remained at par with man in contemporary India. The culture of poverty theory is a theoretical paradigm that explains the phenomenon of poverty from the perspective of social and cultural studies. It debuted in the 1959 book *Five Families Mexican Case in the Culture of Poverty* by American anthropologist Oscar Lewis, a book based on case studies of poverty stricken families and communities. During his research, Lewis called the passive and negative attitude towards an impoverished life of those marginalized in the social power structure from poverty pressure the culture of poverty, believing that this subculture produces negative social and mental impacts on its members and the community. Due to prevalence of poverty, their moral is getting affected resulting into increased alcoholism and other problems. Oscar Lewis concluded that, "this culture of poverty featuring this morbid value and belief system is developed in the poverty stricken class's social life, which causes them to expect no economic prosperity for themselves or moving to an upper social stratum. In the longer run, this subculture developed by them, contrary to the mainstream society, begins to solidify, and gradually becomes a way of life."⁴ It is a way of life that sustains their poverty. Lewis construct of poverty applies to Indian context also.

Women community is badly affected from the prevalence of poverty. Despite massive progress since last few decades, poverty is still rampant and roughly 200 million people below the poverty line, which is bigger than combined population of France and Germany. Kautilya was unique because he gave prominence to people and made the king accountable for the people. Even today's democracy it is fulcrum of democratic values. Two and half millennia ago, Kautilya proposed an elaborate welfare state in domestic politics, something that has been called a socialized monarchy.⁵

Kautilya was the earliest thinkers who shifted monarch accountability from the god to the people. He stated that happiness of the people is the happiness of the king. It is pertinent to mention here that monarchy believed that king is the representative of the god on the planet therefore he is accountable for the god only. It also believed that it has no accountability for the people. We must remember that he was the Prime Minister under a monarch and therefore he took comprehensive risk to divert the accountability of the king from the

god to the people. In contemporary global society, democracy is well accepted way of governance and non democratic countries are also even claiming that they are democratic. But during Kautilya time it was not even a remote possibility. In this prevailing situation he gave much importance to the people and laid the foundation of modern democracy.

Historical Background of Women Empowerment in India

The status of Women in India has been subject to many great changes over the past few millenniums. In early Vedic period Women enjoyed equal status with men. Rigved & Upanishads mention several names of women sages and seers notably Gargi & Maitrey. However later the status of women began to deteriorate approximately from 500 B.C., the situation worsened with invasion of Mughal invaders.

Some reformatory movements by Guru Nanak, Jainism, Rajaram Mohan Rai, Ishwarchandra Vidya Sagar, Pandita Rama Bai and others did give some relief. It is not that Britishers didn't do anything for improving the condition of women. Some laws were enacted such as "Abolition of practice of Sati", Widow Remarriage Act 1856 etc.

The real change came after independence. Constitution of India guarantees equality to women (Article 14). There are other articles too which ensure rights of women e.g. no discrimination by the state (article 15(1)) equality of opportunity (Article 16) etc. Feminist activism picked up momentum in India during later 1970's. Later on many groups and NGO's have been working for the Empowerment of women. We are proud that in India Women got voting right much before USA and some other European countries.

Steps towards Women Empowerment

The Constitution Framers were very much conscious of the problem of women empowerment hence they ensured that the Principle of Gender Equality is enshrined in the Indian Constitution in its Preamble, Fundamental duties and Directive Principles. The various articles mentioned in the earlier paragraph are meant for ensuring gender equality. Moreover the Constitution also empowers the states to adopt measures of positive discrimination in favour of women. Dr. Ambedkar was particularly concerned for women empowerment and

as first law minister of the country he enacted many women friendly legislation.

The real impetus for this movement was gained when many scheme were launched, UNDP also incorporated issues of women upliftment as Primary objective. Various Schemes were later on launched for the empowerment of women such as Rashtriya Mahila Kosh, Mahila Samridhi Yojana, Beti Bachao Beti Padhao, Self help groups at Panchayat level and many more. The establishment of National Women's Commission and State Women's Commissions were important milestones in the direction of Women Empowerment in India.

The National Policy for the Empowerment of women (2001) was an important step taken by the Government of the time for accelerating the pace of women empowerment. The policy was aimed at ensuring women empowerment through positive economic and social policies for the full development of women. So that they could realize their full potential. The policy assured equal access to women to health care, quality education, participation and decision making in Social, Political and Economical life of the nation.

The National Policy also aims at strengthening legal system for eliminating discrimination against Women. Gamuts of legislations have been passed by the legislatures to ensure equality and dignity to women. Judiciary has also contributed enormously to support women cause in a comprehensive way. Media and other facets of civil- society has played crucial role to ensure dignity to women community. It also visualizes strengthening partnership with Civil Society, particularly Women's organizations. States have also taken various measures for empowerment of women.

Despite various measures taken up by the government after Independence and the Women haven't been fully empowered. We may be proud of women in India occupying highest offices of President, Prime Minister, Lok Sabha Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, Chief Minister's or many women like Ms. Chandra Kochar occupying highest positions in the Corporate Sector but the fact remains that we still witness dowry deaths, domestic violence and verities of exploitation of women. The female feticide is not an uncommon phenomenon.

The male female ratio though improved over last few years is still far from satisfactory. It is 940 women per 1000 men for India in some states it is as much lower as 800. These are the states where

female feticide is maximum. The female literacy rate is also lower than the male literacy rate. The popular UNESCO slogan should come in handy:

*“educate a man and you educate an individual;
educate a woman and you educate a family”.*

A conquering king should reassure a defeated people that not much, except their rulers, will change. The king who has triumphed “should adopt a similar character, dress, language and behavior (as the subjects). And he should show the same devotion in festivals in honour of deities of the country, festive gatherings and sportive amusements.”⁶ He should keep his promises, especially to those who helped him win, he should honor the local “deities,” and he should make grants of land and money to men distinguished in wisdom and piety.⁷ And the conquering king should show his goodwill toward the defeated by instituting “a righteous custom, not initiated before.”⁸ While the victorious king is reassuring the general population with generous policies, he must continue to kill anyone who is dangerous and those who are disgruntled: “He should put down by silent punishment those capable of injuring (him) or those brooding on the master’s destruction.”⁹ In what might be a surprising observation about those whom the king has killed, Kautilya commented that if one must kill a dangerous person, the king must leave his property untouched and “shall not covet the land, property, sons or wives of the slain one.”¹⁰ It is significant to mention here that Kautilya was advocating due respects to women but interestingly Aristotle, who considered as the father of modern political science was advocating for less rights and less food for the women. Even today in the second decade of 21st century, which is considered as enlightened era, Aristotle remains fulcrum of European superiority complex. This comparison vindicates the kind of Kautilyan accommodation for the women rights.

Concluding Remarks

It seems logical to conclude that women have shifted traditional

assumptions about their roles and capabilities. There has been a marked change, and it has been for the better. Many of its benefits

however have yet to touch the majority and all of us continue to experience various forms of gender discrimination. If laws designed to address the concerns of women are to have a dramatic and positive impact on women's lives, they must be sensitive to the social, economic and political disempowerment of women throughout the world. Here it is pertinent to mention that women discrimination could not be stopped till societal mindset will not change. Mindset of our people will only change when we will promote social movement. India is unique country where changes comes in a gradual manner therefore social movements are comprehensive way to create new social construct which could be respectable for the women.

Today our country is relatively educated but women are getting discriminated. Women constitute half of any society and without brining women into mainstreaming into development; no society could ensure sustainable development. Kautilaya was of the opinion that state will be strong first by acquiring economic well being and subsequently this power will be backbone of upliftment of all marginalized sector. Women still constitute within worst marginalized sector therefore their all round development will only ensure sustainable development of the country. Kautilya time was ancient but the status of women was quite good, we need to retrieve that status for women in contemporary times.

REFERENCES

1

- 2 Martin Ravallion and Shaohua Chen have pioneered poverty analysis and also developed PovcalNet—a leading source of poverty data, including various methods for estimating future poverty levels. Ravallion's and Chen's projections typically rely on computing poverty elasticities relative to household income growth. This method is more data intensive than the method employed in the text, and is also more appropriate for short to medium term projections. See, for example, Martin Ravallion and Shaohua Chen, "What Can New Survey Data Tell Us about Recent Changes in Distribution and Poverty?", *World Bank Economic Review*, vol. 11, no. 2, (1997), pp. 357-82, and

Martin Ravallion, "Can high-inequality developing countries escape absolute poverty?", *Economic Letters* 56 (1997) pp. 51-57.

- 3 Uri Dadush and Benntt Stancil' The World Order in 2050, *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Washington, April 2010, P-17.
- 4 Oscar Lewis, *Five Families; Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*, 2004, P-107.
- 5 Stanley Wolpert, *A New History of India*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 60.,
- 6 Kautilya, *Artha's-astra*, 13.5.7-8: 491.
- 7 Kautilya, *Artha's-astra*, 13.5.11, 6: 491-92.
- 8 Kautilya, *Artha's-astra*, 13.5.24: 493.
- 9 Kautilya, *Artha's-astra*, 13.5.17: 492.
- 10 Kautilya, *Artha's-astra*, 7.16.26: 374.