

# A Critical Comparison of Kautilya's 'Arthashastra' and Machiavelli's 'The Prince', their Political Theories and Philosophies

Yamini Patruni

Delhi Public School, Ranchi and Cambridge Future Scholar

## Abstract

Kautilya's Arthashastra was translated to English in the year 1915, since then its comparison with Machiavelli started. Chanakya is credited with the creation of Arthashastra, a magnum opus on statecraft, law, military, and other matters of the state. The Arthashastra is the oldest book on political science and political ethics, and he introduced many other prominent issues to be kept in mind compared to Machiavelli. Machiavelli only concentrates on political and fiscal matters, Kautilya writes about the importance of land settlements, promotion of economic activity, rules of society, construction of infrastructure, defence, and communication. He has given a list of behavioral codes for ministers, king, and civilians. There is mention of diverse levels of administration, various departments and the roles for the officials are clearly defined. And the entire administration was based on the foundation of 'Dharma'. Arthashastra is a comprehensive, coherent, original document while on the other hand Machiavelli was seeking a job and he sent his manuscript with job application. Consequently, he covered a very few topics and did not analyze any topic in depth. Though written and compiled centuries apart and prior to Machiavelli's Prince, The Arthashastra is much more detailed and complete text on state craft which is relevant even today. Some researchers have even gone to the extent of saying that, comparing Machiavelli's Prince to Kautilya's Arthashastra is like comparing a candlelight to that of sunlight.

**Keywords:** Arthashastra, The Prince, statecraft, political ethics, administration

## Introduction

In ancient India, the Sanskrit word 'Arthashastra' was used by Kautilya around the 3<sup>rd</sup> Century BC, which is a treatise on Politics, Philosophy, Economics, and military strategy. The Arthashastra is originally a compilation of fifteen books which comprises of one hundred and fifty chapters. 'The Prince' was written by Niccolo Machiavelli much later, who is an Italian historian, politician, diplomat, philosopher, writer, who is recognized as the founder of modern political science and political ethics. It was written in 16<sup>th</sup> century; the original title was *De Principatibus* and later changed to *II Principe*. The text contains a total of twenty-six chapters mainly with diplomatic and political affairs of a king, nature of actions a king must take in various situations et cetera. Many historians and philosophers often compared the works and were critical about Arthashastra which was written at least 1800 years before The Prince. Most recently, negative views were expressed on Kautilya's Arthashastra by Roger Boesche, Henry Kissinger, Max Weber and many others have been unsubstantiated. Indeed, radical "Machiavellianism is the popular sense of the word", Max Weber stated flatly, "Is classically expressed in Indian literature in the Arthashastra of

Kautilya (written long before the birth of Christ, ostensibly in the time of Chandra Gupta Maurya); compared to it, Machiavelli's 'The Prince' in harmless".

Likewise, Bana, the 7<sup>th</sup>-century Poet and the author of Kadambari, condemned the science of Kautilya, he says,

*"Is there anything that is righteous for those for whom the science Kautilya, merciless in its precepts, rich in cruelty, is an authority, whose teachers are priests habitually hard-hearted with the practice of witchcraft, to whom ministers? , always inclined to deceive others, one councillor, whose desire is always for the goddess of wealth that has been cast away by thousands of kings, who are devoted to the application of destructive sciences; and to whom brothers, affectionate with natural cordial love, are fit victims to be murdered?"*

Kautilya's Arthashastra was translated into English in 1915, and numerous political philosophers appropriately started comparing Kautilya to Machiavelli. But these scholars focused on one part of Arthashastra, ignoring Kautilya's monumental contributions to economic principles, Law and Justice, etc. It covered all the fundamental principles required for the functioning of the state- like contractual obligations, penal laws, marriage and divorce, taxes, and even prescribed penalties if the rules were breached (Ananya Behera; 2017). On the other hand, Machiavelli did not care about how justice should be administered; instead, he wanted people's minds to be filled with fear of the new prince that he wished to see on the throne of Italy. Machiavelli's reasoning is bizarre, as he remarked, "Since there cannot be good laws where there are not excellent armies, and since there must be good laws where there are not excellent armies" (Sihag; 2017). The motives of both Kautilya and Machiavelli were different; both were hard-working and honest individuals, so the present comparison is only related to their vision, purpose, scope, objective and critical analysis of their works.

## 1. The Objectives

1. The present research is to analyze the vision, the purpose, scope, and objectives of the works.
2. The researcher through this paper would explore the policies of Kautilya and Niccolo Machiavelli.

## 2. Research Methodology

- **Approach to Research** - The materials were gathered from libraries, archives, etc. The book The Arthashastra, translated by R. Shamasastri and L.N. Rangarajan, was the primary source, and the book 'The Prince' written by Niccolo Machiavelli, was also referred to as part of the research. Previous research and other works were also used to analyze and write the present paper.
- **Types of Research:** - Exploratory Research won me in this project as this type of research will be conducted for a problem that needs to be clearly defined. While other research has been done on this problem, there is a new perspective in this paper.
- **Sources of Data Collection:** - Data was gathered from Secondary sources, including books, papers, websites and other sources. There were no surveys or studies performed.

**Comparing the Vision:** Italy at the time lacked both political power and military might sufficient to protect the integrity of the country. All the Italian states were relying for their safety on mercenary troops or on the protection of France or Spain. Machiavelli wanted to rectify this weakness and convinced the leadership that without a good army, the Republic's liberty was utterly insecure. He succeeded in his project but was removed from his position after Italy's loss to Spain in August 1512. On the other hand, Kautilya

was focused on nation-building. He had a great vision to establish a large empire wherein the people were disciplined and hard-working and ruled over by a virtuous King. He believed that the source of the livelihood of men is wealth and that the state or government has a crucial role to play in maintaining the material well-being of the nation and its people. Kautilya gave the highest priority to the preservation and promotion of dharma; he believed that if there were no dharma, there would be no society and that by the rule of law alone, the security and welfare of the people can be protected.

He says, "*Matsya - nyayamudbhavayati, danda - dharā bhava*", which means that in the absence of a magistrate, the strong will swallow the weak, but under his protection, the weak will resist the strong. Kautilya's views of the state are very similar to those of the famous philosophers in The West, such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, etc. The Concept of Natural Law, Matsya- Nyaya, must be removed (Sharma *et al.* 2023). According to Kautilya, the perfect King should possess the highest levels of discipline, intelligence, leadership, etc. He suggested reading the Vedas and philosophy to learn moral theory, which clarifies the differences between right and wrong, moral and immoral behavior (Sihag; 2005).

However, Machiavelli believed that when exercising political authority, a ruler should put the interests of the state before, the morality behind those decisions. Even in the use of violence, and brutality of a ruler should not fall behind due to a mere reason called morality. While acknowledging the positive traits of a ruler, Machiavelli emphasized that he must also have negative traits in order to be a successful leader. Machiavelli on Irrelevance of a Vision: He describes, " But my hope is to write a book that will be useful to those who read it intelligently, and so I thought it sensible to go straight to a discussion of how things are in real life and not waste time with a discussion of an imaginary world. For many authors have constructed imaginary republics and principalities that have never existed in practice and never could; for the gap between how people actually behave and how they ought to behave is as great that anyone who ignores everyday reality in order to live up to an ideal will soon discover he has been taught how to destroy himself, not how to preserve himself."

Thus, Machiavelli did not see the necessity to create any conceptual framework or program to provide wealth or security to the people, since he was seeking employment and could not afford the luxury of entertaining a vision. Living during the period of the Renaissance gave Machiavelli the inspiration he needed to create a unified peninsula, but it was all in theory, and he could not execute it properly.

**Comparing the approaches**" Kautilya says, "In the happiness of his subjects lies his own happiness....." summarizes it all. He further elaborates that, "an ideal king is one who has the highest qualities of leadership, intellect, energy and personal attributes and behaves like a sage monarch, a Rajarishi. Among other things, a Rajarishi is one 'who is ever active in promoting the *Yogakshema* of the people and who endears himself to his people by enriching them and doing good to them" (*Chapter 1 Pg 70*); he also mentions that the subjects also should practice dharma, and that when dharma overpowers dharma the King also will be destroyed. Moreover, he goes further by saying that a wicked son should not be installed on the throne even though he is the only son. And that the King's attitude to his people should be like that of a father towards his children, particularly when any danger threatened the population. Hence, the approach of Kautilya is based on the principles of dharma, "*Yatha Raja Tatha Praja*".

However, Machiavelli appears to teach the immortal pursuit of power. He clearly teaches two sets of moral values: one deals with the relation between States, where only success counts; the other more complex, concerns one's dealing with one's fellow citizens, where the means must be justified by the purposes they serve. Machiavelli does not assign any role to moral values, whether the King was dealing with his own subjects or others; that is, there was only one set of immoral values and not two sets of moral values. The

excerpts from "The Prince' (Page 11&55) clearly mention the unethical approach of Machiavelli," It is necessary not only to pay attention to immediate crises, but to foresee those that will come, and to make every effort to prevent them." whereas Kautilya believed, "It is the duty of the king to protect the people from all calamities." In fact, Kautilya established a disaster management department to tackle any crises. Kautilya, as mentioned earlier, discourages—a wicked prince who hates dharma and is full of evil from being installed on a throne. However, Machiavelli says, "A ruler, and particularly a ruler who is new to power, cannot conform to all those rules that men who are thought good are expected to respect, for he is often obliged, in order to hold on to power, to break his word, to be uncharitable, inhumane and irreligious. So, he must be mentally prepared to act as circumstances and changes in fortune require. As I said, he should do what is right if he can, but he must be prepared to do wrong if necessary."

When coming to battles and destroying the enemies, Kautilya has taken a pragmatic view. He believes that an enemy should be destroyed even if there is a great loss of men, materials, and wealth. But Machiavelli believes that victory in war is assured if there are appropriate moats and ramparts and more than enough artillery. He believes that if these requirements are fulfilled, the public stores will have enough food and drinks, and firewood, to be able to hold not for a year." This clearly shows that Machiavelli focused exclusively on the self-interest of the King. But Kautilya envisioned a well-organized, prosperous, and progressive state but not a welfare or centrally planned one. His approach was people centric.

**Views on king's nature and duties:** Kautilya (Book 1, 16) has described the following ideal for the King. "*Praja sukhe Sukham rajanah,*

*Prajanam cha hite hitam "Natmapriyam hitam rajanah, Prajanam tu priyam hitam"*

This means the monarch should seek happiness in the happiness of his citizens; his welfare is in their welfare; his good is not in what pleases him but in what pleases the citizens. Kautilya did not subscribe to the divine origin of the King but was a human institution. However, the King was expected to be more than a mere human being since he was the protector of the dharma of the whole society. He had to observe exemplary conduct himself. He had no private life, and all his actions were subject to public scrutiny (Rao; 1958:122). On the other hand, Machiavelli suggested that the King should pretend to be ethical but need not behave ethically. He suggests that a city where people are habituated to live in liberty should be destroyed. So, Machiavelli's King was like a stationary bandit, Whereas Kautilya's King was a Rajarishi faithful to his subjects. Machiavelli lays great importance on a king exhibiting a charismatic, powerful, intelligent character; he says a king must never beg for help, should always have a vision before having an armed force.

In conclusion, we may say that early Indian kingship was broadly contractual, conceived as a trust, subject to popular approval, and, most importantly, subject to higher law and certain other restraints, normative and practical. It was basically a secular institution.

**On assumption on human nature:** Kautilya understood the link between Character-building and nation-building. He believed in the ethical anchoring of the King, "A Rajarishi (a king, wise like a sage) is one who has self- control, having conquered the (inimical temptations) of the senses, cultivates the intellect by association with elders, is ever active in promoting security and welfare of the people. The King is expected to be virtuous, and much importance is laid on this character. As the only son, if he is wicked, he shall not be installed on the throne under any circumstances". There are other specific characteristics that Kautilya emphasizes, the most important being Self-Control, which is the basis of knowledge and discipline and is acquired by giving up lust, anger, greed, conceit, arrogance, etc. And also avoiding over-indulgence in all pleasures of hearing, touch, sight, taste and smell. He believed in the principle of "*Yatha Raja Tatha*

*Praja* " i.e. whatever character the King has, the other elements also come to have the same.

On the other hand, Machiavelli believed that all people were amoral or immoral. He mentions that it is praiseworthy for a prince to keep his word and to live with integrity and not cunning. However, princes who have accomplished great deeds are those who have been known to cunningly manipulate men's minds, and in the end, they have surpassed those who laid their foundations upon sincerity. Machiavelli believes in deceit and deception. And he further adds that "A wise ruler, therefore, cannot and should not keep his word, if men were all good, this precept would not be good. But since men are a wicked lot and will not keep their promises to you, you likewise need not keep yours to them." He further says (Page 73), "This is how it has to be, for you will find men are always wicked unless you give them no alternative but to be good. Some may conclude that good advice, no matter who it comes from, really comes from the ruler's own good judgment and that the ruler's good judgment never comes from good advice.

The Arthashastra also speaks on vices of men; Kautilya explains how anger and excessive desires can cause injuries to men who do not know the consequences of such emotions and actions.

**On the role of advisors (a councilor or minister):** Kautilya believes in appointing advisors in different grades of the hierarchy and that they should have them trained in all the arts and have the logical ability to foresee things. And that they should be intelligent, persevering, dexterous, eloquent, energetic, bold, brave, able to endure adversities and firm in loyalty. And that they should be amicable and not excite hatred or enmity in others. In order to arrive at the heart possible solution or decision it is necessary to appoint advisers and full information, knowledge and wisdom. Kautilya analyzed the tradeoff between efficiency and confidentiality and concluded that the optimum number of advisors should not be higher than four (Sihag; 2014).

Machiavelli could not justify the hiring of an advisor as the absence would change the King's mind due to the influence of near and dear ones. However, the near and dear ones may be protecting their own interest, in which case an advisor is required. But a ruler who is not himself wise cannot be given good advice. Machiavelli believes that a ruler should take advice only when he wants to, not when others want him to. But at the same time, he should not be discouraging everybody. Rather, he should always be asking, and he should be listening patiently. The writings in 'The Prince' further show that he is distrustful of the advisors as he mentions that, "when you see your adviser give more thought to his own interests than yours, and recognize everything he does is aimed at his own benefit, then you can be sure such a person will never be a good adviser"!

Machiavelli always believed that men are amoral and wicked unless we give them no alternative but to be good. And that good advice comes from a ruler's good judgment and never comes from good advice. On the other hand, Kautilya believed that a King can reign only with the help of others, as one wheel cannot move a chariot. So, a King should appoint advisors based on their virtues to different levels of hierarchy. He emphasized on knowledge and information. Kautilya stated that " Vishalaksha says 'never can a single person arrive at the right decisions. The work of the government is dependent on (complete) knowledge that which the King personally knows, that which is reported to him and that which he has to infer. To find out what is not known, to clarify doubts when there are alternatives, to obtain more information when only a part is known, all there can be done with the help of advisors.

Hence, a King shall conduct his deliberations with advisers of mature intelligence. (As the saying goes) 'Despise no one, (but) listen to all views; for wise man pay heed to all sensible advice, even those of a Child (1.15)." But at the same time Kautilya recommends that no one who belongs to the side likely to be



adversely affected by the project shall be consulted. However, Machiavelli, just like Kautilya, agreed that to get the best of the advisor, he should consider his adviser's interests like heaping honours on him, enriching him, placing him in debt, ensuring that he receives public recognition so that he sees that he cannot do better without him; that he has too many honours he desires no more, so much wealth he desires no more, so much status that he fears the consequences of political upheaval. Moreover, when a ruler has good advisers and knows how to treat them, then they can rely on each other; otherwise, either ruler or adviser will suffer. Kautilya considered advisers as prized employees, whereas Machiavelli could not justify the need to hire advisers as he was ignorant of the importance of pooling information.

**On Economic policy** Machiavelli just mentioned one paragraph in 'The Prince' regarding economic well-being. He wrote (pg. 70), " A ruler also should show himself to be an admirer of skill and should honour those who are excellent in any type of work. He should encourage his citizens by making it possible for them to pursue their occupation peacefully. Whether they are Businessman, farmers, or engaged in any other activity, make sure they do not hesitate to improve what they own for fear it may be confiscated from them, and they are not discouraged from investing in business for fear of losing their profits in taxes; instead, he should ensure that those who improve and invest are rewarded, as should be anyone whose actions will benefit his city or his government."

Kautilya devoted more than a third of his book to economic policies and economic administration. It is strongly of the view that the ultimate purpose of economics is to increase the welfare of the King's subjects. In outlining the duties, he states: "In the happiness of his subjects lies his happiness; in their welfare of his welfare; Whatever pleases himself he shall not consider good, but whatever pleases his subjects he shall consider as good. Hence, the King shall ever be active and discharge his duties; the root of wealth is activity, and of evil in the reverse. In the absence of activity, acquisition present and to come will finish; by activity, he can achieve both his desired and abundance of wealth (Shamasastri; 1961). The main guiding principle of the administration of the economy is diversification. The King is advised to be ever active in the management of the economy because the root of wealth is economic activity; inactivity brings material distress. With an active policy, both current prosperity and future gains are preserved.

Kautilya believed that agriculture was the most important economic activity. 'Cultivable land is better than mines because mines fill only the treasury while agricultural production fills both the treasury and the storehouses (verses 7-11, 10-12). He made janapada a unit of economic activity (like the present-day Special Economic zone) where productive economic activity took place and was completely independent; there was a lot of productive land with cultivable fields, mines, timber, forests, elephant forests and pastures. It was Capable of providing a wide variety of commodities and is a self-reliant and self-sustaining unit. They were rich areas and could support a high level of taxation and a large army. The other economic activity includes building forts, waterworks and reservoirs, mining, productive forestry, etc. The forests were well protected for various purposes like capturing the elephants and for maintaining the watershed and ecosystem services. He says, ' Among forests, one watered by a river was better because it was self-sustaining and provided shelter in times of calamities. The land was classified according to the rainfall, and the land use was done accordingly. The Arthashastra treats every aspect of trade, which is the third pillar of economic activity.

**On justice and jurisprudence :** Kautilya believed that a king who administers justice in accordance with dharma, evidence, custom and written law would be able to conquer the whole world and that only an ethical King, a raja rishi, could enact laws that would promote both efficiency and ethical conduct. Kautilya mentions that whenever there is disagreement between custom and the dharma shastras or between

the evidence and the shastras, The matter shall be decided in accordance with dharma. Whenever there is a conflict between the shastras and the written law based on dharma, then the written law shall prevail.

He mentions that "*Matsya - Nyaya mud bhavayati, danda - dhara bhava*", i.e. in the absence of a magistrate, the strong will swallow the weak, but under his protection, the weak will resist the strong. The Kautilya's Arthashastra also contained details on the administration of justice, Contract laws, property rules, punishments, etc. Kautilya, in this passage, has cautioned the King in exercising his power, "A severe king is hated by the people he terrorizes while one who is too lenient is held in contempt by his own people. Whoever imposed just and deserved punishment is respected and honored. A well-considered and just punishment makes the people devoted to dharma, artha and Karma. Unjust punishment, whether awarded in greed or ignorance, excites the fury of even the forest recluses and ascetics, not to speak of householders. When no punishment is awarded through misplaced leniency and no law prevails, then there is the law of fish. Unprotected, the small fish will be swallowed by big fish. In the presence of a king maintaining just law, the weak can resist the powerful (1.4)".

Machiavelli's goal was to create fear in the minds of the public and not the administration of justice; his logic is that, "Since there cannot be good laws where there are not good armies, and since there are good armies, there must be good laws. In Chapter 12 (page 28) he mentions that, "I said above it was necessary for a ruler to lay good foundations; otherwise, he is likely to be destroyed. The principal foundations on which the power of all governments is based (whether they may be new, long-established- or mixed) are good laws and good armies. Furthermore, since there cannot be good laws where there are not good armies, and since where there are good armies, there must be good laws, I will omit any discussion of laws and will talk about armies". The basis for Kautilya's justice in dharma and he clearly state that a Severe king is hated by the people, on the other hand Machiavelli mentions that, "there is a general rule to be noted here: People should either be caressed or crushed. If you do them minor damage, they will get their revenge, but if you cripple them, there is nothing they can do. If you need to injure someone, do it in such a way that you do not have to fear their vengeance." so a ruler ought not to mind the disgrace of being called cruel if he keeps his subjects peaceful and law-abiding, for it is more compassionate to impose harsh punishments on a few than out of excessive compassion, to allow disorder to spread. This reminds of a Chinese proverb, which says, "*Kill the chicken, to frighten the monkeys.*" Machiavelli says that it is better to be feared than loved, a king who is feared will keep the loyalty of the nobles and his subjects but he must not take actions to be hated.

**On National security and Foreign policy:** The first verse of (62), '*Sama Avaya mau Yogakshemay – Oryonih*' - The welfare of a state ensuring the security of the state within its existing boundaries and acquiring new territory to enlarge it depends on adopting a policy of non-intervention or overt action - establishes the basis for Kautilya's foreign policy. He mentions that *Yogakshema* depends on 'sama', a word which is associated with *samdhi* (peace treaty) and *samadhi* (a treaty with hostages), which should be seen as a means of creating confidence among kings. The six guiding principles governing Kautilya's foreign policy are, (i) A king shall develop his state i.e. augment its resources and power in order to enable him to embark on a campaign of conquest (ii) The enemy shall be eliminated (iii) those who help are friends (iv) a prudent course shall always be adopted; (v) Peace is to be preferred to war (vi) a king's behaviour in victory and defeat, must be just. Even in waging a War, Kautilya's advice is that it is better to attack an unrighteous King than a righteous one. A king shall also behave in a just manner towards a king whom he has subjugated.

Kautilya argued that national sovereignty was essential to prosperity since a foreign ruler would be

interested only to enrich himself. He also understood that if a country focused either only on prosperity or only on national security, it could lose both; that is, he understood the interdependence of prosperity and security. However, Machiavelli did not understand such interdependence and, therefore, paid no attention to bringing prosperity. Machiavelli was involved with national security in the position of secretary for a long time and could not develop a comprehensive approach. Kautilya suggested benefits of having the informational advantage: (i) It helped the King in negotiating a more favorable treaty, and (ii) it Provided an advantage if hostility broke out with another ruler. Both Kautilya and Machiavelli acknowledge the importance of public support. Kautilya clearly mentions the way to win public support, but Machiavelli is silent.

With regard to armies, Kautilya lists several types of armies, such as regular standing armies, territorial armies, organized militias, friendly troops, alien forces and jungle tribe forces. Kautilya concluded that the regular army was the best. He wrote, "It is better to mobilize a force earlier in the list than one later because the standing army depends on the King for its existence. Moreover, because it is constantly under training, he remarked, "Alien troops and jungle tribal forces both have plunder as their objective. When there is no plunder or when there is a calamity, they are as dangerous as a viper in one's bosom." Machiavelli too did not trust mercenary armies and remarked, "A wise ruler, therefore, will always avoid using mercenary and auxiliary troops and will rely on his force. He would rather lose with his own troops than win with someone else, for he will not regard it a true victory if it is won with troops that do not belong to him. He concluded, "I conclude, therefore, that no ruler is secure unless he has his troops.

Machiavelli says that while commanding his army, a ruler must be cruel as it is the only way to keep his army up to the standards and fit for combat as the army always looks up to their king for motivation and power. And adds that a ruler must learn to be half man and half beast at the same time, and though the image of a king who keeps his promise sounds compelling, the kings who played fox so far were the ones who ruled for a long time.

## Conclusion

Since the translation of Kautilya's Arthashastra in the Year 1915 a flock of philosophers started comparing with Machiavelli, the author of 'The Prince'. This comparison seems unfair as Kautilya lived many centuries before Machiavelli. But the sobriquet of 'Indian Machiavelli' given to Kautilya is unfair both in terms of ignorance of his work and originality. The basis of Arthashastra is rooted in dharma. As a teacher of practical statecraft, he advocated unethical methods in furtherance of national interest. Kautilya was devoted to establishing his country. Keeping in mind the political conditions of when he was studying and where he was, he had a lofty goal with a properly executed vision of creating an empire that would span the entire Indian subcontinent. He went on to create the strongest dynasty to rule India for a long time. He was instrumental in making Chandra Gupta Maurya a Vaishya (Caste), a great emperor to rule India.

It was during his reign that Alexander was camping on the fringes of his empire. It was due to the political thinking and the philosophy of Arthashastra that a direct Conflict was avoided. Machiavelli, on the other hand, did not see the necessity of creating any conceptual framework or program to provide wealth or security to the people since he was seeking employment, and his political theory could not create a unified country. He did not care about how justice should be administered. Instead, he wanted people's minds to be filled with fear. Moreover, his reasoning is strange, and he remarked, "Since there cannot be good laws where there are not excellent armies, and since there must be good laws where there are good armies' (Sihag; 2017).



Kautilya's approach is people-centric whereas Machiavelli's approach was king-centric. Kautilya's objective was to promote *Yogakshema* - peaceful enjoyment of prosperity, but Machiavelli did not propose such ideas. Machiavelli's suggestions essentially are how a king could change his status from a moving bandit to a stationary bandit. According to him, one should appear to be ethical but need not be ethical, and he advanced the maxim: the end justifies the means. Considering both works in terms of originality of concepts, theories and philosophy, 'The Arthashastra is distinct and comparing it to 'The Prince' is inequitable. Machiavelli clearly states that his goal is to write 'something useful for anyone who understands it'. He indicates that his counsel or advice is directed to make a new prince both secure and praised. If followed prudently, it will make a new prince long-established. He wants his work to be understood as a text that teaches the prince to follow the virtues that would bring him security and honor and, if necessary, abandon those that would surely cause him to lose his state and be condemned to perennial infamy. In other words, it is the philosophy of Convenience, whereas 'The Arthashastra' is laid on the concept of 'dharma' and is in tune with human nature. This philosophical text is inclusive of all ideas and aspects of modern society. Moreover, if there is any text which is most relevant in today's world is 'The Arthashastra' by Kautilya. As aforementioned, comparing it to the prince is like comparing candlelight to the Sun.

## References

1. Ananya Behera. (2017), "Kautilya and Niccolo Machiavelli: A Comparative Analysis", National Law University And Judicial Academy, Assam.
2. Aseem Prakash (December 1993), "State and Statecraft in Kautilya's Arthashastra", Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indian University, Bloomington.
3. Ambiranjana, S. (1997), "The Concepts of happiness, Ethics, and Economic Value in Ancient Economic Thought". Pp.19-42 in B. B. Price (ed.) Ancient Economic Thought, Vol. 1, Routledge. London and New York.
4. Balbir S. Sihag (2017), Kautilya and Machiavelli on Justice, Prosperity and National Security., University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, USA.
5. Fleet, J. F. (1914), "Introductory Note". Pp. V-vi in R. Shamasastri, translator, Kautilya's Arthashastra, 7th edition, 1961, Mysore Printing and Publishing House, Mysore.
6. [https://www.academia.edu/78799016/Science\\_of\\_Ethical\\_Governance\\_Complementing\\_National\\_Security](https://www.academia.edu/78799016/Science_of_Ethical_Governance_Complementing_National_Security).
7. [https://www.academia.edu/76901661/Shedding\\_Light\\_on\\_a\\_Changing\\_International\\_Order\\_Theoretical\\_and\\_Empirical\\_Challenges](https://www.academia.edu/76901661/Shedding_Light_on_a_Changing_International_Order_Theoretical_and_Empirical_Challenges).
8. [https://www.academia.edu/15260890/Making\\_Sense\\_of\\_Bureaucracy\\_with\\_Special\\_Reference\\_to\\_Kautilya's\\_Arthashastra](https://www.academia.edu/15260890/Making_Sense_of_Bureaucracy_with_Special_Reference_to_Kautilya's_Arthashastra).
9. Jaiswal, K. P. (1958), "Hindu Polity: in, Rao": 14-15.
10. "Kautilya, Vishnugupta". [4th Century BCE] (1992), The Arthashastra was Edited, rearranged, and introduced by L. N Rangranjan. New Delhi. Penguin Books.
11. "Kautilya: Arthashastra: Translated by R Shamasastri" ([1915] 1957), eighth ed. Mysore, India.
12. Mysore Printing and Publishing House.
13. Machiavelli, Niccolo. (2007), "The Prince". The Modern Library. New York.
14. Nanda Lal Darnal, "Kautilya's Arthashastra and Economic Development: An Analytical study on State's Role in Modern Perspective", Tribhuvan University, Tehrathum.

15. Rangarajan, L. N. (1992), “Kautilya: The Arthashastra” [English]. Penguin Books India.
16. Rao M.V Krishna (1958), “Studies in Kautilya”: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal.
17. Shahram Arshadnejad, (2018), “A critical comparison and contrast of Machiavelli’s The Prince, Kautilya’s Arthashastra and Han Fei Tzu’s” essential writings on the advice regarding "good government", Claremont Graduate University.
18. Sourav G pai: “Review of the Arthashastra, A strategic Treatise on Foreign Diplomacy, Political and Corporate Governance, Economic Policies, National Security and Military Strategies and its Relevance in The Modern World”, Manipal Institute of Technology Bengaluru.
19. Sarkar, S. (1999-2000) “Kautilyan Economics: An Analysis and interpretation”, Indian Economic Journal 47(4): 62-67.
20. S. Sihag (2005, March), “Kautilya on Ethics and Economics. Humanomics”, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cb018902>.
21. Sharma. (n.d), “Kautilya State and Duties of Kingship”.
22. Sihag, B.S. (2017), “Kautilya and Machiavelli on Justice. Prosperity and National Security”. Theoretical Economics letter. 7(3).