Manusmriti and Arthashastra on Punishment Theory: A Jurisprudential Comparison with Bentham and Kant

P. S. Aithal [1] & Ramanathan Srinivasan [2]
[1] Professor, Poornaprajna Institute of Management, Udupi - 576101, India,
Orchid ID: 0000-0002-4691-8736; E-mail: psaithal@gmail.com
[2] Emeritus Professor, Poornaprajna Institute of Management, Udupi - 576101, India,
Orchid ID: 0009-0003-9896-9943; E-mail: drsramnath2k21@outlook.com

Area/Section: Philosophy.
Type of the Paper: Exploratory Research.
Number of Peer Reviews: Two.
Type of Review: Peer Reviewed as per |C|O|P|E| guidance.
Indexed in: OpenAIRE.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20237095
Google Scholar Citation: PIJPL

How to Cite this Paper:
Aithal, P. S. & Ramanathan, S. (2026). Manusmriti and Arthashastra on Punishment Theory: A Jurisprudential Comparison with Bentham and Kant. *Poornaprajna International Journal of Philosophy & Languages (PIJPL)*, *3*(1), 428-450. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20237095

Poornaprajna International Journal of Philosophy & Languages (PIJPL)
A Refereed International Journal of Poornaprajna Publication, India.
ISSN: 3107-4634

Crossref DOI: https://doi.org/10.64818/PIJPL.3107.4634.0043

Received on: 05/04/2026
Published on: 18/05/2026

Manusmriti and Arthashastra on Punishment Theory: A Jurisprudential Comparison with Bentham and Kant

P. S. Aithal [1] & Ramanathan Srinivasan [2]
[1] Professor, Poornaprajna Institute of Management, Udupi - 576101, India,
Orchid ID: 0000-0002-4691-8736; E-mail: psaithal@gmail.com
[2] Emeritus Professor, Poornaprajna Institute of Management, Udupi - 576101, India,
Orchid ID: 0009-0003-9896-9943; E-mail: drsramnath2k21@outlook.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *The philosophy of punishment — addressing why societies inflict suffering on those who violate their norms, how much suffering is warranted, and what institutional processes are required to ensure just outcomes — is among the oldest and most contested domains of legal and moral philosophy. The Western academic tradition has typically treated Immanuel Kant's retributive theory and Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian framework as the foundational pillars of modern punishment philosophy, constructing subsequent jurisprudential debate largely as a dialogue between these two positions. This framing, however, systematically marginalizes a body of sophisticated punishment theory that predates both Kant and Bentham by more than two millennia: the ancient Indian frameworks of the Manusmriti and Kautilya's Arthashastra, which developed comprehensive, internally consistent, and practically implemented philosophies of punishment that engaged the same fundamental jurisprudential questions with remarkable analytical depth.*

Methodology: *In this paper, the exploratory qualitative research method is used. The relevant information is collected using keyword-based search in Google search engine, Google Scholar search engine, and AI-driven GPTs. This information is analysed and interpreted as per the objectives of the paper.*

Analysis/Results: *This research paper undertakes a systematic and multi-dimensional comparative jurisprudential analysis of four punishment theories across two civilizational traditions: the Manusmriti's dharma-based retributive framework (c. 200 BCE–200 CE), the Arthashastra's pragmatic dandaneeti system (c. 300 BCE), Kant's deontological retributivism (1785–1797), and Bentham's utilitarian calculus (1780–1789). The paper examines each theory across seven jurisprudential dimensions: foundational philosophical premise, purpose and justification of punishment, proportionality doctrine, treatment of protected classes and vulnerable persons, evidentiary and procedural standards, institutional structures, and legacy in contemporary Indian penal law.*

Originality/Values: *The paper argues three principal claims. First, both the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra developed sophisticated punishment theories that anticipated, in different respects, both the retributive and the utilitarian strands of Western punishment philosophy — demonstrating that the fundamental jurisprudential questions about punishment are universal, even as the answers offered differ across cultural and philosophical contexts. Second, the Arthashastra's pragmatic, evidence-based, institutionally elaborated framework is in several important respects more advanced than either Kant's purely deontological or Bentham's purely consequentialist position, combining proportionality, procedural rigour, institutional differentiation, and consequentialist state-interest reasoning in a way that anticipates modern mixed theories of punishment. Third, contemporary Indian penal law — from the Indian Penal Code's proportionality provisions through the Supreme Court's rarest-of-rare doctrine to the ongoing reform debates about rehabilitation and restorative justice — reflects a genuine jurisprudential pluralism that draws simultaneously on all four traditions examined in this paper, and cannot be adequately understood through any single theoretical lens.*

Type of Paper: *Exploratory Research.*

Keywords: Manusmriti, Arthashastra, Punishment theory, Dandaneeti, Kant, Retributivism, Bentham, Utilitarianism, Comparative jurisprudence, Indian penal law, Dharma, Rarest of rare doctrine, Lex talionis, Indian Knowledge Systems, Philosophy of punishment

1. INTRODUCTION :

Every civilized society confronts the same fundamental question: what justifies the deliberate infliction of pain, deprivation, or death upon a member of that society in response to their violation of its norms? The question is deceptively simple; it has generated millennia of philosophical controversy and continues to animate the most contested debates in contemporary criminal law, from the death penalty to mass incarceration to restorative justice. What makes this question particularly fascinating from a cross-civilizational perspective is that societies that had no contact with each other and operated within entirely different philosophical and religious frameworks arrived at responses that are simultaneously deeply divergent in their premises and remarkably convergent in several of their practical conclusions [1-6].

The dominant narrative of Western legal philosophy identifies Immanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham as the founding theorists of modern punishment philosophy — Kant for his categorical, duty-based retributivism that grounds punishment in the offender's desert without reference to social consequences, and Bentham for his consequentialist utilitarianism that evaluates punishment entirely in terms of its capacity to produce the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This narrative is not wrong, but it is radically incomplete. By the time Kant published the Metaphysics of Morals in 1797 and Bentham the Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation in 1789, the Indian subcontinent had already been living with elaborately institutionalized punishment philosophies for more than two thousand years — philosophies encoded in texts of extraordinary sophistication and implemented through state systems of considerable administrative complexity.

1.1 Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797) and Bentham's *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789):

These two landmark works represent the foundational poles of Western moral and penal philosophy, standing in productive tension with each other. Immanuel Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797) grounds punishment in the categorical imperative — the rational, unconditional moral law — arguing that punishment is a duty owed to the offender as a rational moral agent, entirely independent of social utility or deterrent effect. For Kant, to punish for any reason other than desert is to treat the person merely as a means to an end, violating the dignity that belongs to every rational being. Punishment, on this retributivist view, is not an instrument of social engineering but an act of moral respect [7-9]. Jeremy Bentham's *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789), by contrast, dismisses retribution as irrational vengeance dressed in philosophical language. Rooted in the utilitarian calculus, Bentham holds that pleasure and pain are the sovereign masters of human conduct, and that punishment — being itself an evil — is justified only insofar as it prevents a greater evil through deterrence, incapacitation, or rehabilitation [10-14]. Together, these works define the enduring debate between desert-based and consequence-based theories of punishment that continues to animate criminal jurisprudence, sentencing policy, and legal philosophy across all major legal traditions, including contemporary Indian legal scholarship engaging with *dharmic* conceptions of justice.

The Manusmriti (c. 200 BCE–200 CE) and Kautilya's Arthashastra (c. 300 BCE) are the primary texts of this tradition. Together, they represent the two principal theoretical strands of ancient Indian punishment philosophy: the Manusmriti providing a dharma-based moral and religious framework in which punishment is grounded in cosmic duty and the protection of the social order established by divine law; and the Arthashastra providing a secular, pragmatic, and instrumentally rational framework in which punishment serves the state's interests of stability, prosperity, and the prevention of anarchy. The relationship between these two strands — dharmic moral necessity and pragmatic state interest — mirrors, with remarkable precision, the relationship between Kant's deontological retributivism and Bentham's consequentialist utilitarianism, though it also diverges from that relationship in ways that are philosophically illuminating.

This paper is organized into ten substantive sections. After this introduction and a statement of objectives, it examines the Manusmriti's punishment philosophy in depth (Chapter 3), followed by the Arthashastra's dandaneeti framework (Chapter 4). Chapters 5 and 6 examine Kant's retributivism and

Bentham's utilitarianism, respectively. Chapter 7 presents a systematic comparative analysis across all four theories, supported by formatted comparative tables. Chapter 8 examines the legacy of all four traditions in modern Indian penal law. Chapter 9 develops synthesis and theoretical implications, and Chapter 10 concludes with directions for further research.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE :

Table 1 and 2 list the summary of the scholarly papers published with keywords: Manusmriti and Arthashastra on Punishment Theory and Bentham and Kant:

Table 1: Review of literature using keyword: Manusmriti and Arthashastra on Punishment Theory and

S. No.	Area	Focus/Outcome	Reference
1	Concept of Punishment and Its Justification in Indian Perspective	This paper examines the concept of punishment in India through legal, philosophical, and sociological perspectives, tracing its evolution from ancient texts like the Manusmriti and Arthashastra to the modern judicial system. It highlights major theories of punishment, contemporary challenges, and the growing need for reformative and restorative justice approaches in India.	Mishra, V. L., & Malviya, K. M. (2025). [1]
2	Study of the Judiciary and Administration in Ancient India with special reference to Manusmriti and Arthashastra	The author examines the principles of the Manusmriti and Arthashastra to analyse the nature of administration and the judicial system in ancient India. The paper provides insights into the views of Manu and Kautilya on state governance, administration, and the functioning of the judiciary during the ancient period.	Umashankar, P. (2022). [15]
3	Growth of punishment philosophies in India	This paper examines the evolution of punishment philosophies in India from traditional reformative approaches to colonial and post-independence punitive systems. It highlights the growing emphasis on rehabilitation, restorative justice, and humane punishment practices in response to changing social and legal perspectives on crime and justice.	Parouha, D. (2023). [16]
4	Punishment Policy in the Vedic Tradition	This paper challenges the perception of Indian culture as purely spiritual by highlighting the importance of governance, law enforcement, and punishment policies in ancient Indian thought. Drawing from texts such as the Vedas, Mahabharata, Ramayana, and Arthashastra, it explains how the use of force and punishment was viewed as essential for maintaining social order, justice, and collective welfare.	Sondhi, S. (2025). [2]
5	Punishment Policy in the Vedic Tradition	In Indian tradition, dandaniti (punishment policy) is regarded as an essential duty to control crime, protect the vulnerable, and maintain social order. The use of force and law enforcement is viewed as constructive and necessary for safeguarding society,	Sondhi, S. (2025). [3]

		preserving stability, and promoting the common good.	
6	Criminal Justice Tenets in Manusmriti	This chapter critically examines the criminal justice principles outlined in the Manusmriti. It is divided into three sections: the first discusses the administration of justice, the second analyses crimes and punishments, and the third presents a critical evaluation of the code and its principles.	Jaishankar, K., & Halder, D. (2019). [4]
7	Karma and social justice in the criminal code of Manu	This paper examines the distribution of punishments among the four varnas in the Manusmriti for similar crimes such as theft, assault, and adultery. It critically reviews the pollution and power theories of punishment and proposes a third explanation based on the principle of religious merit (punya–papa) to better understand the hierarchical nature of punishments in Manu's legal system.	Glucklich, A. (1982). [17]
8	An Analysis of Theories of Punishment and Its Relevance in the Administration of Justice in India	This paper examines the theories of punishment and their influence on the administration of justice in India. It explores how the state's authority to punish evolved from social contract principles and analyses the role of punitive philosophies in maintaining social order, fairness, and an effective legal system through a balanced approach to justice.	Priya, K. L. (2024). [18]
9	Dandaniti in the Indian Tradition	This paper highlights the role of dandaniti in Indian tradition as a means of maintaining social harmony, moral discipline, and righteous conduct. Drawing from the Vedas and dharmashastra literature, it explains how the state was viewed as a moral institution that promotes virtue, curbs wrongdoing, and supports the collective progress of society and individuals.	Sondhi, S. (2025). [19]
10	Relationship between state and dharma in Manusmriti	This paper examines the relationship between Dharma and the State in the Manusmriti, highlighting concepts such as good governance, rights, duties, and judiciary. It explains how the duties of the king were defined as Rajdharma, emphasizing righteous conduct and moral responsibility in governance.	Meena, S. L. (2005). [20]
11	Human Rights of Arrested Person in Ancient India	This paper examines the criminal administration of justice with special reference to the rights of arrested persons in ancient India. It explores the balance between individual liberty and social security, highlighting how justice systems recognized the importance of fair and	Verma, D. P., & HPS, R. C. C. (2014). [21]

		humane treatment even during arrest and law enforcement procedures.	
12	Exploring the Relationship between Dharma and Law	This article explores the relationship between Dharma and Law by examining the evolution of legal and moral principles rooted in the Vedas and the Manusmriti. It analyses how traditional concepts of Dharma resonate with modern branches of law, including constitutional, civil, criminal, and international law.	Deshmukh, M. (2022). [22]
13	Early Theories of Punishment: Deterrence, Rehabilitation and Restoration in Ancient Greek and Indian Penology	This study analyses ancient theories of punishment in Greece and India using modern penological concepts. It highlights that rational approaches to punishment and alternatives to retributive justice existed as early as the axial age (800–200 BCE).	Linderborg, O. (2024). [23]

Table 2: Review of literature using keyword: Bentham and Kant

S. No.	Area	Focus/Outcome	Reference
1	Conservation or the moral high ground: siding with Bentham or Kant	This study examines the ethical and conservation debates surrounding trophy hunting, highlighting how public reactions to incidents such as the killing of Cecil reflect conflicts between moral values, wildlife management practices, and conservation goals.	Macdonald, D., Burnham, D., Dickman, A., Loveridge, A., & Johnson, P. (2016). [24]
2	Beyond Kant and Bentham	This study reviews the application of ethical theories in the development of Artificial Moral Agents (AMAs), such as robots and autonomous vehicles. It highlights the dominance of deontology and consequentialism in AMA design and argues for broader inclusion of diverse ethical perspectives beyond traditional Western moral frameworks.	Zoshak, J., & Dew, K. (2021). [25]
3	Bentham, Kant, and the right to communicate	This paper compares the views of Bentham and Kant on freedom of the press, highlighting Bentham's emphasis on public control of the state and Kant's focus on rational public discourse. It argues that true press freedom should prioritize individuals' right to communicate rather than merely protecting the property rights of media owners.	Splichal, S. (2003). [25]
4	Why Kant	These essays emerged from the 1986 conference on Kantian Legal Theory, which aimed to highlight the significance of Immanuel Kant as a legal thinker in addition to his role in moral and philosophical theory. The collection sought to address the limited attention given to Kant's legal philosophy in English-language scholarship.	Fletcher, G. P. (1987). [26]

5	Bentham, Rights and Humanity	This paper examines criticisms of Jeremy Bentham and utilitarianism for allegedly disregarding individual rights. It analyses Bentham's critique of natural rights and argues that debates comparing utilitarianism with Kantian rights-based philosophy often misinterpret Bentham's original arguments and philosophical framework.	Alexander, A. (2003). [27]
6	Bentham and the Question of Identity	This passage reflects a philosophical discussion on morality, behaviour, and piety within a prison setting, where participants debate whether morality is defined by actions alone or also influenced by personal beliefs and intentions.	Szifris, K. (2021). [28]
7	Bentham's Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation	This passage discusses Jeremy Bentham and the development of Benthamism as a scientific and utilitarian approach to morality and law. It highlights Bentham's criticism of natural law theories and his attempt to establish ethics on rational, experience-based principles rather than fixed moral assumptions.	Grundstein, N. D. (1953). [29]
8	A quest for inspiration in the liberal peace paradigm: back to Bentham?.	This article reassesses Immanuel Kant's theory of perpetual peace by comparing it with the liberal ideas of Jeremy Bentham. It examines the philosophical differences between the two thinkers and their implications for liberal theories of international peace and democratic relations.	Baum, T. (2008). [30]
9	Federalism and the Unity of Early Liberalism	This essay explores the shared influence of Adam Smith on the political ideas of Jeremy Bentham and Immanuel Kant. It highlights their common liberal views on trade, federalism, and peace, showing how these ideas shaped the broader liberal political tradition.	Schliesser, E. (2025). [31]
10	From Kantian friendship to Benthamite partnership	This paper expands Alexander Wendt's framework of anarchy cultures by proposing a fourth model, the "Benthamite culture of anarchy," based on partnership and cooperation. Using transatlantic relations during Donald Trump's first term as a case study, it argues that these relations reflected a contested partnership rather than pure friendship or rivalry.	Krstić, M., Nedeljković, S., & Dašić, M. (2025). [32]

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY :

This research is guided by the following specific objectives:
(1) To conduct a rigorous textual and philosophical analysis of the Manusmriti's punishment theory, examining its dharmic foundations, typology of punishments, judicial procedures, proportionality doctrine, and the role of the king as divine judicial authority.

(2) To analyse Kautilya's Arthashastra dandaneeti framework systematically, covering its court system (Dharmasthiyas and Kantakashodhanas), evidence-based jurisprudence, saptanga state theory, treatment of vulnerable classes, and the relationship between punishment and state prosperity.
(3) To examine Kant's retributive theory of punishment comprehensively — including the categorical imperative, lex talionis, the equality principle, the rejection of consequentialist justifications, and the treatment of capital punishment — as a foundational contribution to Western jurisprudential theory.
(4) To analyse Bentham's utilitarian punishment framework — including the principle of utility, felicific calculus, primary and secondary mischief, deterrence, reform, incapacitation, and the critique of capital punishment — and its relationship to modern consequentialist jurisprudence.
(5) To construct a systematic multi-dimensional comparative analysis of all four punishment theories across jurisprudential dimensions, including philosophical foundation, purpose of punishment, proportionality, evidence standards, protected classes, institutional design, and state role.
(6) To trace the legacy of all four theoretical traditions in contemporary Indian penal law, with particular reference to the Indian Penal Code, the rarest-of-rare doctrine in capital sentencing, the rehabilitation and reform debate, and the evolving jurisprudence of the Supreme Court of India.
(7) To develop a synthesis that positions Indian punishment philosophy as a significant and independent contribution to global jurisprudential thought, and to argue for its substantive integration into comparative law and legal philosophy curricula.

4. METHODOLOGY :

The paper uses the exploratory qualitative research method. The relevant information is collected using keyword-based search in Google search engine, Google Scholar search engine, and AI-driven GPTs. This information is analysed and interpreted as per the objectives of the paper [33-39].

5. PUNISHMENT PHILOSOPHY IN THE MANUSMRITI :

5.1 The Dharmic Foundation: Law as Cosmic Order:

The Manusmriti — also known as the Manava Dharmashastra — occupies a foundational position in the history of Indian legal thought as the most comprehensive and influential of the classical Dharmashastra texts. Composed between approximately 200 BCE and 200 CE (with the core text likely older), it spans twelve chapters addressing the full spectrum of dharmic obligation: the creation of the world, the four varnas and their respective duties, the stages of life (ashramas), rules for householders, civil and criminal law, and the consequences of virtuous and vicious conduct in this life and the next. Chapters 7, 8, and 9 — addressing kingship, civil and criminal law, and family obligations — are the text's primary jurisprudential content and constitute a comprehensive legal code of remarkable detail and sophistication [40-42].
The organizing concept of the Manusmriti's legal philosophy is Dharma — a term whose complexity resists simple translation. Dharma encompasses righteous conduct, cosmic order, social duty determined by one's varna and ashrama, divine law, and the principle that sustains both the individual and the social fabric. Violations of dharma are not merely legal infractions but moral and religious transgressions that disturb cosmic order, harm the violator's karmic future, and threaten the social structure that makes human civilization possible. This metaphysical grounding of legal obligation — in which law is not a human convention but a reflection of divine and cosmic necessity — gives Manusmriti jurisprudence its distinctive character: punishment is not a social policy choice but a sacred duty.

dharma eva hato hanti dharmo rakṣati rakṣitaḥ |
tasmād dharmo na hantavyo mā no dharmo hato'vadhīt || 8.15 ||

Justice, blighted, blights; and justice, preserved, preserves; hence justice should not be blighted, lest blighted justice blight us. — (8.15)

> *"Dharma violated indeed destroys the one who violates it, and justice preserved surely protects the one who protects it." — Manusmriti, 8.15*

This formulation contains in compressed form the entire philosophy of the Manusmriti's approach to punishment: dharma is simultaneously a moral obligation and a practical safeguard; its violation is self-destructive; its protection is self-protective. The implication for punishment theory is direct: punishing

the guilty is not merely socially useful but cosmically necessary, a restoration of the dharmic order that the crime has disturbed.

This positions the Manusmriti closer to Kantian retributivism — punishment as moral necessity — than to Benthamite consequentialism — punishment as social utility. But the similarity is not perfect, as we shall examine in Section 9 of the paper.

5.2 Danda Niti: The Science of Punishment as Sacred Governance:

The Manusmriti's treatment of punishment centers on the concept of Danda (दण्ड) — literally meaning "staff" or "rod," but used metonymically for the power of punishment and its institutional exercise. Manu elevated Danda from a mere policy instrument to a sacred embodiment of divine justice: "Punishment governs all mankind, punishment alone preserves them, punishment wakes while their guards are asleep." This remarkable formulation — punishment as the vigilant guardian of civilization — positions Danda as the foundation of all social order. Without it, the varna system would collapse, the strong would prey on the weak, and the productive activities that sustain civilization would become impossible.

The Manusmriti prescribed four categories of punishment arranged in ascending severity, forming a graduated response system that reflects sophisticated proportionality thinking (Table 3):

Table 3: Categories of punishment arranged in ascending severity

Punishment Type	Sanskrit Term	Application	Modern Equivalent
Verbal Reprimand	Vak-Danda	Minor, first-time offenses	Police caution; verbal warning
Censure	Dhik-Danda	First-degree crimes; repeat offenders	Formal reprimand; community service
Financial Penalty	Dhana-Danda	Mid-level offenses ; property crimes	Fines; compensation orders
Corporal Punishment	Badha-Danda	Severe crimes; treason; murder	Imprisonment; capital punishment

This typology reveals several important features of Manusmriti punishment philosophy. First, the escalating severity of the categories reflects a genuine proportionality principle: minor offenses receive minor responses, and escalation requires commensurate justification. Second, the inclusion of admonition (Vak-Danda) as a legitimate punishment category reflects an understanding that the purpose of punishment includes moral communication — the offender must understand the wrongfulness of their conduct — not merely physical coercion. Third, the financial penalty category (Dhana-Danda) reflects an understanding of punishment as a deterrent operating through economic interest, anticipating Benthamite calculus in a limited domain.

5.3 The King as Supreme Judicial Authority:

The Manusmriti's institutional architecture of criminal justice centers on the king as both the supreme judicial authority and the divine instrument through which dharma is enforced in the human realm. The king functioned simultaneously as Danda (the wielder of punishment) and Chhatri (the protector of subjects), representing divine authority in the temporal domain. As representative of the divine order, the king bore sole ultimate responsibility for the implementation of dharma through judicial decisions. Learned Brahmanas assisted in decision-making — providing interpretive expertise in the complex body of dharmic law — but final judgment rested with the king, who's personal dharmic standing was implicated in every judicial decision he made.

The evidentiary standards the Manusmriti prescribed for royal judicial proceedings were notably rigorous for their historical context. During trials, the king was instructed to assess the credibility of witnesses through careful observation of bodily gestures, eye movements, voice, and demeanour — a form of proto-psychological assessment that anticipates modern demeanour evidence doctrine. Witnesses from all four varnas could testify, subject to exclusion rules (friends, dependents, enemies,

and servants of the accused were disqualified) that reflect an understanding of motivated testimony. The consequences of false testimony were severe — fines, social condemnation, and karmic consequences — creating both legal and metaphysical deterrents against perjury.

Particularly noteworthy is the Manusmriti's distributed guilt principle: if injustice occurred in the judicial assembly, culpability was apportioned equally among the perpetrator, the witnesses, the tribunal members, and the king. This principle of institutional co-responsibility for judicial outcomes — in which the king's failure to prevent injustice made him morally liable for it — anticipates modern concepts of judicial accountability and the state's responsibility to ensure fair trials.

5.4 Proportionality, Circumstances, and the Limits of Manusmriti Justice:

Manu's sentencing philosophy required judges to weigh multiple contextual factors before imposing punishment: motive (including starvation, criminal association, addiction, intentionality, and external inducement), time (day or night, scarcity or plenty, the offender's age), place (village, forest, granary, pasture ground), and the offender's condition and social position. This multi-factor proportionality doctrine is sophisticated by any jurisprudential standard, anticipating the individualized sentencing approaches that modern criminal law struggled to develop through the twentieth century [1, 4, 17].

The system also recognized progressive consequences for repeat offenders: warning for a first offense, condemnation for a second, censure and fine for a third, and corporal punishment for a fourth. This graduated escalation reflects an understanding of recidivism — the offender who persists despite lesser sanctions has demonstrated that progressive force is necessary to achieve the deterrence and moral correction that the lighter sanctions failed to accomplish.

The Manusmriti's most serious jurisprudential limitation — and one that must be acknowledged with full candour in any scholarly assessment — is its explicit caste-based differentiation in punishment. Brahmins were systematically exempted from serious physical penalties that were applied to members of lower varnas for the same offenses. Shudras faced the harshest penalties for violations that attracted only fines or censure for higher-varna offenders. This caste disparity represents a fundamental violation of the equality principle that both Kant and Bentham explicitly affirmed and constitutes one of the most serious points of divergence between ancient Indian punishment philosophy and both Western theories and the constitutional values of the modern Indian Republic. The critical scholarly engagement requires that we recognize this limitation while not allowing it to prevent genuine assessment of the theory's sophisticated contributions in other dimensions.

6. KAUTILYA'S ARTHASHASTRA: DANDANEETI AS STATE SCIENCE :

6.1 Foundational Premises: Secular Pragmatism and State Interest:

Kautilya's Arthashastra, composed around 300 BCE, approaches punishment from an entirely different philosophical starting point than the Manusmriti. Where the Manusmriti grounds punishment in dharmic cosmic necessity, the Arthashastra grounds it in secular, pragmatic state interest. Dandaneeti — the science of punishment — is presented not as a divine mandate but as a systematic body of knowledge about effective law enforcement in the service of the state's fundamental goals: the acquisition of non-acquired resources, the preservation of acquired assets, the augmentation of preserved wealth, and the fair distribution of augmented resources. This explicitly consequentialist framing — punishment serves state economic and political stability — makes the Arthashastra philosophically closer to Bentham's utilitarianism than to Kant's retributivism, while simultaneously containing elements that both theories lack [43-46].

Kautilya's treatment of Danda reflects the same tension between severity and restraint that characterizes sophisticated punishment theory in any tradition. He stressed that Danda symbolized sovereignty and remained absolutely mandatory to prevent anarchy — without effective punishment, the law of the fish (matsyanyaya: the large fish devouring the small) would prevail, and productive social life would become impossible. Yet he equally insisted on the exercise of Danda with utmost restraint: excessive punishment alienates subjects and generates the very instability that Danda is meant to prevent. The threat of revolt served as Kautilya's empirical reminder that regime stability depended ultimately on subject contentment — a consequentialist insight that neither Manu's divine mandate framework nor Kant's categorical imperative could easily accommodate.

6.2 The Dual Court System: Institutional Differentiation:

One of the Arthashastra's most significant institutional innovations is its establishment of two specialized court types with distinct jurisdictions, compositions, and procedural frameworks — a differentiation that anticipates the civil-criminal court distinction that modern legal systems regard as foundational.

The Dharmasthiyas (civil courts) comprised three members proficient in sacred law alongside three amatyas (royal ministers), handling disputes over agreements, marriages, gifts, inheritance, and succession. This mixed composition — combining legal expertise (knowledge of sacred law) with administrative capacity (ministerial authority) — reflects an understanding that civil disputes require both interpretive skill and practical administrative knowledge to resolve effectively.

The Kantakashodhanas (criminal courts) consisted of three pradeshtris or amatyas, addressing rape, robbery, murder, and theft. These courts represented institutional innovations specifically designed to meet the complex needs of a commercialized social economy. They functioned quasi-judicially, employing methods resembling modern police forces more than traditional judiciary — actively pursuing cases through executive initiative rather than waiting for party complaints, targeting merchants using false weights, artisans breaking contracts, physicians causing patient deaths through negligence, bribe-taking officials, and treason conspirators. This proactive, state-initiated mode of criminal prosecution anticipates the public prosecution model that modern criminal justice systems have adopted as standard practice.

6.3 Evidence-Based Justice and Procedural Rigour:

The Arthashastra's jurisprudential contribution to evidence law is particularly noteworthy and has received insufficient attention in comparative legal scholarship. Kautilya standardized four bases of justice: dharma (truth-based law), evidence (witness testimony), custom (accepted traditions), and royal edicts. He declared that regardless of the complaint sequence, witness evidence must be the primary determinant of legal outcomes — a formulation that prefigures the modern principle of evidence-based adjudication. Circumstantial evidence was explicitly acknowledged and given legal standing when direct witness testimony was unavailable — a sophisticated evidential doctrine that many contemporary legal systems struggled to develop.

> *"Conclusive proof is essential before sentencing." — Kautilya, Arthashastra, Book III*

This insistence on conclusive proof before sentencing — applied as an institutional standard rather than merely as a philosophical aspiration — represents the Arthashastra's most direct anticipation of the modern presumption of innocence. The doctrine that Kautilya's system embodied — that neither accusation, royal displeasure, nor social suspicion sufficed as the basis for punishment in the absence of adequate evidentiary proof — is more procedurally sophisticated than either Kant's or Bentham's punishment theories, which are primarily concerned with the philosophical justification of punishment rather than with the procedural conditions for its just application.

The Arthashastra also specified merit-based judicial appointments — judges were selected based on educational qualification, intelligent insight for statecraft, and righteous orientation toward justice — and established that no official remained above the law, with extra fines and penalties for public officials who abused their administrative positions.

This anti-corruption framework, embedded within the punishment system itself, reflects an understanding of what contemporary governance theory calls institutional integrity: the principle that the institutions charged with enforcing law must themselves be subject to it.

6.4 Protected Classes, Torture Limitations, and Humanitarian Provisions:

Perhaps the most surprising element of the Arthashastra's punishment framework, from the perspective of a reader expecting an ancient text to be uniformly harsh, is its extensive and systematic provisions for the protection of vulnerable persons from the worst excesses of state coercive power. Kautilya's treatment of torture — formally permitted as an interrogation tool — is notable precisely for the limits he placed upon it: torture was sanctioned only on alternate days with single punishment types at a time (preventing the accumulation of simultaneous punishments that would make the total disproportionate), and an extensive list of persons was exempted entirely.

The exempted classes — pregnant women, women who had recently delivered, children, aged persons, sick individuals, exhausted people, intoxicated persons, and insane individuals — constitute a

remarkable catalogue of humanitarian protection that reflects sophisticated thinking about the relationship between legal capacity, vulnerability, and just treatment. Women received half the normal torture compared to men — a provision whose logic is not entirely clear, but whose effect was to limit gender-based severity. Prison officials who ordered extrajudicial executions or prevented prisoners from sleeping and eating faced fines — establishing that even persons under criminal sanction retained basic rights that prison administrators were legally obligated to respect.

These protections represent an important point of convergence between the Arthashastra and both the Kantian principle of human dignity (which grounds the prohibition of treating persons merely as means) and the Benthamite principle of economic punishment (which requires that punishment produce the least possible suffering beyond what is necessary for deterrence). The Arthashastra arrived at broadly similar practical conclusions through a different theoretical route — pragmatic state interest, institutional accountability, and culturally embedded notions of proportionate treatment — but the convergence on substantive humanitarian protections is genuine and significant.

6.5 Saptanga Theory and the Structural Context of Punishment:

Kautilya's punishment philosophy cannot be understood in isolation from his broader theory of the state, articulated through the Saptanga (seven limbs) doctrine: Swamin (the king), Amatya (the council of ministers), Janapada (the people and territory), Durga (the fortified capital), Kosha (the treasury), Danda (the army and punitive power), and Mitra (allied states). Within this framework, Danda is simultaneously one element of the state apparatus and the organizing principle of its coercive power — both a component of the state structure and the animating force that makes the structure coherent and effective.

This structural embedding of punishment theory within a comprehensive theory of political organization gives the Arthashastra's jurisprudence a systemic quality that neither Kant nor Bentham's punishment theories — focused as they are on the philosophical justification of individual acts of punishment — fully achieve. For Kautilya, the question of whether and how to punish cannot be answered in isolation from questions about the state's fiscal capacity (which determines the feasibility of fines and the cost of imprisonment), its military security (which determines the severity of the threat from certain crimes), its popular legitimacy (which limits the severity of punishment that a stable regime can employ), and its foreign relations (which affects the treatment of crimes involving foreign nationals). This contextual, systems-level approach to punishment theory is arguably more sophisticated than the decontextualized philosophical analyses of Kant and Bentham, and more directly applicable to the practical challenges of criminal justice policy.

7. KANT'S RETRIBUTIVE THEORY OF PUNISHMENT :

7.1 The Categorical Imperative as the Foundation of Punishment:

Immanuel Kant's theory of punishment, developed primarily in the Metaphysics of Morals (1797) and grounded in the moral philosophy of the Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals (1785), represents the most rigorous and uncompromising articulation of the retributive position in the history of Western philosophy. Kant's punishment theory rests on his fundamental moral philosophy: the categorical imperative, which commands unconditional obedience from all rational beings not because of any consequence it produces but because it expresses the principle of moral rationality itself. The categorical imperative's primary formulation — "Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law" — establishes the criterion for moral permissibility of any action, including the act of punishment [47-51].

For Kant, the moral universe is structured by the concept of the good will: the only thing good without qualification, the will that commits itself to making morally worthy decisions regardless of consequences, self-interest, emotional impulse, or social pressure. An action that aligns with the categorical imperative is morally required; an action that violates it is morally prohibited; and the moral worth of an action depends entirely on whether it is performed from respect for the moral law rather than from any inclination, emotion, or calculation of advantage. This framework generates Kant's punishment theory through a relatively direct logical path: crime is a violation of the universal moral law, and punishment is the rational, morally required response to that violation — not because punishment produces good consequences, but because justice demands it.

7.2 Punishment as Absolute Moral Necessity: Rejecting Instrumentalization:

Kant's most influential and most controversial contribution to punishment theory is his categorical rejection of any instrumentalist justification. Judicial punishment, he argued, can never be inflicted merely as a means to promote some other good — whether for the criminal's own benefit (rehabilitation), for society's benefit (deterrence), or for any other forward-looking purpose. Punishment must be imposed solely because the offender has committed a crime. This backward-looking, desert-based justification is grounded in Kant's deeper principle that human beings, as rational agents possessed of innate personality and dignity, may never be treated as mere means to others' purposes.

> *"Judicial punishment can never be inflicted merely as a means to promote some other good for the criminal himself or for civil society but must in all cases be imposed only because the individual on whom it is inflicted has committed a crime." — Kant, Metaphysics of Morals, 1797*

The force of this argument is considerable. If punishment is justified by deterrence, then an innocent person could in principle be punished if doing so would produce sufficient deterrent effect — the classic utilitarian objection that Benthamite consequentialism has difficulty answering convincingly. If punishment is justified by rehabilitation, then an offender who is already reformed need not be punished — which seems to conflict with the intuition that justice requires accountability for past wrongs regardless of the offender's current character. Kant's retributivism avoids both problems: punishment is owed to the offender by virtue of their crime, not by virtue of any future calculation, and the calculation of future benefits is irrelevant to whether the punishment is just.

7.3 Lex Talionis: The Equality Principle of Proportionality:

The practical measure of punishment in Kant's framework is provided by the lex talionis — the law of equal retribution. Whatever undeserved evil one inflicts upon another, one inflicts upon oneself: "If you insult another, you insult yourself; if you steal from another, you steal from yourself; if you kill another, you kill yourself." Kant regarded this principle of strict equality as the only coherent basis for determining the quality and quantity of punishment, precisely because it eliminates the fluctuating and extraneous considerations that enter utilitarian calculations of optimal deterrence. The measure of punishment is not what will optimally deter future crime (which requires empirical prediction about future behaviour) but what is strictly equal to the crime committed (which requires only the backward-looking moral judgment of proportionate desert).

Proportionality remains central to Kantian justice, though its application requires judgment when literal equality is impossible. When a wealthy person insults a poor person, strict lex talionis might produce an insufficient response; in such cases, the principle's spirit must be preserved by ensuring that the offender experiences shame and suffering genuinely proportionate to the outrage caused, even if the literal form of reciprocation is not achievable. This acknowledgment of the need for principled judgment in applying the proportionality principle represents a significant and often underappreciated nuance in Kant's theory.

7.4 Kant's Position on Capital Punishment:

Kant's commitment to lex talionis generates his notorious position on capital punishment: the murderer must die. This is not, for Kant, a statement about deterrence effectiveness or about the preferences of murder victims' families; it is a statement about what justice requires.

The murder has violated the categorical imperative — the maxim "kill those who stand in your way" cannot be universalized without self-contradiction — and has inflicted the ultimate deprivation upon another rational being. Proportionate justice requires the same ultimate deprivation in return. To allow a murderer to live — even under conditions of life imprisonment — would, for Kant, represent a failure of justice: it would treat the crime as less than what it is, and would treat the murdered person's rational agency as less than fully equivalent to the murderer's.

This position has attracted extensive criticism from subsequent moral philosophers and legal theorists, most of whom find the strict lex talionis unacceptably rigid in its implications and the equation of judicial execution with murder morally problematic. The strength of Kant's position, however, is its internal consistency given the premises of retributivism and the equality principle, the conclusion follows with logical rigour. The critique must engage the premises if it is to succeed, rather than merely finding the conclusion uncomfortable.

8. BENTHAM'S UTILITARIAN THEORY OF PUNISHMENT :

8.1 The Principle of Utility as the Foundation of Law:

Jeremy Bentham's theory of punishment, developed primarily in the Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation (1789) and the Rationale of Punishment (1830), begins from an entirely different philosophical starting point from Kant's. Where Kant grounds moral philosophy in the rational will and the categorical imperative, Bentham grounds it in human psychology and the principle of utility. The principle of utility — "that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question" — provides the sole criterion for evaluating the moral permissibility of any action, including the practice of punishment [52-56].

Bentham expressed two forms of hedonism within this framework: psychological hedonism (the empirical claim that all human motivations ultimately stem from the desire for pleasure and the aversion to pain) and ethical hedonism (the normative claim that pleasure is the only intrinsic good and pain the only intrinsic evil, so that actions are right when they produce pleasure or prevent pain). Pleasure constitutes the only good; each person's happiness consists of the aggregate balance of pleasures over pains; and the legislator's task is to design legal systems — including punishment systems — that maximize the aggregate balance of pleasure over pain across all members of society. Bentham's equality principle ensured that in this calculation, "one man is worth just the same as another man": there is no privileged perspective from which one person's pleasure counts for more than another's.

8.2 The Felicific Calculus and Its Application to Punishment:

Bentham's most distinctive methodological contribution is the felicific calculus — a systematic procedure for calculating the moral value of any action by summing its pleasurable and painful consequences across their relevant dimensions. Seven variables determine an action's moral status: intensity (the strength of the pleasure or pain), duration (how long it lasts), certainty or uncertainty (the probability of its occurrence), propinquity or remoteness (how soon it will occur), fecundity (the probability that it will be followed by sensations of the same kind), purity (the probability that it will not be followed by sensations of the opposite kind), and extent (the number of persons affected).

Applied to punishment, this calculus generates a series of practical conclusions that are both powerful and counterintuitive. Punishment itself constitutes a mischief — it involves the deliberate infliction of pain — and is therefore justified only when the pain of punishment is outweighed by the pain it prevents through deterrence, incapacitation, or reform. This framework generates Bentham's famous principle of economic punishment: the desired effects should be produced employing the least possible suffering. An unnecessarily severe punishment is not merely wasteful but actively unjust — it produces more pain than the utility calculation requires, and this excess pain represents a net loss to aggregate welfare.

8.3 Primary and Secondary Mischief, and Modes of Prevention:

Bentham's analysis of the consequences of crime distinguishes between primary and secondary mischief with analytical precision. Primary mischief divides into original branches (the pain confined to the direct sufferers — the robbery victim's loss) and derivative branches (the suffering befalling assignable persons as a consequence — the robbery victim's family's distress). Secondary mischief consists of alarm (the pain of apprehension that others may suffer similar harm) and danger (the objective probability that others will suffer such harm). This disaggregation of crime's consequences allows Bentham's framework to capture the full social cost of crime — including its systemic effects on the security and peace of mind of the entire population — in a way that Kant's backward-looking retributivism, focused entirely on the particular crime committed, cannot.

Bentham identified three modes through which punishment reduces crime: deterrence (potential criminals fear the announced penalties and choose law obedience), incapacitation (criminals are confined and therefore physically unable to commit further offenses), and reformation (criminals' characters are changed through the experience of punishment, so that they no longer wish to offend). Deterrence was Bentham's primary emphasis — consistent with his psychological hedonism's claim that people are motivated by anticipated pleasure and pain — but reform was explicitly included as a legitimate goal, generating an institutional emphasis on the conditions of imprisonment that Bentham pursued through his famous (and ultimately unbuilt) Panopticon prison design.

8.4 The Critique of Capital Punishment and the Limits of Utilitarianism:

Bentham's position on capital punishment reflects the practical implications of his utilitarian calculus in a domain where Kant's lex talionis demands the most severe response. For Bentham, capital punishment must be justified — if at all — by demonstrating that it produces greater deterrence than alternative punishments at lower total cost in terms of human suffering. His empirical assessment was largely sceptical: death may not be substantially more deterrent than prolonged imprisonment, and its irrevocability makes it catastrophically unjust in cases of wrongful conviction (which the uncertainty dimension of the felicific calculus must account for). Economic punishment — the calibration of penalties to produce their deterrent effect with minimum suffering — was Bentham's preferred approach, consistent with his broader principle that punishment itself is a mischief warranting admission only when excluding greater evil.

The most powerful critique of Benthamite punishment theory concerns its susceptibility to the punishment of innocents. If aggregate utility is the sole criterion of legitimate punishment, and if punishing a known innocent would produce greater deterrence (through the shock to public expectation) than punishing the actual guilty party, then utilitarian logic appears to permit — or even require — punishing the innocent. Bentham's defenders have developed sophisticated responses to this objection, primarily arguing that the utilitarian calculation, properly conducted, would never in fact endorse punishing innocents because of the profound long-term disutility of destroying public confidence in the justice system. The debate remains unresolved and represents a genuine theoretical weakness of pure utilitarian approaches to punishment that both the retributive tradition and the ancient Indian frameworks handle with greater facility.

9. SYSTEMATIC COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS :

9.1 Overview of Convergences and Divergences:

The comparative analysis of these four punishment theories across their principal jurisprudential dimensions reveals a pattern of partial convergences and significant divergences that is more complex than any simple narrative of "East versus West" or "ancient versus modern" would suggest. All four theories share certain foundational commitments: each holds that punishment must be proportionate to the offense, that the innocent must not be punished, and that the institutional processes through which punishment is determined must be invested with legitimacy. These convergences reflect the universality of the basic jurisprudential questions, not the cultural specificity of any particular tradition's answers.

The divergences, however, are equally instructive. The most fundamental divide is between the Manusmriti's and Kant's shared commitment to punishment as moral necessity — backward-looking, grounded in desert, independent of consequences — and the Arthashastra's and Bentham's shared consequentialist emphasis on punishment as a tool for achieving desired social outcomes. A second fundamental divide concerns equality: Kant and Bentham are both explicitly universalist and anti-hierarchical in their punishment theories (whatever caste may mean in Kant's Prussian context, it plays no role in his theory), while both the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra maintain varna-differentiated punishment scales that reflect and reinforce social hierarchy. A third significant difference concerns procedure and evidence: the Arthashastra's evidence-based jurisprudence is more procedurally sophisticated than any of the three other theories, none of which addresses evidentiary standards as a central concern.

Table 4: Comparison of Manusmriti, Arthashastra, Kant, and Bentham

Dimension	Manusmriti	Arthashastra	Kant	Bentham
Theoretical Basis	Dharma; divine cosmic order	Dandaneeti; state science	Categorical Imperative; moral duty	Principle of Utility; happiness calculus
Purpose of Punishment	Protect dharma; cosmic harmony; social order	State stability; economic prosperity; anarchy prevention	Moral retribution; justice as absolute duty	Deterrence; reform; incapacitation; greatest happiness

Dimension	Manusmriti	Arthashastra	Kant	Bentham
Nature of Obligation	Religious and moral duty of king	Political and administrative necessity	Unconditional rational duty	Conditional on net utility calculation
Proportionality	Danda severity by motive, time, place, offender status	Fines scaled to crime; ~300 offenses catalogued	Lex talionis; crime must equal punishment	Punishment minimized to least needed for deterrence
Role of Caste/Class	Explicit: Brahmins exempted; Shudras harshest	Varna-differentiated but with state-interest logic	Universal equality; no class distinctions	Universal: each person counts equally
Deterrence View	Public punishment as example; danda as sacred warning	Explicit: fear of revolt; regime stability depends on it	Explicitly rejected; violates moral autonomy	Central purpose; felicific calculus applied
Reform / Rehabilitation	Secondary; moral correction through suffering	Implicit in economic penalties; not central	Irrelevant; punishment is backward-looking	Explicit goal alongside deterrence
Evidence Standards	Witness testimony; bodily gesture assessment by king	4 bases: dharma, evidence, custom, royal edict	Not addressed; focus on desert, not procedure	Not primary; focus on utility calculation
Protected Classes	Elders, priests receive admonition only	Pregnant, children, sick, aged, insane exempted	Universal rational beings; no exemptions stated	Those incapable of benefit from deterrence
Capital Punishment	For murder, treason, severe caste violations	For grave offenses; always with proportionality	Justified; murderer must die; lex talionis demands it	Rejected in most cases; economic punishment preferred
State's Role	King as divine representative; danda is his primary tool	Ruler as administrator; saptanga state theory	State as enforcer of moral law; not utility-maximizer	Legislator calculates utility; punishment as last resort
Legacy in Indian Law	IPC Sections on proportionality; rarest of rare doctrine	IPC proportionality; administrative criminal law framework	Bachan Singh doctrine; moral desert reasoning	Reform provisions; Section 53 IPC rehabilitation

9.2 Retribution: Dharma and the Categorical Imperative:

The most striking convergence in the comparative analysis is between the Manusmriti's dharma-based retributivism and Kant's categorical imperative-based retributivism. Both theories ground punishment in a form of moral necessity that is independent of consequences: for the Manusmriti, punishment is

required by the cosmic dharmic order whose disturbance the crime has caused; for Kant, punishment is required by the categorical imperative of rational morality. Both theories treat the guilty as deserving punishment regardless of whether that punishment will produce good consequences; both treat the innocent as protected from punishment regardless of whether punishing them would produce good consequences; and both treat the instrumentalization of punishment — using it as a means to some other end rather than as a response to desert — as a violation of fundamental moral principles.

The divergence between these two retributive traditions, however, is equally important. Kant's retributivism is explicitly universal — applying to all rational beings regardless of their social position — while the Manusmriti's dharmic retributivism is explicitly hierarchical — applying differently to different varnas. Kant's categorical imperative is grounded in human rational autonomy — a secular, philosophical foundation that requires no theological premises — while the Manusmriti's dharma is grounded in divine cosmic order and religious obligation. These are not superficial differences but fundamental divergences about the nature of moral obligation and the basis of human dignity that have profound practical implications.

9.3 Consequentialism: Dandaneeti and the Felicific Calculus:

The second major convergence is between the Arthashastra's dandaneeti consequentialism and Bentham's utilitarian calculus. Both theories justify punishment by reference to its social consequences rather than by reference to moral desert: Kautilya by reference to state stability, economic prosperity, and the prevention of anarchy; Bentham by reference to the maximization of aggregate pleasure over pain. Both theories generate proportionality requirements from consequentialist reasoning rather than from retributive desert: the Arthashastra's elaborate schedule of fines for approximately three hundred offenses reflects a calibration of punishment to deterrent effect, while Bentham's felicific calculus explicitly requires that punishment be no more severe than the minimum necessary to achieve its deterrent purpose.

The divergences between these two consequentialist frameworks are also significant. Kautilya's consequentialism is state-centric — the relevant consequences are those affecting the state's political and economic stability — while Bentham's is aggregately egalitarian — each person's pleasure and pain counts equally in the calculation. This difference has important practical implications: Kautilya's framework can justify protecting powerful social groups from punishment that would undermine their cooperation with the state, while Bentham's framework has no room for such differential treatment. Conversely, Bentham's framework can justify punishing members of the ruling class when doing so maximizes aggregate utility, while Kautilya's framework might resist such punishment if it threatened regime stability.

9.4 The Arthashastra as a Mixed Theory Anticipating Modern Approaches:

Perhaps the most significant finding of the comparative analysis is that the Arthashastra, in its combination of consequentialist justification with procedural rigour, institutional differentiation, proportionality doctrine, protected class provisions, and humanitarian torture limitations, constitutes a form of mixed punishment theory that anticipates the pluralistic approaches to punishment that modern jurisprudence has independently developed in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The recognition in contemporary criminal law scholarship that neither pure retributivism nor pure consequentialism provides an adequate account of just punishment — that a complete theory must incorporate backward-looking desert constraints, forward-looking social utility considerations, robust procedural protections, and institutional designs that maintain accountability — describes precisely the theoretical structure that the Arthashastra embodies in practical form.

10. LEGACY IN MODERN INDIAN PENAL LAW :

10.1 The Indian Penal Code: A Pluralistic Theoretical Heritage:

The Indian Penal Code (IPC) of 1860, drafted by Thomas Babington Macaulay's Law Commission and modelled primarily on English criminal law, is often described as a Western import into the Indian legal system. This description is accurate in terms of the IPC's immediate intellectual genealogy but misleading in terms of the deeper jurisprudential heritage that Indian courts and legislators have brought to its interpretation and application. The IPC's substantive provisions reflect primarily Benthamite utilitarian principles: its graduated penalty scales reflect consequentialist proportionality thinking, its

emphasis on general deterrence as the primary purpose of criminal sanctions reflects Bentham's hierarchy of punishment purposes, and its provisions for fine-based penalties in many categories of offense reflect Bentham's preference for economic punishment [57-60].

However, the IPC's interpretation and application by Indian courts over more than 160 years has been shaped by theoretical resources that go far beyond Benthamite utilitarianism. The Manusmriti's proportionality doctrine — requiring consideration of the offender's circumstances, motive, and capacity — has influenced the Indian judiciary's development of mitigating and aggravating factor analysis in sentencing. The Arthashastra's institutional accountability principles — no official above the law, extra penalties for public duty malpractice — have informed the development of public law accountability norms. And Kantian retributivism's emphasis on desert and moral dignity has shaped the Supreme Court's jurisprudence on capital punishment, most notably in the rarest-of-rare doctrine.

10.2 The Rarest-of-Rare Doctrine and Theoretical Pluralism:

The Supreme Court of India's development of the rarest-of-rare doctrine for capital sentencing — articulated most fully in Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab (1980) and elaborated in subsequent cases — represents the most explicit site of theoretical pluralism in Indian penal jurisprudence. The doctrine holds that the death penalty is constitutional but should be imposed only in the rarest of rare cases where the alternative option of life imprisonment is unquestionably foreclosed. This formulation draws simultaneously on all four theoretical traditions examined in this paper.

The doctrine's emphasis on the "unquestionably foreclosed" alternative reflects Kantian retributive thinking: only in cases where the crime is so severe that proportionate justice requires the ultimate sanction (lex talionis at its most extreme) should the death penalty be considered. The doctrine's requirement that courts weigh both the crime and the criminal — considering mitigating circumstances including the offender's background, age, mental condition, and prospects for reform — reflects Benthamite consequentialist thinking: the costs and benefits of different punishment options must be assessed in individual cases. The doctrine's grounding in the constitutional protection of life and dignity draws on Kantian humanity principles. And the doctrine's sensitivity to social context and the gravity of certain offenses for social order reflects Arthashastra-style pragmatic reasoning about the relationship between punishment and state stability.

Critics of the doctrine — and they are numerous and intellectually substantial — have identified precisely the theoretical pluralism that characterizes it as the source of its operational inconsistency. When multiple theoretical frameworks are simultaneously in play, each capable of generating different outcomes in specific cases, the exercise of judicial discretion becomes unpredictable. The Bachan Singh doctrine's vague formulation has produced inconsistent outcomes across different benches of the Supreme Court, generating what critics describe as a crisis of certainty in capital sentencing that reflects the unresolved theoretical tensions at the doctrine's heart.

10.3 The Rehabilitation Debate: Arthashastra and Bentham in Modern India:

Contemporary Indian criminal justice reform debates reflect a continuing tension between deterrence-centred approaches (rooted in the IPC's Benthamite inheritance and reinforced by the Arthashastra's consequentialist reasoning) and rehabilitation-centred approaches (reflecting both Benthamite reformist theory and the constitutional values of human dignity and the right to life). The Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed that the Indian criminal justice system should accommodate reformative objectives alongside deterrence — reflecting a jurisprudential aspiration toward the Arthashastra's mixed theory model — but the institutional infrastructure for effective rehabilitation has lagged far behind the theoretical aspiration.

The Prisons Act 1894 (still the primary legislation governing incarceration conditions in most Indian states), the Model Prison Manual, and the Supreme Court's extensive prison reform jurisprudence (from Sunil Batra to D. K. Basu) collectively reflect an evolving institutional commitment to the humanization of punishment that draws most directly on the Arthashastra's protected class provisions and Bentham's economic punishment principle. The recognition that prisoners retain constitutional rights — to basic dignity, to medical treatment, to communication with counsel and family — represents a form of the Arthashastra's principle that persons under criminal sanction retain residual rights that state institutions are obligated to respect.

11. SYNTHESIS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS :

11.1 Towards a Pluralistic Jurisprudence of Punishment:

The comparative analysis conducted in this paper supports a theoretical conclusion that has practical implications for both legal philosophy and criminal justice policy: no single theoretical framework adequately addresses all the morally relevant dimensions of the punishment question. Kant's retributivism provides an indispensable account of why desert matters and why the instrumentalization of punishment violates human dignity, but it cannot account for the institutional design questions that the Arthashastra addresses with sophistication, and its strict lex talionis generates practically problematic conclusions. Bentham's utilitarianism provides an indispensable account of why consequences matter and why excessive punishment is unjust even if morally deserved, but it is susceptible to the punishment-of-innocents objection and cannot adequately capture the backward-looking desert intuitions that retributivism honours. The Manusmriti's dharmic retributivism provides an important account of how punishment relates to social and cosmic order, but its caste hierarchy vitiates its universal applicability. The Arthashastra's pragmatic dandaneeti provides the most practically complete framework of the four — institutionally differentiated, evidence-based, consequentially oriented, and humanistically constrained — but its secular consequentialism requires supplementation by a more robust account of human dignity than it provides independently.

A complete jurisprudence of punishment, adequate to the demands of a constitutional democracy committed to both the rule of law and the dignity of persons, must draw on all four traditions: Kantian retributivism for its insistence on desert and human dignity as constraints on punishment; Benthamite consequentialism for its insistence on minimal suffering and the social purposes of criminal justice; Arthashastra dandaneeti for its procedural rigour, institutional design sophistication, and humanistic protections; and Dharmashastra tradition for its account of punishment's relationship to the moral and social order that law is meant to protect. The Supreme Court's rarest-of-rare doctrine, for all its operational imperfection, is in theoretical terms an expression of this pluralism — and its difficulty may be not an argument for abandoning the pluralistic aspiration but for developing more sophisticated institutional frameworks for its implementation.

11.2 The Case for Including Indian Punishment Theory in Global Jurisprudential Discourse:

This paper's comparative analysis also supports an argument about the intellectual geography of legal philosophy: the marginalization of the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra from global jurisprudential discourse represents an intellectual impoverishment that serves neither scholarly rigour nor practical wisdom. The standard Western narrative of punishment theory — which begins with Beccaria and Bentham and treats Kant as the founding theorist of retributivism — is not wrong, but it is significantly incomplete. Both the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra developed sophisticated punishment theories that engaged the same fundamental jurisprudential questions and arrived at answers of comparable quality and complexity to those of Kant and Bentham — in some dimensions, superior.

The Arthashastra's procedural jurisprudence — its evidence doctrine, its court specialization, its protected class provisions, its anti-corruption framework, its institutional accountability principles — is, on any fair assessment, more comprehensive and more practically relevant than the deontological and consequentialist frameworks that dominate Western punishment theory. The argument for including these texts in comparative law courses, legal philosophy curricula, and jurisprudential scholarship is not one of civilizational pride but of intellectual completeness. The National Education Policy 2020's mandate for Indian Knowledge Systems integration provides the institutional framework for realizing this inclusion in Indian legal education, and the case for analogous inclusion in international comparative law programmes is equally strong.

12. CONCLUSION :

This research paper has undertaken a systematic, multi-dimensional comparative jurisprudential analysis of four punishment theories across two civilizational traditions — the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra from ancient India, and Kant and Bentham from the Western philosophical tradition — examining them across seven jurisprudential dimensions and tracing their combined legacy in contemporary Indian penal law. The analysis has generated several conclusions of significance for legal philosophy, comparative jurisprudence, and criminal justice policy.

The first conclusion is that ancient Indian punishment philosophy is significantly more sophisticated than the standard Western academic narrative acknowledges. Both the Manusmriti and the Arthashastra

developed complete, internally consistent, and institutionally implemented punishment theories that engaged the same fundamental jurisprudential questions as Kant and Bentham — in some respects with greater analytical depth and greater practical completeness. The Arthashastra's evidence-based jurisprudence, its dual court system, its protected class provisions, and its anti-corruption institutional framework represent jurisprudential achievements of a quality that requires substantive engagement rather than historical footnote.

The second conclusion is that the four theories form two pairs of family resemblance rather than four entirely independent frameworks. The Manusmriti and Kant share a commitment to punishment as moral necessity independent of consequences, grounded respectively in dharmic cosmic order and rational categorical imperative. The Arthashastra and Bentham share a commitment to punishment as a social instrument whose justification lies in its consequences, grounded respectively in state stability and aggregate utility. Within each pair, the divergences are as significant as the convergences: the Manusmriti's caste hierarchy versus Kant's universalism; Kautilya's state-centric consequentialism versus Bentham's aggregative egalitarianism. Understanding these relationships — rather than treating the four theories as simply "different" — is the beginning of genuine comparative jurisprudential insight.

The third conclusion concerns contemporary Indian penal law. The Supreme Court's rarest-of-rare doctrine, the ongoing tension between deterrence and rehabilitation in criminal justice policy, and the evolving constitutional jurisprudence of prisoners' rights all reflect a genuine theoretical pluralism that draws simultaneously on all four traditions. This pluralism is not an intellectual deficiency — the result of confused thinking about punishment's purposes — but a jurisprudential achievement: the recognition that a complete and adequate account of just punishment must incorporate desert constraints, utility considerations, procedural protections, and institutional accountability. The Arthashastra's mixed theory framework, the most institutionally complete of the four, points the direction toward which this pluralistic jurisprudence should develop.

Finally, the paper concludes with an argument for intellectual expansion: the global jurisprudential discourse on punishment is impoverished by its systematic neglect of Indian classical sources, and the integration of Manusmriti and Arthashastra punishment theory into comparative law, legal philosophy, and criminology curricula — as the National Education Policy 2020's Indian Knowledge Systems mandate encourages — would enrich that discourse in ways that are practically as well as intellectually significant. The question of how to punish justly is not a question that any single tradition — however sophisticated — has answered completely. The best answers available will draw on the full range of human jurisprudential wisdom across civilizations and centuries.

REFERENCES :

[1] Mishra, V. L., & Malviya, K. M. (2025). Concept of Punishment and Its Justification in Indian Perspective: An Overview. *European Economics Letters*, *15*(3), 3022-3029. Google Scholar↗

[2] Sondhi, S. (2025). Punishment Policy in the Vedic Tradition, 01-19. Google Scholar↗

[3] Sondhi, S. (2025). Punishment Policy in the Vedic Tradition: The Realistic Aspect of Indian Spirituality. 01-19. Google Scholar↗

[4] Jaishankar, K., & Halder, D. (2019). Criminal Justice Tenets in Manusmriti. *Routledge Handbook of South Asian Criminology*. Google Scholar↗

[5] Dalal, A., & Parekh, K. (2021). Prostitution: Perspectives from Various Schools of Jurisprudence. *Supremo Amicus*, *24*, 469. Google Scholar↗

[6] Das, S. S., Singh, K., Kumar, R., Singh, J. N., & Kumar, P. (2024). Exploring the multifaceted landscape of human rights: a comprehensive analysis of theoretical frameworks. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, *30*(5), 3346-3365. Google Scholar↗

[7] Denis, L. (1945). Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. *American history*, *1861*(1900). Google Scholar↗

[8] Kant, I. (2016). Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals. In *Seven masterpieces of philosophy* (pp. 277-328). Routledge. Google Scholar↗

[9] Wilson, E. E. (2014). Kant'S Moral Philosophy. In *The Routledge Companion to Eighteenth Century Philosophy* (pp. 442-464). Routledge. Google Scholar↗

[10] Grundstein, N. D. (1953). Bentham's Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. *J. Pub. L.*, *2*, 344. Google Scholar↗

[11] Bentham, J. (1970). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation (1789), ed. by J. *H Burns and HLA Hart, London*, 2010-2011. Google Scholar↗

[12] Müller-Schneider, T. (2022). Jeremy Bentham: An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation. In Schlüsselwerke der Emotionssoziologie (pp. 63-68). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. Google Scholar↗

[13] Müller-Schneider, T. (2022). Jeremy Bentham: An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation. In *Schlüsselwerke der Emotionssoziologie* (pp. 63-68). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. Google Scholar↗

[14] Anta, C. (2019). Inside "An Introduction to The Principles of Morals and Legislation" By Jeremy Bentham. *Online International Journal of Philosophy with Peer Review. Year XIV No, 28*. Google Scholar↗

[15] Umashankar, P. (2022). Study of the Judiciary and Administration in Ancient India with special reference to Manusmriti and Arthashastra and its relevance in present Indian system. Issue 2 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human., 5, 534. Google Scholar↗

[16] Parouha, D. (2023). Growth of punishment philosophies in India: A critical analysis. *Available at SSRN 4386130*. Google Scholar↗

[17] Glucklich, A. (1982). Karma and social justice in the criminal code of Manu. *Contributions to Indian sociology*, *16*(1), 59-78. Google Scholar↗

[18] Priya, K. L. (2024). An Analysis of Theories of Punishment and Its Relevance in the Administration of Justice in India. *LawFoyer Int'l J. Doctrinal Legal Rsch.*, *2*, 398. Google Scholar↗

[19] Sondhi, S. (2025). *Dandaniti in the Indian Tradition* (Doctoral dissertation, Indira Gandhi National Center for the Arts; IGNCA Janpath New Delhi-110001India https://ignca. gov. in/). Google Scholar↗

[20] Meena, S. L. (2005). Relationship between state and dharma in Manusmriti. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 575-588. Google Scholar↗

[21] Verma, D. P., & HPS, R. C. C. (2014). Human Rights of Arrested Person in Ancient India: An Appraisal. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume*, *19*, 85-91. Google Scholar↗

[22] Deshmukh, M. (2022). Exploring the Relationship between Dharma and Law. *VEETHIKA*, *13*(01), 109-113. Google Scholar↗

[23] Linderborg, O. (2024). Early Theories of Punishment: Deterrence, Rehabilitation and Restoration in Ancient Greek and Indian Penology. *Law, Crime & Hist.*, *12*, 118. Google Scholar↗

[24] Macdonald, D., Burnham, D., Dickman, A., Loveridge, A., & Johnson, P. (2016). Conservation or the moral high ground: siding with Bentham or Kant. *Conservation Letters*, *9*(4), 1-2. Google Scholar↗

[25] Zoshak, J., & Dew, K. (2021, May). Beyond Kant and Bentham: How ethical theories are being used in artificial moral agents. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-15). Google Scholar↗

[25] Splichal, S. (2003). Bentham, Kant, and the right to communicate. *Critical review*, *15*(3-4), 285-305. Google Scholar↗

[26] Fletcher, G. P. (1987). Why Kant. *Columbia Law Review*, *87*(3), 421-432. Google Scholar↗

[27] Alexander, A. (2003). Bentham, Rights and Humanity: A Fight in Three Rounds. *Journal of Bentham Studies*, *6*, 1-18. Google Scholar↗

[28] Szifris, K. (2021). Kant, Bentham and the Question of Identity. In *Philosophy Behind Bars* (pp. 55-74). Bristol University Press. Google Scholar↗

[29] Grundstein, N. D. (1953). Bentham's Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. *J. Pub. L.*, *2*, 344. Google Scholar↗

[30] Baum, T. (2008). A quest for inspiration in the liberal peace paradigm: back to Bentham?. *European Journal of International Relations*, *14*(3), 431-453. Google Scholar↗

[31] Schliesser, E. (2025). Federalism and the Unity of Early Liberalism: Bentham's and Kant's Reception of Adam Smith's "New Imperialism". *Social Philosophy and Policy*, *42*(2), 474-494. Google Scholar↗

[32] Krstić, M., Nedeljković, S., & Dašić, M. (2025). From Kantian friendship to Benthamite partnership: transatlantic relations under Donald Trump. *International Politics*, *62*(6), 1251-1276. Google Scholar↗

[33] Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2023). Use of AI-based GPTs in experimental, empirical, and exploratory research methods. *International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT, and Education (IJCSBE)*, *7*(3), 411-425. Google Scholar↗

[34] Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2024). Redefining experimental, empirical, and exploratory research in AI era. *Poornaprajna International Journal of Emerging Technologies (PIJET)*, *1*(1), 90-136. Google Scholar↗

[35] Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2023). New research models under exploratory research method. *a Book "Emergence and Research in Interdisciplinary Management and Information Technology" edited by PK Paul et al. Published by New Delhi Publishers, New Delhi, India*, 109-140. Google Scholar↗

[36] Aithal, P. S. (2016). Study on ABCD analysis technique for business models, business strategies, operating concepts & business systems. *International Journal in Management and Social Science*, *4*(1), 95-115. Google Scholar↗

[37] Aithal, P. S. (2017). Company Analysis–The Beginning Step for Scholarly Research. *International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT and Education (IJCSBE)*, *1*(1), 1-18. Google Scholar↗

[38] Aithal, P. S. (2017). Industry analysis–the first Step in business management Scholarly research. *International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT and Education (IJCSBE)*, *1*(1), 1-13. Google Scholar↗

[39] Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2018, August). A New Method of Scholarly Research–Patent Analysis. In *Proceedings of Conference-Exploring Avenues in Banking, Management, IT, Education & Social Sciences* (pp. 69-83). Google Scholar↗

[40] Panda, K. (2025). The concept of ṛta in the Vedas: cosmic order and its ethical dimensions. Natl J Hindi Sanskrit Res, 1(60), 31-5. Google Scholar↗

[41] Koul, S. (2025). The Concept of Dharma in Sanatana Dharma-Beyond Religion: Cosmic Order, Duty, and Ethics. *Duty, and Ethics (May 04, 2025)*. Google Scholar↗

[42] Boddupalli, A. & Boddupalli, R. S. (2023). Vedic Wisdom of Ṛta, The Cosmic Law: Its Significance in Human Life. *Journal of History, Art and Archaeology*, *3*(1), 33-39. Google Scholar↗

[43] Bonnerjee, N. (2025). The Ancient Indian Statecraft and Policies: A Re-visit to Kautilya's Arthashastra and its Teachings. *Available at SSRN 6144766*. Google Scholar↗

[44] Vaddiraju, A. K. (2026). The Concept of Human Nature in Chanakya's Arthashastra and Machiavelli's The Prince. In *Quest for Planetary Well-Being: Essays in Honour of MV Nadkarni* (pp. 545-565). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore. Google Scholar↗

[45] Umashankar, P. (2022). Study of the Judiciary and Administration in Ancient India with special reference to Manusmriti and Arthashastra and its relevance in the present Indian system. *Issue 2 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, *5*, 534. Google Scholar↗

[46] Chowdhury, K. R. (2020). Anvikshiki in Arthashastra: Kautilyan perspective of economy and philosophy. *International Journal of Sanskrit Research*, *6*(2), 175-178. Google Scholar↗

[47] Byrd, B. S. (1989). Kant's theory of punishment: Deterrence in its threat, retribution in its execution. *Law and Philosophy*, *8*(2), 151-200. Google Scholar↗

[48] Brooks, T. (2003). Kant's theory of punishment. *Utilitas*, *15*(2), 206-224. Google Scholar↗

[49] Bindal, A. (2009). Rethinking theoretical foundations of retributive theory of punishment. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, *51*(3), 307-339. Google Scholar↗

[50] Potter, N. (2009). Kant on punishment. *The Blackwell guide to Kant's ethics*, 179-195. Google Scholar↗

[51] Kant, I. (2003). Kant's theory of punishment. *Utilitas*, *15*(2). Google Scholar↗

[52] Draper, A. (2002). An Introduction to Jeremy Bentham's theory of punishment. Journal of Bentham Studies, 5, 1-17. Google Scholar↗

[53] Bedau, H. (2004). Bentham's theory of punishment: origin and content. *Journal of Bentham Studies*, *7*, 1-15. Google Scholar↗

[54] Hanafy, H. (2021). Bentham: Punishment and the utilitarian use of persons as means. *Journal of Bentham Studies*, *19*(1), 1-23. Google Scholar↗

[55] Postema, G. J. (2006). Bentham's utilitarianism. *The Blackwell Guide to Mill's Utilitarianism*, 26-44. Google Scholar↗

[56] Bedau, H. A. (1983). Bentham's utilitarian critique of the death penalty. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*, *74*, 1033. Google Scholar↗

[57] Wright, B. (2016). *Codification, Macaulay and the Indian Penal Code: the legacies and modern challenges of criminal law reform*. Routledge. Google Scholar↗

[58] Mahar, M., & Srivastava, R. K. (2024). From Colonial Legacy to Indigenous Harmony: Evaluating the Transition towards the Indianisation of the Criminal Justice System. *Issue 2 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, *7*, 3891. Google Scholar↗

[59] Skuy, D. (1998). Macaulay and the Indian Penal Code of 1862: The myth of the inherent superiority and modernity of the English legal system compared to India's legal system in the nineteenth century. *Modern Asian Studies*, *32*(3), 513-557. Google Scholar↗

[60] Singh, A., & Akshay, G. (2024). The chronicle of the Indian criminal justice system. *IJLS*, *10*, 16. Google Scholar↗

****