

# Ethics and Morals in Human Beings

---

**Author:** [AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan.org](http://AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan.org) - a group of people studying Madhyasth Darshan philosophy. Source repository: [raghavamohan/AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan](https://github.com/raghavamohan/AnalyticMadhyasthDarshan).

**The question:** What are ethics and morals in human beings? Are they divine commands, social conventions, evolutionary adaptations, rational principles, neural/emotional mechanisms, or evidence of correct understanding? How does **Madhyasth Darshan** answer these questions, and how does its answer compare with **Advaita Vedanta** and **modern scientific approaches**?

This study argues that Madhyasth Darshan gives a distinctive answer: human ethics is not merely obedience to rules, calculation of consequences, inherited custom, or emotional intuition. It is the lived evidence of a human being who understands existence as coexistence, understands the self as **jeevan** in association with the body, and fulfils values in relationships through justice, dharma, truth, character, right-use, and purposeful participation in orderliness.

---

## Quick Glossary

---

<b>Term</b>	<b>Plain meaning</b>
<b>Ethics</b>	In this paper: a reasoned, examinable account of right human living. In Madhyasth Darshan, ethics specifically includes right-use and protection of body, mind, and wealth.
<b>Morals</b>	Socially held norms, codes, prohibitions, virtues, and judgments of right/wrong. They may be inherited, taught, enforced, or personally internalized.
<b>Humane conduct</b>	Madhyasth Darshan's integrated structure of values, character, and ethics.
<b>Values</b>	In relationships, the mutual evaluation and fulfilment that yields mutual satisfaction.
<b>Character</b>	In Madhyasth Darshan: rightfully owned wealth, marital faithfulness, and kindness in action and behaviour.
<b>Justice</b>	The necessary behavioural order that protects and develops humaneness.
<b>Dharma</b>	Orderliness, innateness, and the discipline of thought aligned with the human goal.
<b>Truth</b>	The non-transforming ultimate reality in whose refuge dharma and justice are grounded.
<b>Jeevan</b>	The sentient self in Madhyasth Darshan: a real, active, immortal unit that operates through the body.
<b>Coexistence</b>	Reality as the inseparable presentness of Omnipresence and all sentient and insentient units.
<b>Atman / *Brahman*</b>	In Advaita Vedanta: the innermost Self and ultimate non-dual reality.
<b>Mithya</b>	In Advaita: the world as dependent appearance, neither absolute reality nor sheer non-being.
<b>Moral psychology</b>	The empirical study of human thought, emotion, judgment, motivation, and behaviour in moral contexts.

---

# 1. The Central Thesis

---

The central problem is not simply “What rules should humans follow?” A more rigorous question is:

What is the source, criterion, evidence, and failure mode of human rightness?

Madhyasth Darshan answers by joining ontology, anthropology, and conduct:

1. **Source:** Ethics arises from existence as coexistence, not from arbitrary command or social invention.
2. **Human locus:** Only the human being, as a knowledge-order being with imagination and freedom of action, can understand and evidence ethics.
3. **Criterion:** Humane conduct is right when it fulfils values in relationships, protects humaneness through justice, disciplines thought through dharma, and remains grounded in truth.
4. **Evidence:** Ethical understanding must become visible in behaviour, work, production, family, society, and coexistence with nature.
5. **Failure mode:** Immorality is not explained finally as sin, selfish genes, bad incentives, or irrationality alone. It is explained as delusion: wrong identification, wrong priority, wrong perspective, and failure to understand `jeevan`, existence, and humane conduct.

This makes Madhyasth Darshan neither a conventional moral code nor a secular moral psychology. It is a proposed science of humane living grounded in a metaphysics of coexistence.

---

## 2. Ethics and Morals: A Working Distinction

---

Ordinary language often treats ethics and morals as synonyms. For analysis, a distinction helps.

**Morals** are the norms a person or community holds: do not lie, care for family, keep promises, respect elders, be faithful, do not steal, do not harm, help the weak, obey duty, follow purity rules, defend the group. Morals are usually taught through family, culture, religion, law, story, reward, punishment, shame, honour, and imitation.

**Ethics** asks whether those morals are justified, universalizable, coherent, livable, and grounded in the nature of the human being. Ethics asks:

1. Why should this rule be followed?
2. What human need does it answer?
3. What happens when rules conflict?
4. Is the norm local custom or universal human requirement?

5. What is the evidence that it leads to fulfilment rather than repression, domination, or hypocrisy?

This distinction matters because many societies have strong morals and weak ethics. They possess rules but cannot justify them universally. Conversely, modern institutions may have elaborate ethical theories but weak moral formation: people know arguments but do not embody trust, restraint, care, or justice.

Madhyasth Darshan tries to bridge this split. It does not want ethics to remain theory, nor morals to remain inherited rule. It wants **understood conduct**.

---

### 3. The Madhyasth Darshan Answer

---

**The claim in one sentence:** Ethics and morals in human beings are fulfilled as humane conduct: values, character, and right-use grounded in the understanding of *jeevan*, coexistence, justice, dharma, truth, and relationships.

#### 3.1 Ethics is part of humane conduct

The most direct Madhyasth Darshan passage for the present topic appears in *Jeevan Vidya: An Introduction*:

**“Humane conduct is universally consistent across all times and places. It combines values, character, and ethics. Character entails rightfully owned wealth, marital faithfulness, and kindness in actions and behaviour. Ethics involve the right-use and protection of body, mind, and wealth. Values are about evaluation and achieving mutual satisfaction in relationships.”**

- *JV*, p. 165

This is a compressed definition. It does not define morality as rule-obedience, ritual purity, divine command, legal compliance, or social preference. It divides humane conduct into three inseparable dimensions:

Dimension	Madhyasth meaning	Ethical significance
<b>Values</b>	Evaluation and mutual satisfaction in relationships	Morality is not solitary purity; it is fulfilled in mutuality.
<b>Character</b>	Rightfully owned wealth, marital faithfulness, kindness in action and behaviour	Ethics must include sexuality, property, and interpersonal benevolence.
<b>Ethics</b>	Right-use and protection of body, mind, and wealth	Resources and capacities must be used rightly, not merely possessed or consumed.

This definition is unusually concrete. It avoids two common extremes:

1. **Spiritual abstraction:** Ethics is not reduced to inner purity, detachment, or mystical realization.
2. **Secular externalism:** Ethics is not reduced to legal compliance, outcome calculation, or social coordination.

The human being must evidence humane conduct in relationship, wealth, body, mind, speech, family, society, and nature.

### 3.2 The ethical hierarchy: pleasant, useful, profitable, just, dharmic, true

Madhyasth Darshan distinguishes lower and higher standpoints of evaluation:

**“All human behaviour is manifest in six perspectives: - (1) pleasant-unpleasant, (2) healthy-unhealthy, (3) profit-loss, (4) justice-injustice, (5) dharma-adharma, and (6) truth-untruth.”**

- *MVD, p. 67*

**“The behaviour of humans with inhumane perspective is in the refuge of pleasant-unpleasant, healthy-unhealthy, and profit-loss. The behaviour of humans with humane perspective is in the refuge of justice-injustice, dharma-adharma, and truth-untruth.”**

- *MVD, p. 67*

This is one of the strongest ethical claims in the darshan. It does not deny pleasure, health, or profit. It denies their sufficiency. A human being who lives only by liking, bodily benefit, and gain is not yet living as a fully human being.

The ethical transition is:

Pleasant/unpleasant -> Justice/injustice  
 Healthy/unhealthy -> Dharma/adharma  
 Profit/loss -> Truth/untruth

Modern public life often remains trapped in the first three perspectives:

1. consumer culture optimizes pleasant/unpleasant;
2. biomedical culture optimizes healthy/unhealthy;
3. market culture optimizes profit/loss.

Madhyasth Darshan does not reject these domains, but subordinates them to justice, dharma, and truth. This is the basis of its critique of both consumer materialism and purely instrumental science.

### 3.3 Justice, dharma, and truth are not optional ideals

MVD states the human requirement directly:

**“The necessary behaviour for humans is to adhere to the laws of justice, and the necessary thought for humans is to adhere to the laws of dharma.”**

- MVD, p. 67

It later clarifies the internal relation:

**“The regulation of human behaviour takes place through justice, discipline in thoughts takes place through dharma, and realisation takes place only through truth.”**

- MVD, p. 137

This gives a three-level structure:

Level	What is regulated	Ethical role
<b>Justice</b>	Behaviour	Prevents exploitation and protects humaneness in relationship.
<b>Dharma</b>	Thought	Disciplines imagination, desire, inference, and intention toward the human goal.
<b>Truth</b>	Realization	Grounds justice and dharma in what is ultimately real, not merely preferred.

Madhyasth Darshan therefore does not treat ethics as only external conduct. Behaviour, thought, and realization must become aligned.

### 3.4 Values are fulfilled in relationship

MVD defines sociality as value-fulfilment:

**“Sociality (samajikta): - Fulfilling the values inherent in relationships and associations itself is sociality.”**

*- MVD, p. 56*

This has major implications. The primary site of ethics is neither the isolated individual nor the state. It is the human being in relationship.

In this sense, moral failure is not merely “breaking a rule.” It is failure to recognize and fulfil the value inherent in a relationship. Betrayal, exploitation, deceit, violence, hoarding, and humiliation are not wrong merely because a rule says so. They are wrong because they break mutuality, destroy trust, obstruct satisfaction, and contradict coexistence.

This makes Madhyasth Darshan close to virtue ethics and care ethics in one respect: it takes character and relationship seriously. But it is not identical to either. It claims that relationship-values are grounded in the structure of coexistence, not only in cultivated virtue or affective care.

### 3.5 Character is social, economic, and bodily

The JV definition of character is concrete: rightfully owned wealth, marital faithfulness, and kindness in actions and behaviour. MVD expands this:

**“The behaviour devoid of ill-gotten wealth, adultery, and hurting others, and the dedication towards righteous wealth, marital faithfulness, and kindness in work and behaviour - is the entirety of just behaviour.”**

*- MVD, p. 102*

This is not a random list. It identifies three recurring sites of disorder:

1. **Wealth:** exploitation, theft, hoarding, corruption, unjust acquisition.
2. **Sexual/family life:** betrayal, objectification, instability, misuse of attraction.
3. **Power over others:** injury, cruelty, humiliation, domination.

Madhyasth Darshan’s ethics is therefore not only about individual conscience. It is also about property, sexuality, family, work, and non-harm.

### 3.6 Ethics means right-use, not renunciation of material life

The darshan does not ask humans to reject body, wealth, production, or social organization. It asks for right-use:

**“Sociality gives rise to needs; needs give rise to experimentation and production; experimentation and production give rise to creation of wealth; creation of wealth gives rise to use, right-use and purposeful-use; use, right-use and purposeful-use give rise to practicality; practicality gives rise to humaneness, and humaneness gives rise to sociality. Sociality is meaningful when it is towards undivided sociality.”**

- MVD, p. 56

This is a full ethical economy:

Sociality -> Need -> Experiment/Production -> Wealth  
-> Use / Right-use / Purposeful-use  
-> Practicality -> Humaneness -> Undivided sociality

Here wealth is neither demonized nor absolutized. It is ethically valid only when it becomes right-use and purposeful-use within humane sociality.

This is one of Madhyasth Darshan’s strongest contributions to ethical theory. Many religious systems oscillate between wealth as temptation and wealth as charity. Many modern systems treat wealth as utility, preference satisfaction, growth, or distribution. Madhyasth Darshan asks whether wealth is being used to protect body, mind, relationship, family, society, and coexistence.

### 3.7 Moral failure is delusion, not merely weakness

MVD states:

**“Humans who have realised the truth and embody thought and behaviour aligned with justice and dharma are awakened or developed. Those who have thought and behaviour aligned with justice & dharma are half-developed. Those who have thought and behaviour aligned with justice are partially developed or progressive. Those who are attached to thoughts and behaviour of injustice are heading towards decline and are in the form of animalistic-human and demonic-human.”**

- MVD, p. 160

This is a developmental moral anthropology. Humans are not all treated as equally awakened moral agents. Nor are they condemned as permanently sinful. They are seen along a continuum of awakening and decline.

The key diagnostic claim is that disorder arises from wrong identification and wrong priority. SB states that complete understanding requires three areas:

**“The definitive understanding aligned with the human objective in existence encompasses: 1. Knowledge of jeevan 2. Knowledge of holistic view of existence 3. Knowledge of humane conduct”**

*- SB, p. 116*

Without these, the human being confuses body-needs with jeevan-needs, sensory satisfaction with happiness, profit with fulfilment, and social success with human purpose. Morality becomes fragile because the self is misunderstood.

### **3.8 Ethics must be evidenced, not merely believed**

Madhyasth Darshan repeatedly insists that understanding must become evidence in living. SB presents the human being as the seer in existence:

**“The noteworthy points here are: 1. In coexistence, the human being is integrally and indivisibly present. 2. In existence, the human being is a seer (observer).”**

*- SB, p. 188*

And JV says:

**“The goal of jeevan is happiness, and the human goal is resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, and coexistence. Ethics are essential for achieving these goals and give them purpose.”**

*- JV, p. 165*

Thus the test of ethics is not only sincerity, scripture, emotion, or intention. The test is whether living produces:

1. resolution in understanding;
2. prosperity without exploitation;
3. fearlessness in relationships and society;
4. coexistence with nature.

This gives Madhyasth Darshan a practical criterion for judging moral systems. A system that produces obedience but not resolution, wealth but not prosperity, law but not trust, or spirituality but not humane conduct remains incomplete.

---

## 4. Traditional Religions: Ethics as Divine Command, Sacred Law, and Virtue

---

Traditional religions usually answer the question of ethics and morals by locating right conduct within a sacred order. In Abrahamic traditions especially, morality is often framed through divine command, covenant, law, sin, obedience, repentance, compassion, justice, charity, and accountability before God.

This is not one single theory. Religious ethics includes at least four strands:

1. **Divine command:** an act is obligatory because God commands it, or because it participates in God's will.
2. **Sacred law:** ethical life is guided by revealed commandments, prohibitions, duties, and disciplines.
3. **Virtue and transformation:** the person must cultivate humility, charity, mercy, truthfulness, chastity, self-restraint, and devotion.
4. **Community order:** morality is sustained through family, worship, ritual, law, authority, education, and shared identity.

In Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, one finds strong ethical themes: justice, care for the poor, sexual restraint, truthfulness, neighbour-love, mercy, charity, reverence, and judgment. Christianity famously compresses the law into love of God and neighbour (Matthew 22:37-40). Islam gives a compact ethical formula in Qur'an 16:90: justice, good conduct, giving to relatives, and the rejection of immorality, wrongdoing, and oppression. Jewish ethics similarly binds law, covenant, justice, compassion, and communal obligation.

From Madhyasth Darshan's standpoint, this religious approach has real strengths. It gives moral seriousness, intergenerational discipline, restraint against selfishness, community support, reverence, charity, and a sense that human conduct is answerable to something higher than private desire or market gain.

Its limitation is that morality can remain **authority-dependent**. If the person obeys because scripture, priest, prophet, community, reward, punishment, heaven, hell, sin, or fear commands it, then conduct may be disciplined without being fully understood. Religious morality may also become sectarian: the ethical boundary can shrink from all humans to the saved, chosen, believing, pure, or obedient community.

Madhyasth Darshan's critique is therefore not that traditional religions lack morals. They often contain profound moral resources. The critique is that moral instruction must become **universally studyable, understandable, and evidential in behaviour**. A command

may restrain wrongdoing, but Madhyasth Darshan asks whether the human being understands why justice, relationship-values, right-use, and coexistence are intrinsically necessary.

The contrast can be stated simply:

<b>Traditional religious ethics</b>	<b>Madhyasth Darshan</b>
Morality is grounded in divine will, sacred law, covenant, scripture, or religious discipline.	Ethics is grounded in coexistence, <b>jeevan</b> , relationship-values, justice, dharma, and truth.
The moral subject is often a servant, sinner, believer, devotee, covenant-member, or accountable soul.	The moral subject is <b>jeevan</b> in a human body, capable of understanding and evidencing humane conduct.
Obedience, repentance, worship, virtue, and charity are central.	Understanding, right-use, value-fulfilment, resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, and coexistence are central.
Strength: moral seriousness and communal formation.	Strength: universal, studyable, behaviour-evidenced ethics.
Risk: dogmatism, guilt, sectarianism, or heteronomy.	Risk: metaphysical claims must be publicly evidenced.

Thus, Madhyasth Darshan does not merely reject religion. It relocates the source of ethics from **commanded morality** to **understood orderliness**. If religious virtues become understood as relationship-values and coexistence, they can converge with humane conduct. If they remain only obedience to authority, they remain incomplete.

## **5. Advaita Vedanta: Ethics as Preparation and Expression of Self-Knowledge**

Advaita Vedanta gives a very different foundation. Its final claim is not coexistence of real units, but non-duality of Atman and Brahman.

Brahma Jnanavali Mala states:

**“Brahman is real, the universe is mithya (it cannot be categorized as either real or unreal). The jiva is Brahman itself and not different.”**

- *BJM, v. 20*

It also says:

**“He who realizes after repeated contemplation that he is a mere witness, he alone is liberated. He is the enlightened one.”**

- *BJM, v. 18*

In this framework, the deepest ethical problem is ignorance of one’s true Self. Attachment, desire, fear, and ego arise because the Self is confused with body, mind, senses, and action.

### **5.1 Advaita has virtues, but the virtues are preparatory**

It would be inaccurate to say that Advaita has no ethics. The Bhagavad Gita, read through Shankara, lists divine qualities:

**“Non-injury, truthfulness, absence of anger, renunciation, control of the internal organ, absence of vilification, kindness to creatures, non-covetousness, gentleness, modesty, freedom from restlessness”**

- *BG, 16.2, p. 640*

Shankara’s commentary expands these virtues:

**“Ahimsa, non-injury, abstaining from giving pain to creatures; satyam, truthfulness, speaking of things as they are, without unpleasantness and prevarication”**

- *BG, 16.2, p. 641*

Vivekachudamani lists the disciplines required of a seeker:

**“The first step to Liberation is the extreme aversion to all perishable things, then follow calmness, self-control, forbearance, and the utter relinquishment of all work enjoined in the Scriptures.”**

- *VC, v. 69, p. 6*

And:

**“If indeed thou hast a craving for Liberation, shun sense-objects from a good distance as thou wouldst do poison, and always cultivate carefully the nectar-like virtues of contentment, compassion, forgiveness, straight-forwardness, calmness and self-control.”**

- *VC, v. 82, p. 7*

So Advaita contains a serious discipline of virtue: non-injury, truthfulness, self-control, detachment, compassion, forgiveness, calmness, and desire for liberation.

## 5.2 Where Advaita differs from Madhyasth Darshan

The difference is not “Advaita is immoral and Madhyasth Darshan is ethical.” The difference is the ground, aim, and scope of ethics.

Question	Advaita Vedanta	Madhyasth Darshan
Ultimate reality	Non-dual Brahman; world is <b>mithya</b>	Coexistence of Omnipresence and real units; world is perpetual
Human problem	Ignorance of Atman-Brahman identity	Delusion about <b>jeevan</b> , body, existence, conduct
Ethical discipline	Purification and preparation for knowledge; expression of non-attachment	Evidence of understanding coexistence in behaviour, work, relationships, and social order
Social world	Ultimately sublated in Brahman; practically navigated through dharma and discipline	Real field of fulfilment; relationship-values must be specified and lived
Liberation/fulfilment	Moksha through Self-knowledge	Resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, coexistence through awakened understanding

Advaita’s strength is its profound critique of ego, desire, and identification with body-mind. It can produce detachment, compassion, and self-mastery.

Its vulnerability, from Madhyasth Darshan’s standpoint, is that it does not by itself give a complete programme for family, economy, production, right-use, education, justice, undivided society, and coexistence with nature. If the final truth is the witness Self and the world is **mithya** , worldly order may become ethically secondary. Madhyasth Darshan refuses this move. It says the world is real, relationships are real, units are real, and conduct is the evidence of understanding.

## 6. Modern Scientific Approaches

Modern science usually treats morality descriptively: what moral judgment is, how it evolved, how it develops, what brain systems are involved, how cultures vary, and how cooperation is stabilized.

This is different from Madhyasth Darshan and Advaita. Science does not normally claim to reveal the final purpose of human life. It explains mechanisms.

## 6.1 Moral psychology: empirically responsible ethics

The Stanford Encyclopedia entry on empirical moral psychology defines the field as interdisciplinary:

**“Moral psychology investigates human functioning in moral contexts, and asks how these results may impact debate in ethical theory. This work is necessarily interdisciplinary, drawing on both the empirical resources of the human sciences and the conceptual resources of philosophical ethics.”**

*- SEP Moral Psychology*

This is important. Modern moral science does not simply replace philosophy. It tests the psychological assumptions hidden inside ethical theories.

For example, if an ethical theory assumes that humans reason impartially, but experiments show that moral judgment is often intuitive, emotional, biased, tribal, or post-hoc, the theory must either revise its anthropology or explain how training can overcome these tendencies.

## 6.2 Intuition and emotion

Haidt’s social intuitionist model argues that moral judgment is often produced by quick intuitive evaluation, with reasoning frequently serving social justification after the judgment. Greene and colleagues’ fMRI work similarly helped popularize the idea that emotion and controlled cognition both shape moral judgment, especially in sacrificial dilemmas.

This line of work is useful because it punctures naive rationalism. Human beings often do not first reason from principle and then judge. They feel, react, identify, defend, and rationalize.

From a Madhyasth Darshan standpoint, this is unsurprising but incomplete. It describes the unawakened or partially awakened functioning of human beings under sensory, emotional, social, and ideological influence. It does not decide what the human being is capable of after understanding. Empirical description of common moral psychology is not the same as a theory of fulfilled human conduct.

## 6.3 Computational neuroscience and decision systems

Crockett’s “Models of morality” connects moral judgment to decision systems:

**“Moral dilemmas engender”**

*- Crockett 2013, p. 1*

This approach helps explain why people may reject direct physical harm even when the outcome calculus favours it. Moral judgment may emerge from interactions between

prospective reasoning, learned action-values, and Pavlovian aversions.

Madhyasth Darshan can accept the usefulness of such mechanism-level accounts for body-brain-behaviour patterns. But it would reject the reduction of ethics to those mechanisms. It would say that neural and cognitive systems are instruments in human functioning; they do not by themselves define justice, dharma, truth, or the goal of human life.

## 6.4 Morality as cooperation

Curry, Mullins, and Whitehouse propose a cooperative theory:

**“The theory of ‘morality-as-cooperation’ argues that morality consists of a collection of biological and cultural solutions to the problems of cooperation recurrent in human social life.”**

*- Curry, Mullins, and Whitehouse 2019*

They identify recurring moral domains such as family values, group loyalty, reciprocity, bravery, respect, fairness, and property rights. This is one of the strongest scientific parallels to Madhyasth Darshan because both see morality as relational and social, not merely private.

But the difference remains sharp:

<b>Morality-as-cooperation</b>	<b>Madhyasth Darshan</b>
Morality solves recurrent cooperation problems.	Ethics fulfils values in real relationships grounded in coexistence.
Universals are inferred from cross-cultural recurrence and game-theoretic cooperation problems.	Universality is grounded in the structure of existence and the human being as knowledge-order.
The explanation is evolutionary, biological, cultural, and strategic.	The explanation is ontological, sentient, behavioural, and social.
It can explain why cooperation is valued.	It claims to define why cooperation, justice, right-use, and coexistence are humanly necessary.

The scientific approach is strong where it explains emergence, variation, and mechanism. It is weaker where it must justify ultimate normativity. If morality is a set of cooperative adaptations, why should a person remain just when exploitation pays and punishment is avoidable? Science can answer prudentially, socially, or evolutionarily, but it cannot easily produce an unconditional criterion of rightness.

## **6.5 Moral foundations and plural moral grammars**

Moral Foundations Theory argues that human moral judgment is plural, not reducible to harm and fairness alone. It identifies domains such as care/harm, fairness/cheating, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation. This helps explain why cultures and political groups moralize different things.

Madhyasth Darshan would likely accept the observation that humans moralize several domains. But it would challenge whether all such foundations are equally valid. Loyalty can become sectarianism. Authority can become domination. Sanctity can become purity obsession. Care can become attachment. Fairness can become calculation without relationship.

For Madhyasth Darshan, the criterion is not “what humans commonly moralize.” The criterion is whether the moral response aligns with justice, dharma, truth, relationship-values, and coexistence.

---

## 7. Comparative Matrix

Question	Madhyasth Darshan	Traditional religion	Advaita Vedanta	Modern science
What is morality?	Humane conduct: values, character, and ethics in coexistence	Obedience to sacred order; virtue, duty, law, sin/merit, repentance	Preparatory purification and expression of Self-knowledge/dharma	A set of judgments, emotions, norms, adaptations, and behaviours
What is ethics?	Right-use and protection of body, mind, and wealth; justice in behaviour	Divine command, sacred law, covenant, duty, compassion, charity	Discipline of mind/senses and non-attachment supporting liberation	Normative theory informed by empirical moral psychology
Human being	Jeevan + body; knowledge-order being; seer-status possible	Creature, soul, servant, sinner, devotee, believer, covenant-member	Atman ultimately identical with Brahman	Biological organism, social primate, cognitive-affective system
Root problem	Delusion about self, existence, and conduct	Sin, disobedience, ego, impurity, forgetfulness of God, broken covenant	Ignorance of Atman-Brahman identity	Bias, emotion, incentives, social learning, evolved psychology, neural mechanisms
Moral criterion	Justice, dharma, truth, relationship-values, coexistence	God's will, scripture, law, virtue, holiness, divine judgment	Liberation-oriented discipline; non-injury, truth, self-control, detachment	Cooperation, wellbeing, harm, fairness, adaptive function, decision mechanisms

Question	Madhyasth Darshan	Traditional religion	Advaita Vedanta	Modern science
Evidence	Resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, coexistence in living	Obedience, repentance, virtue, charity, communal order, salvation/liberation claims	Self-knowledge, detachment, freedom from bondage	Behavioural data, cross-cultural evidence, experiments, neuroscience
Failure mode	Can become metaphysical assertion if not evidenced in conduct	Can become dogmatic, guilt-based, sectarian, or authority-dependent	Can become inward or world-negating if social conduct is underspecified	Can become descriptive, reductionist, or unable to justify ultimate ought

## 8. Critical Assessment

### 8.1 Strengths of Madhyasth Darshan

**1. It refuses to separate knowledge and conduct.**

A person who claims realization but cannot evidence justice, right-use, relationship-values, and social responsibility is not ethically complete.

**2. It integrates body, mind, wealth, sexuality, relationship, society, and nature.**

Many ethical theories focus on one domain: rights, consequences, virtue, duty, liberation, emotion, or cooperation. Madhyasth Darshan links all of them through humane conduct.

**3. It gives a concrete test of moral maturity.**

The move from pleasant/healthy/profitable to just/dharmic/true is a powerful diagnostic tool for individuals, families, markets, politics, education, and technology.

**4. It avoids both moral relativism and command morality.**

Moral rules are not merely local customs, but neither are they arbitrary commands. They are to be understood and evidenced.

**5. It treats wealth and production ethically without rejecting them.**

The sequence from need to production to right-use is more socially complete than renunciation-only spirituality and more humane than growth-only economics.

### 8.2 Vulnerabilities of Madhyasth Darshan

**1. It depends on its ontology.**

The full argument relies on `jeevan`, coexistence, Omnipresence, awakening, and the human

as knowledge-order. A secular scientist may accept the practical ethics while rejecting the metaphysics.

## **2. Its universality requires public demonstration.**

The claim that humane conduct is universally consistent across all times and places is strong. It needs continued comparative work across cultures, institutions, and moral conflicts.

## **3. It must clarify hard cases.**

Madhyasth Darshan gives strong principles, but applied ethics must still clarify cases where relationship-values appear to conflict: family duty versus public justice, compassion toward a wrongdoer versus truth, immediate bodily need versus ecological right-use, or local loyalty versus universal humaneness.

The key test is:

Which action preserves truth, protects humaneness, fulfils the real relationship avoids exploitation, and remains compatible with coexistence?

This means family duty cannot justify hiding injustice; one should stand with the person as a human being, but not with their injustice. Public justice must outrank family partiality, while still avoiding revenge, humiliation, and cruelty. Likewise, ecological right-use cannot deny genuine bodily need, but immediate need cannot become a permanent excuse for exploitation. Emergency use may be justified; repeated extraction without restoration indicates disorder in production, distribution, or understanding.

So the applied principle is crisp: **justice requires relationship-aware truthfulness**. It is neither cold legalism nor blind affection; neither ecological absolutism nor human convenience. It protects humaneness across person, family, society, and nature.

## **4. It risks moral idealism if social mechanisms are underdeveloped.**

Understanding is central, but institutions, incentives, trauma, inequality, and power also shape conduct. Madhyasth Darshan needs a robust account of how awakened education and social design handle these realities.

## **8.3 Strengths and limits of traditional religion**

Traditional religions are strong in moral formation. They train restraint, reverence, charity, repentance, family responsibility, compassion, and accountability. They also sustain moral life through ritual, memory, community, and intergenerational discipline.

Their limitation, from Madhyasth Darshan's standpoint, is that morality may remain tied to command, fear, guilt, reward, punishment, priestly authority, or sectarian identity. The question is not whether religious morals are valuable; many are. The question is whether the human being understands and evidences them as universal relationship-values and coexistence, rather than merely obeying them as external authority.

## 8.4 Strengths and limits of Advaita

Advaita's strength is its radical diagnosis of ego, attachment, and body-identification. Its disciplines of non-injury, truthfulness, self-control, compassion, calmness, and detachment are ethically serious.

Its limitation, for this paper's question, is that ethics remains largely preparatory to liberation or an expression of knowledge, not a fully elaborated theory of production, family order, social economy, ecological right-use, and universal human organization. Madhyasth Darshan is more behaviourally and socially explicit.

## 8.5 Strengths and limits of science

Modern science is strongest in explaining:

1. how moral judgments arise;
2. how intuitions and emotions shape reasoning;
3. how cooperation evolved and varies;
4. how moral learning and decision systems work;
5. how culture and institutions shape norms.

Its limitation is normativity. Science can show that humans value cooperation, punish cheaters, feel empathy, respond to harm, and form group norms. It cannot by itself prove that one ought to live for justice, truth, right-use, or universal coexistence. It can inform ethics, constrain ethics, and expose self-deception, but it does not replace the need for an account of human purpose.

---

## 9. Final Answer

---

Madhyasth Darshan answers the question of ethics and morals by relocating it from rule to understanding.

Morals, in ordinary human life, are inherited rules and norms. Ethics, in a deeper sense, is the examinable basis of right living. Madhyasth Darshan says that both become complete only as **humane conduct**, which includes values, character, and right-use. The human being is ethical when behaviour is regulated by justice, thought by dharma, realization by truth, wealth by right-use, sexuality by faithfulness, relationships by mutual satisfaction, and society by undivided coexistence.

Compared with Advaita, Madhyasth Darshan is more world-affirming and socially explicit. Advaita aims at liberation through knowledge of the non-dual Self; its virtues purify and prepare the seeker. Madhyasth Darshan aims at awakening evidenced in conduct: resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, and coexistence.

Compared with traditional religions, Madhyasth Darshan is less command-centred and less sectarian. Abrahamic and other religious traditions often give powerful moral formation through divine command, sacred law, virtue, repentance, charity, and community. Madhyasth Darshan asks that moral life become universally understandable and evidenced in behaviour, not dependent only on belief, fear, authority, or inherited identity.

Compared with science, Madhyasth Darshan is more normative and ontological. Science explains moral judgment through evolution, cooperation, emotion, cognition, culture, and neural systems. Madhyasth Darshan asks what human beings are for, what fulfils them, and what conduct evidences correct understanding.

The most balanced critical conclusion is:

*Madhyasth Darshan offers a rigorous ethical anthropology in which morality is neither divine command, nor social convention, nor evolutionary strategy, nor private emotion. It is the evidence of understanding coexistence. Its practical strength lies in integrating values, character, ethics, wealth, family, society, and nature. Its philosophical vulnerability lies in the need to make its ontology of jeevan , awakening, and coexistence publicly examinable for those outside the darshan.*

---

## References

---

All sources cited in this document. Each entry begins with the bold tag used in the text.

### Madhyasth Darshan (primary sources)

- **MVD** - Nagraj, A. *Madhyasth Darshan - Co-existentialism, Part 1: Holistic View of Human Behaviour*. English translation by Rakesh Gupta. Cited: Sociality and right-use sequence (p. 56); six perspectives and necessary behaviour/thought (p. 67); justice, dharma, truth and just behaviour (p. 102); regulation of behaviour/thought/realization (p. 137); moral development and decline (p. 160).
- **SB** - Nagraj, A. *Samadhanatmak Bhautikvad (Resolution Centred Materialism)*. English translation by Rakesh Gupta. Cited: threefold knowledge of jeevan , existence, and humane conduct (p. 116); human being as seer in coexistence (p. 188).
- **JV** - Nagraj, A. *Jeevan Vidya: An Introduction*. English translation by Rakesh Gupta. Cited: humane conduct as values, character, and ethics; ethics as right-use and protection of body, mind, and wealth; human goal (p. 165).

## Advaita Vedanta

- **BG** - *Bhagavad Gita with the Commentary of Shankaracharya*. English translation by Swami Gambhirananda. Cited: divine qualities, non-injury, truthfulness, absence of anger, renunciation, kindness, and purity (16.2-16.3, pp. 640-642).
- **BJM** - *Brahma Jnanavali Mala*, attributed to Adi Shankaracharya; English translation by S. N. Sastri. Cited: witness realization (v. 18); *Brahma satyam jagan mithya* (v. 20).
- **VC** - Shankaracharya, *Vivekachudamani*. English translation by Swami Madhavananda. Cited: liberation disciplines and virtues (vv. 69, 82).

## Traditional Religious Ethics

- **SEP Theological Voluntarism** - Murphy, Mark. "[Theological Voluntarism.](#)" *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Used for divine-command / theological-voluntarist framing.
- **SEP Natural Law Ethics** - Murphy, Mark. "[The Natural Law Tradition in Ethics.](#)" *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2024 archived edition. Used for natural-law framing in religious ethics.
- **Matthew 22:37-40** - "[Matthew 22:37-40, King James Version.](#)" Public-domain biblical passage cited as an example of Christian ethical compression into love of God and neighbour.
- **Quran 16:90** - "[Surat An-Nahl 16:90.](#)" Cited as an example of Quranic ethical compression into justice, good conduct, kinship-giving, and rejection of oppression.

## Modern Science and Philosophy

- **Crockett 2013** - Crockett, Molly J. "[Models of morality.](#)" *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(8), 363-366. CC BY open-access article.
- **Curry, Mullins, and Whitehouse 2019** - Curry, Oliver Scott, Daniel Austin Mullins, and Harvey Whitehouse. "[Is It Good to Cooperate? Testing the Theory of Morality-as-Cooperation in 60 Societies.](#)" *Current Anthropology*, 60(1), 47-69. Linked externally; not stored locally because the PDF carries publisher rights/terms language.
- **Graham et al. 2013** - Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, Sena Koleva, Matt Motyl, Ravi Iyer, Sean P. Wojcik, and Peter H. Ditto. "[Moral Foundations Theory: The Pragmatic Validity of Moral Pluralism.](#)" *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 55-130. Linked externally; publisher PDF not stored locally.
- **Greene et al. 2001** - Greene, Joshua D., R. Brian Sommerville, Leigh E. Nystrom, John M. Darley, and Jonathan D. Cohen. "[An fMRI Investigation of Emotional Engagement in Moral Judgment.](#)" *Science*, 293(5537), 2105-2108. Linked externally.
- **Haidt 2001** - Haidt, Jonathan. "[The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment.](#)" *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814-834.

Linked to author page; PDF not stored locally because redistribution status is not clean enough for this repository.

- **SEP Moral Psychology** - Doris, John M., and Stephen Stich. "[Moral Psychology: Empirical Approaches.](#)" *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2025 archived edition.
- **Tomasello and Vaish 2013** - Tomasello, Michael, and Amrisha Vaish. "[Origins of Human Cooperation and Morality.](#)" *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 231-255. Linked externally; publisher PDF not stored locally.