

# How to form Self-Sustaining Organizations ?

---

## Based on Madhyasth Darshan — so that organisations sustain and members are not instrumentalised

---

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

### At a glance

---

- **The question:** must organisations be built on fear or accumulation, or is there a basis on which they sustain *and* their members are not used as instruments?
- **The diagnosis:** every historical basis — safety, sustenance, protection, belief, wealth — reduces to fear or accumulation; such organisations must extract from their members, and they dissolve when the fear passes or the accumulation stalls.
- **The alternative:** organisation around **understood coexistence** — shared cause, goal, and programme; values fulfilled in relationships; prosperity through right-use; understanding transmitted to every member through education-sanskar.
- **The caveat:** the design is coherent but untested at civilisational scale, and its deepest premises are asserted rather than demonstrated (§10).

## Glossary of key terms

---

Term	Meaning in this paper
<b>Jeevan</b>	The sentient self, distinct from the body; the seat of desire, thought, and understanding.
<b>Coexistence (sah-astitva)</b>	Existence as units submerged in all-pervading space — distinct, energised, related; the darshan’s account of reality itself.
<b>Resolution (samadhan)</b>	The state in which every <i>why</i> and <i>how</i> one lives by is answered; understanding without residue.
<b>Right-use (sadupyog)</b>	Use of body, mind, and wealth for their purpose, as against consumption or hoarding.
<b>Education-sanskar</b>	The paired institution of teaching (education) and formation of disposition (sanskar) by which understanding is transmitted across generations.
<b>Undivided society (akhand samaj)</b>	Humankind as one society, not finally divided into sects, classes, or nations.
<b>Universal orderliness (sarvabhaum vyavastha)</b>	Self-organising governance scaling from family to world.
<b>Dharma-niti / Rajya-niti</b>	Moral policy (right-use of body, mind, wealth) and state policy (security of the same).
<b>Awakening (jagriti)</b>	Living from correct understanding, evidenced in conduct.
<b>Instrumentalised</b>	Treated as a means — net-extracted-from — rather than as an end (this paper’s term, not the texts’).

### 1. The central question

---

Reviewing history, humans have organised in a near-universal sequence — around **safety, sustenance, protection, shared belief**, and finally **wealth and power**. Section 2 traces this sequence in the sources.

The question of this paper: is this the only way to form human organisations? Any better answer must meet two design objectives together:

1. **Objective 1 — members are not instrumentalised.** People in the organisation are happy and do not feel “used” by the system.

2. **Objective 2 — the organisation sustains.** It remains orderly and alive over long periods, across generations.

Madhyasth Darshan answers **No, this is not the only way** — and claims the two objectives are met together or not at all.

The argument of the paper in one diagram:

flowchart TD

```
A["Historic bases: safety, sustenance, protection, belief, wealth"] --> B["C"]
B --> C["Objective 1 fails: members instrumentalised"]
B --> D["Objective 2 fails: organisation decays"]
H["Reached by study, verified in living"] --> E["Alternative basis: understo"]
E --> F["Members nurtured: values fulfilled in relationships"]
E --> G["Organisation sustains: resolution + tradition of coexistence"]
E --> I["Transmitted to all members via education-sanskar"]
```

## 2. The historic pattern and its common root

---

SB's *History of Humans* as well as JV, tell the story of how humans organized themselves as a sequence of ages — each stage formed to answer a felt lack, each stage leaving that lack unresolved.

In the jungle and stone ages, fear of nature and wild animals drove the first groupings. Forest, food, and shelter became the first wealth. Humans then submitted to monarchs. SB records that “The submission age was accepted based on assurances of ... comfort by the monarch” (SB, Ch. 2); JV adds that the promise was never kept:

**“The promise was that the king would ensure the security of life and property, but that hasn’t happened until now. Life and property remain insecure; peace and harmony are further still.” - JV**

Theocratic states and idealism came next. JV recounts that idealism imposed “dos and don’ts, labelling non-believers as sinners and subjecting them to harassment, as documented in history” (JV, Ch. 1). Materialism followed — which “in practice, became caught in the cycle of accumulation” (SB, Ch. 2) — and power-centric rule built on monopoly.

**The common root.** The darshan’s central diagnostic claim is that all five bases reduce to two intertwined roots — **fear** and **accumulation**:

**“Only three causes are observed for all the fear in humans: (1) Fear of natural events (2) Fear of animals (3) Fear of inhumaneness in humans.” - MVD, Ch. 5**

**“The lust for accumulation does not lead to satisfaction, because there is no end to accumulation.” - MVD, Ch. 12**

The mapping is direct. Organising for safety and under monarchs is organising around **fear** — of nature, of animals, of other humans and groups. Organising for food, shelter, and wealth is organising around **accumulation**. Organising around shared belief trades on both: fear of sin, death, or damnation on one side, and accumulation of merit or salvation on the other. The power-centric economy, finally, is accumulation guarded by force — that is, by fear.

Every stage is reactive. Humans organise *against* something feared or *for* something accumulated. The organising principle is never the human relationship itself; it is always an external threat or an external object.

### **3. Why such organisations instrumentalise their members**

If an organisation is held together by fear and accumulation, its members are inevitably treated as **means** — instruments for producing safety or wealth for someone else. The darshan defines this with unusual precision:

**“Nurturing (poshan): Unit + Conducive unit.” - MVD, Ch. 3**

**“Exploitation (shoshan): Unit - Conducive unit.” - MVD, Ch. 3**

Exploitation **subtracts** from the other; nurturing **adds**. And:

**“To disregard sentiments (values) in a relationship is indeed exploitation of that relationship.” - MVD, Ch. 16**

**“No human wants their own exploitation.” - MVD, Ch. 16**

Profit-bound organisations must extract more from members than they return, because profit is defined as that very imbalance — “Getting higher value in exchange for lower value itself is profit” (MVD, Ch. 4) — and “No one is happy from earning obtained through exploitation” (MVD, Ch. 13). The political form of instrumentalisation is rule itself:

**“A thinker is invariably a sustainer of orderliness, whereas a ruler is invariably an exploiter of orderliness.” - MVD, Ch. 15**

The sense of being instrumentalised is not a complaint about a particular boss or regime. It is the **predictable signature of any organisation whose organising principle is fear or accumulation**, because such a principle requires some members to be net-extracted-from so that others (or the system) can be net-secured. This is the failure of Objective 1.

## 4. Why such organisations do not sustain

Fear-and-accumulation is not merely unkind; it is *structurally fragile*. This is the failure of Objective 2.

**Fear-based collectivity is animal-order, and dissolves when the fear passes:**

**“The semblance of collectivity among animals is generally observed only in situations of fear. Under no circumstances is such collectivity observed in activities of study, production, or the maintenance of orderliness.” - MVD, Ch. 4**

**“A person may remain restrained by the fear of livelihood for some time, but eventually, they shed that fear. The end of slavery in history exemplifies this. ... neither fear nor temptation can be the basis of orderliness, as they are unacceptable to humans.” - JV**

**Accumulation breeds suspicion, and suspicion breeds conflict:** “War has always been driven by suspicion, mistrust, apprehension, coercion, bribery” (SB, Ch. 6); “Profit and loss constitute a relentless cycle that not only fails to secure humans but also destroys everything in its path” (JV).

**The decisive sustainability claim:**

**“Resolution is the very foundation of sustainability.” - SB, Ch. 4**

**“There is no sustainment of sociality without the tradition of coexistence.” - MVD, Ch. 4**

An organisation does not last because it accumulates the most resources or commands the most force. It lasts because it produces **resolution** (members understand why and how they live and work together) and lives a **tradition of coexistence** (members complement rather than extract from each other). Resources and security are outputs of such an order, not its foundation.

## 5. The alternative basis: coexistence

---

### 5.1 Coexistence as the binding principle

**“Resolution Centred Materialism is coexistence only.” - SB, Ch. 7**

**“For an organisation, commonness of cause and goal is necessary. For its sustainment, commonness of the program is also necessary.” - MVD, Ch. 4**

A durable organisation thus needs a **shared cause** (why we exist), **shared goal** (what we are for), and **shared programme** (how we live it daily). The binding is not contract or command but duty and dedication: “The fulfilment of sociality is through duty and dedication ... Otherwise, its decline occurs” (MVD, Ch. 4). The glue is **trust**:

**“Trust is the act of fulfilling the inherent expectation of values in mutuality.” - MVD, Ch. 4**

And the positive formula:

**“The foundational basis of sociality in awakened humans is living in resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, and coexistence.” - MVD, Ch. 4**

**“Coexistence means living with complementarity. Fearlessness is trust in the present. Prosperity is producing in excess of our family’s needs. Resolution is living with justice.” - JV**

Note the precision of the term this paper turns on: the basis is not coexistence as sentiment, slogan, or mere peaceableness, but **understood coexistence** — coexistence that each member has studied and verified for themselves. Section 6 unpacks what this understanding consists of and how it is reached.

### 5.2 Organisational design: ten-tier governance and two policies

The same principle scales from individual to family to society to nation to undivided world: “a family is an integral part of the undivided society, while an individual is an integral part of a family” (MVD, Ch. 14). It is implemented as **family-based self-organising orderliness** — ten-tier self-governance from family assembly up to world family assembly (MVD, Ch. 4).

SB specifies the working machinery at the local tier: the village council nominates **five self-governance working committees**, each with defined roles:

**“There will be five such committees: 1. Education-Sanskar Committee 2. Justice-Security Committee 3. Health-Restraint Committee 4. Production-Work Committee 5. Exchange-Reserve Committee. Each committee will have clearly defined roles and responsibilities.” - SB, Ch.**

8

The five names are the four-fold goal made administrative: education-sanskar transmits understanding (§6); justice-security holds relationships and protection together; health-restraint covers the body and self-regulation; production-work delivers prosperity; exchange-reserve circulates goods without the profit-motive.

By design, two policies operate **together**, not in rivalry:

- **Dharma-niti** (*moral policy*): orderliness for the *right-use* of body, mind, and wealth.
- **Rajya-niti** (*state policy*): orderliness for the *security* of the same.

Each person desires both utilisation and protection; the darshan requires them to be **integrated** at every level from family to nation. They address different aspects of the same assets — not competing programmes.

Morality-versus-power — in its familiar form, religion-versus-state — is usually treated as an inherent rivalry. The darshan treats the rivalry as a **symptom, not a definition**: failure occurs when the two orders stop complementing each other and begin exploiting or interfering with each other and with the public:

**“When these two orders start exploiting or interfering with each other ... societal imbalance arises.” - MVD, Ch. 4**

JV and SB name the present form of this split — moral authority lodged in religion, protection lodged in state, neither delivering orderliness. SB traces how **religion-based politics** and **economics-based politics** each anticipated complementarity between religion and state, or between economics and state, yet failed to secure orderliness in practice (SB, Ch. 2; synthesis).

JV adds that struggle-centred rule yields nothing apart from problems and suffering:

**“Whatever revolts, rebellions, exploitations, and wars that humans have committed until now, these all were contrary to the principles of coexistence.” - JV, Ch. 1**

Rule without understanding repeats the exploitation logic already seen in §3 — the ruler exploits orderliness; only the thinker sustains it.

### 5.3 How coexistence answers both design objectives

**The two design objectives of §1 are answered by the same move:**

1. *Objective 1 – members not instrumentalised*: the organisation must add to the member, not subtract ( Unit + Conducive unit ); fulfil the values owed in each relationship; and hold to justice above mere legality – “Justice (nyaya): Humane behaviour in mutuality itself is justice” (MVD, Ch. 1). A member can be treated entirely legally and still be exploited.
2. *Objective 2 – sustainment*: shared cause-goal-programme; resolution as foundation; prosperity through right-use rather than accumulation – “Material prosperity is accomplished only by adhering to the policy of ‘more production than the needs’” (MVD, Ch. 5), with “earning for expenditure” as non-accumulation (MVD, Ch. 10) and a **cyclical economics** (JV); and transmission across generations through **education-sanskar** – “This is how understanding flows in tradition. Ignorance cannot flow in tradition” (JV).

The two objectives are not in tension. Extraction-based systems must trade member welfare against growth; a coexistence-based system avoids the trade-off because the member’s flourishing *is* the organisation’s strength.

Dimension	Fear / accumulation basis	Coexistence basis
Why people join	Escape a threat; secure a scarce object	Fulfil values in relationships; live with resolution
Binding force	Fear, temptation, command, contract	Shared cause + goal + programme; trust; duty
View of the member	Means (net-extracted-from)	End (net-nurtured)
Economy	Profit, accumulation, hoarding	Right-use, production beyond need, cyclical
Failure mode	Dissolves when fear passes or accumulation stalls	Fragile only if understanding is not transmitted
Longevity basis	Force and resources (external)	Resolution and tradition of coexistence (internal)

## 6. What it takes to understand coexistence

Everything above rests on the load-bearing phrase introduced in §5.1: organisations founded on **understood coexistence**. This is not a figure of speech. In the darshan, “understanding coexistence” names a definite cognitive achievement with definite content, a definite method,

and definite tests — and it is deliberately contrasted with belief, sentiment, agreement, and mystical experience.

## 6.1 What is to be understood

Coexistence here is not tolerance, compromise, or “getting along.” It is a claim about the structure of reality: existence is units **submerged in** all-pervading space — distinct, energised, and related — and the four natural orders (material, bio, animal, and knowledge order) are mutually complementary. To understand coexistence is to know three things together:

1. **Existence** — reality as coexistence; the complementarity of all orders
2. **Jeevan** — the conscious self, distinct from the body, that desires happiness and is satisfied only by understanding
3. **Humane conduct** — the values, character, and ethics that follow for a being who lives among other such beings

This is why “shared belief” cannot substitute for it. A belief locates the bond in an object of faith; understanding locates it in a recognisable structure of reality that each member can examine. The first divides humankind into sects; the second cannot, because what is understood is the same for everyone — “Humankind is united in the right and divided in the wrong” (MVD, Ch. 16).

## 6.2 How it is reached: study, not belief or command

The darshan insists this understanding is *teachable* — open to examination, not reserved for the initiated or granted by grace:

**“According to the idealistic scriptures and the mystery-based God-centric contemplation knowledge and tradition, the knowledge is unmanifest and ineffable. According to Madhyasth Darshan, the knowledge is manifest, effable, and understandable through studying, and its evidence becomes accessible to all through behaviour.” - MVD, *The Alternative***

**“The alternative path is - perform study, attain mastery, then evidence it in living.” - JV, Ch. 1**

The method is a sequence: **study** (adhyayan — sustained engagement with the proposal, guided by someone who already lives it), **contemplation** (turning the proposal over against one’s own observation and natural acceptance), **understanding** (the point where every *why* and *how* is answered — which is what the darshan means by *resolution*), and finally **evidence in living** (pramaan — the understanding showing up as justice, trust, and right-use in actual relationships). The teaching is offered as a *proposal* to be verified, never as a

command to be obeyed: each person checks it against what is naturally acceptable to them and validates it in their own living.

### 6.3 How one knows it has been understood

Three tests separate understanding from its substitutes:

1. **Resolution, not residue.** Belief survives unanswered questions; understanding does not begin until they are answered. If “why coexistence?” still needs authority, fear, or incentive to back it, it has not been understood.
2. **Communicability.** What is understood can be made understandable to another. Mystery, by the darshan’s definition, cannot — which is why it transmits as allegiance instead of knowledge.
3. **Evidence in behaviour.** The decisive test is conduct: fulfilment of values in relationships, right-use of resources, production beyond need. An understanding that changes nothing in behaviour is, on this view, not yet understanding.

### 6.4 Why every member must understand — and what this means for organisations

This is the organisational crux. In belief-based and command-based organisations, the “understanding” is held centrally — by the priesthood, the founder, the ideology, the management — and members participate by trust in authority. The darshan’s design forbids this delegation: resolution must live in **each member**, because trust is “fulfilling the inherent expectation of values in mutuality” (MVD, Ch. 4), and mutuality cannot be outsourced.

Hence two structural consequences already met above:

- **Education-sanskar is the central institution**, not an auxiliary one: “Education-sanskar is the only source of enlightenment and definitive understanding” (SB, Ch. 4). An organisation of understood coexistence is, before anything else, a teaching-and-learning organisation — “This is how understanding flows in tradition. Ignorance cannot flow in tradition” (JV).
- **The family is the first site of verification.** Relationships in the family are where values are first recognised, fulfilled, and evaluated — which is why the darshan’s self-organising orderliness is *family-based* rather than individual-based or state-based.

This also explains the failure modes catalogued earlier. Organisations decay precisely at the point where understanding stops being transmitted and is replaced by its cheaper substitutes — belief in the founder, fear of the rule, or incentive of the pay-off. The darshan’s claim is that no organisational structure can compensate for that substitution, and no structure is needed where it has not occurred.

## 7. Modern organisational forms in brief

The darshan predates these modern forms and does not name them; this section applies its criteria to them. Modern forms line up on a spectrum by what binds members, from extraction toward coexistence:

Modern form	Organised around	Darshan's reading
Shareholder firm; platform/gig	Return on capital; transaction volume	Purest accumulation order; relationship replaced by transaction
Bureaucratic state; command economy	Authority; central plan	Power-centric rule; replacing private owners with state planners changes <i>who</i> extracts, not <i>whether</i> extraction is the principle
Liberal democracy; stakeholder/ESG firm	Consent, rights; multi-stakeholder value	Better form, same basis — consent regulates exploitation but legality is not justice; “a nexus of votes and money” (MVD, Preface)
Cooperatives; self-management (Teal)	Shared ownership; distributed authority	Strong echo of self-organising orderliness and “values and evaluation” over “fear and temptation” (JV); but bounded to one firm, market-embedded, no transmission mechanism
Commons (Ostrom); peer production; mission orgs; intentional communities	Shared resource, cause, or belief	Closest in spirit — non-extraction, right-use, self-governance; but bounded to one domain or cause, funding/founder-fragile, or belief-based rather than understanding-based

The best modern forms independently arrive at several darshan principles. What even they stop short of supplying together: **a universal (non-sectarian) goal** oriented to undivided society; **resolution as understood coexistence** rather than shared interest or belief; **the four-fold goal** (resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, coexistence) as a set; **a transmission mechanism** (education-sanskar) independent of founder or funding; and **an integrated cyclical economy of right-use** rather than accumulation merely constrained by rules.

## 8. Practical principles

An organisation that wants to sustain and not instrumentalise its people should:

1. **Organise around an understood common cause and goal, not around a threat** (§2, §5.1).
2. **Make the programme common and explicit** — sustainment requires shared *how*, not just shared *why* (§5.1).
3. **Treat every internal relationship as value-bearing**; disregarding the values owed (trust, fair return, respect, care) is exploitation by definition (§3).
4. **Design for nurturing, not extraction** ( Unit + Conducive unit ) (§3).
5. **Replace fear and temptation with values and evaluation** — compliance bought by fear or incentive is temporary (§4).
6. **Hold to justice above mere legality** (§5.3).
7. **Aim for prosperity through right-use, not accumulation** — produce beyond need, spend righteously, avoid profit-as-imbalance (§5.3).
8. **Keep moral order and governance complementary**, neither dominating the people (§5.2).
9. **Transmit understanding through education-sanskar** across generations (§6.4).
10. **Orient the small unit toward the larger whole** — family/team toward society and undivided society, not sectarian self-interest (§5.2).

## 9. From here to there: the transition path

---

The darshan describes an end-state, not a reform programme for existing institutions. The texts do not prescribe how a fear- or accumulation-based organisation converts itself. But the darshan's own logic implies a definite ordering, and it is worth making explicit. (*This section is inference from the texts' method, not quotation.*)

1. **Understanding precedes structure.** Since no organisational structure can compensate for the absence of understanding (§6.4), transition cannot begin with restructuring — new charters, new incentives, new org-charts on the old basis reproduce the old basis. It begins with members studying and verifying the proposal.
2. **Start at the scale where verification is possible.** The family — or the smallest working team — is the first site where values can actually be recognised, fulfilled, and evaluated (§6.4). Larger tiers federate what already works; they cannot conjure it.
3. **Education-sanskar before governance reform.** The first committee is the teaching one (§5.2). A transmission mechanism that does not depend on the founder must exist before the founder's understanding can outlive them.
4. **Evidence attracts; command does not.** The method is study → mastery → evidence in living (JV, §6.2). An organisation demonstrating resolution, prosperity, and fearlessness recruits by being visibly worth joining — the darshan's answer to "how does this spread?" is demonstration, not conquest or decree.

The implied sequence — understand, live it small, teach it, federate — also explains why the darshan is unimpressed by reforms that begin at the top: they change who holds the structure, not what the structure is organised around.

## 10. Critical assessment

---

The diagnosis explains a real, recurring pattern — fear- or accumulation-founded organisations do treat members as instruments and do fracture when the founding fear recedes or accumulation stalls. The definition of exploitation as *disregarding values in a relationship* gives a usable test for whether people are being instrumentalised, and the resolution-plus-coexistence thesis dissolves the apparent trade-off between member welfare and durability.

There are however following questionable points in the claims made by the Madhyasth Darshan:

- *Fear has legitimate uses.* Grouping against genuine threats is sometimes necessary. The defensible version of the claim is that threat-avoidance cannot be the *foundational organising principle*, not that safety-driven cooperation is wrong.
- *Accumulation versus prudent reserve.* “Earning for expenditure” and “production more than needs” partly anticipate the need for reserves, but the boundary between healthy surplus and harmful hoarding is left to judgement.
- *No theory of bad-faith actors.* The design assumes members who understand or are willing to study. The texts name a Justice-Security committee (SB, Ch. 8) but give no procedure for the member who persistently exploits, dissents, or refuses to participate — no account of adjudication, sanction, exit, or expulsion. For an organisational design, this is the largest practical gap: every real organisation eventually meets the person its theory says should not exist.
- *Dependence on the ontology.* The deepest premises — jeevan, awakening, existence-as-coexistence — are asserted, not empirically demonstrated. A secular designer can adopt nearly the whole practical programme on organisational grounds alone while remaining agnostic about the metaphysics; a strength for adoption, a weakness for anyone seeking a proven first principle.

## 11. Comparison with Advaita Vedanta

---

A natural question for an Indian reader: does **Advaita Vedanta** — the oldest and most influential non-dual tradition — already offer a basis for humans to come together and build a prosperous society? The two traditions are close relatives: Shri A. Nagraj came through the Vedic/Vedantic stream, and Madhyasth Darshan defines itself partly against Advaita’s central formula, which MVD quotes directly:

**“According to Vedanta knowledge, only Brahma is the truth, and this world is an illusion (‘Brahma satya, jagat mithya’). However, jeeva and jagat are said to have originated from Brahma.” - MVD, *The Alternative***

*Note: this section draws on Advaita literature beyond the three primary sources — Shankara’s classical position (AV), Swami Vivekananda’s “Practical Vedanta” (SV), and Anantanand Rambachan’s contemporary Advaita theology (ATR). Readings of both traditions here are marked interpretation where they go beyond the texts.*

## 11.1 What Advaita does offer

Advaita is not socially empty. Three genuine resources stand out:

1. **A metaphysical ground against exploitation.** If *tat tvam asi* — the self of every being is Brahman — then there is, ontologically, no “Other” to exploit. Exploiting another is self-harm under ignorance (*avidya*). This is arguably a *stronger* anti-exploitation premise than any contract or rights theory, because it removes the very distinction on which extraction depends.
2. **An ethic of selfless action.** *Nishkama karma* (action without craving for results) and *lokasamgraha* (acting for the cohesion of the world) give the realised or aspiring person a reason to serve rather than accumulate.
3. **Modern social readings.** Vivekananda’s *Practical Vedanta* (SV) deliberately built a social vision from non-duality — “potential divinity” of every being, service of the human as worship of Brahman, and on that basis a rejection of caste prejudice. Rambachan’s “not-two is not one” (ATR) similarly argues that since the world is not *other than* Brahman, it cannot be devalued, and non-duality grounds activism against caste, patriarchy, and ecological harm. The Ramakrishna Mission and the dashanami monastic orders show that Advaita can sustain real institutions across generations.

On the darshan’s own spectrum (§7), Advaita-inspired organisations belong with the closest forms — purpose-bound, non-extractive, value-carrying.

## 11.2 What Advaita does not supply

Measured against this paper’s two design objectives — members not instrumentalised, organisation sustained — classical Advaita falls short in specific, identifiable ways:

1. **Its goal is individual, not organisational.** Shankara’s exclusive concern (AV) is *moksha* — the individual’s liberating recognition of non-duality. The community, the family, production, and governance belong to the world the renunciant turns away from. An organisation can at best be *instrumental* to individual liberation; it is never the locus of value. Contrast the darshan, where the family and undivided society are themselves the goal’s living form.

2. **“Jagat mithya” undercuts prosperity.** If the world is ultimately appearance, then production, economy, ecology, and material well-being are second-order concerns. A philosophy cannot found a *prosperous* society on a premise that devalues the very domain in which prosperity occurs. Even sympathetic reformers concede this history: Vivekananda’s followers describe pre-reform Vedanta as having “become a philosophy of escape,” its ideal of inaction deformed into “laziness, inertia, and human unconcern” (SV). The darshan’s reply is structural: the world is not mithya but *perpetual coexistence*, and prosperity is a defined goal — “producing in excess of our family’s needs” (JV).
3. **The two-truths doctrine lets empirical inequality stand.** Advaita distinguishes absolute truth (*paramartha*, where all are Brahman) from empirical convention (*vyavahara*, where distinctions hold). Historically this allowed perfect equality at the absolute level to coexist with caste hierarchy at the practical level for over a millennium. *Interpretation:* a unity that does not bind conduct in the empirical world fails the darshan’s test that understanding must become **evidence in behaviour** — justice, right-use, fulfilment of values in actual relationships.
4. **Transmission is restricted, not universal.** Advaita’s transmission mechanism — guru-shishya lineage, monastic initiation, qualification (*adhikara*) for study — preserved the teaching superbly but for a renunciant minority. It is the opposite of education-sanskar, which the darshan insists must reach **all** members so that “understanding flows in tradition” (JV) through ordinary families, not past them.
5. **No organisational programme.** Advaita specifies no economy, no governance design, no family order. The darshan’s requirement of “commonness of cause and goal ... and of the program” (MVD, Ch. 4) has no Advaitic counterpart; Vivekananda (SV) and Rambachan (ATR) supply social *direction* but still not an integrated design of economy, education, and self-governance such as the ten-tier family-based orderliness.

### 11.3 The decisive difference: oneness versus coexistence

The deepest divergence is metaphysical and has direct organisational consequences. Advaita resolves plurality *upward* into one reality without a second: relationships, like the related persons, are ultimately appearance. Madhyasth Darshan refuses this move — existence is units *submerged in* all-pervading space, distinct and related: **coexistence**. Plurality is real, therefore **relationships are real**, therefore the values inherent in relationships (trust, respect, justice) are real and their fulfilment or violation is real. That is what makes “exploitation = disregarding values in a relationship” a usable organisational test rather than a provisional truth awaiting dissolution.

Dimension	Advaita Vedanta	Madhyasth Darshan
Ultimate reality	Brahman, one without a second; world is mithya	Existence as coexistence; world is real and perpetual
Human goal	Individual moksha through self-knowledge	Resolution, prosperity, fearlessness, coexistence — lived in relationship
Basis against exploitation	No “Other” exists (ontological unity)	Values in real relationships; nurturing vs extraction
Status of relationships	Empirically valid, ultimately appearance	Constitutive of reality; locus of justice
Prosperity	Not a goal; renunciation idealised	Defined goal: production beyond need, right-use
Organisational design	None (monastic orders as exception)	Ten-tier family-based self-organising orderliness
Transmission	Guru-shishya, monastic, qualified few	Education-sanskar for all, through families
Social record	Equality at absolute level; hierarchy tolerated empirically	Undivided society as explicit programme

## 11.4 Verdict

Advaita supplies the strongest possible **premise** for human unity — there is finally no Other — but not the **programme** for human organisation. Its centre of gravity is the individual’s exit from the world, not the world’s orderliness; its strongest social readings (SV, ATR) are modern efforts to extract from non-duality precisely what Madhyasth Darshan builds in from the start: a real world, real relationships, real values, a defined economy, and a transmission mechanism for all. One may fairly say the darshan keeps Advaita’s insistence on human dignity and the unity of existence while replacing “one without a second” with “coexistence” — exactly so that the unity can bind conduct, production, and organisation rather than dissolve them.

A caveat is in order: this comparison is between Advaita’s *historical record* and the darshan’s *design principles*. The darshan’s organisational programme — the ten-tier family-based orderliness, the cyclical economy, the universal education-sanskar — has not yet been tested at civilisational scale. The claim here is therefore about the *coherence and completeness* of the design, not about a proven track record outperforming another. Whether the darshan’s programme can deliver in practice what it promises in theory remains an open question — one that only sustained attempts at implementation can answer.

## 12. Conclusion

---

Humans do not *have* to organise around fear, food, protection, belief, or accumulation. Those are the bases history happened to use, and they are precisely why organisations exploit their members and eventually decay. The durable, non-exploitative basis is organisation around understood coexistence – shared cause, goal, and programme; fulfilment of values in relationships; right-use rather than accumulation; and a tradition that transmits this understanding across generations.

**Fear + accumulation** → *members instrumentalised* → *organisation decays*  
**Coexistence + resolution** → *members fulfilled* → *organisation sustains*

The contribution of this view is to collapse two problems usually treated separately – *keeping people happy* and *keeping the institution alive* – into a single design choice about what an organisation is organised *around*. Choose fear or accumulation, and the two goals fight each other. Choose understood coexistence, and the same principle that fulfils the member also sustains the whole.

## References

---

All sources cited in this document, grouped by tradition. 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 by chapter.
- **SB** – Nagraj, A. *Samadhanatmak Bhautikvad / Resolution Centred Materialism*. English translation by Rakesh Gupta. Cited by chapter.
- **JV** – Nagraj, A. *Jeevan Vidya: An Introduction*. English translation by Rakesh Gupta. Cited by chapter.

### Advaita Vedanta comparison

- **AV** – *Śāṅkara, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Shankara’s classical position as summarised in the SEP entry. Also at <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/shankara/>
- **SV** – Swami Vivekananda. *Practical Vedanta* (Complete Works). Cited for the social reading of non-duality and the Ramakrishna tradition.
- **ATR** – Rambachan, A. *A Hindu Theology of Liberation: Not-Two Is Not One*. SUNY Press, 2015.