

ORGANIZED ANIMALITY TO MORAL CIVILIZATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDIC AND MODERN APPROACHES TO SOCIAL ORDER AND JUSTICE

Hemendra Shah

Associate Professor, Department of Commerce and Management,
Shri Govind Guru University, Godhra, India.
hemendrashah@sngu.ac.in

Abstract

Using a **qualitative, comparative, and interpretive methodology**, this study examines selected primary Indic texts alongside selected works of modern Western political and social thought to explore two contrasting approaches to human social order: **“organized animality”** and **“moral civilization.”** The concept of **organized animality**, proposed in this study, refers to a condition in which human instincts and desires are regulated and organized through laws, institutions, markets, and social systems without sufficient moral transformation. In contrast, **moral civilization** involves the development of social order through moral responsibility, justice, duty, self-restraint, and spiritual awareness. The study examines the Indic framework through nine interrelated values—*Sabhyatā*, *Nyāya*, *Nīti*, *Sadācāra*, *Sadguṇa*, *Maryādā*, *Samskṛti*, *Dharma*, and *Adhyātma*—rooted in Indian scriptures and philosophical traditions and further reflected in the outcomes of the **“Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam Ki Oar”** conclaves. Relevant ideas from the *Hitopadeśa*, *Mahābhārata*, *Manusmṛti*, *Bhagavad Gītā*, and *Arthaśāstra* are examined in comparison with selected ideas from **Hobbes, Nietzsche, Foucault, Elias, and Sen**. The study argues that institutional regulation, although necessary for social order, is insufficient to constitute moral civilization unless accompanied by the cultivation of ethical values and inner responsibility. The Indic framework extends the understanding of justice from **social justice through Sabhyatā to Samskṛti, universal justice through Dharma, and spiritual justice through Adhyātma**. The paper concludes by examining the relevance of this framework for **justice, governance, higher education, and contemporary social order**, and proposes that sustainable civilization requires not only organized social institutions but also the moral and spiritual development of individuals and society.

Keywords: Organized animality, moral civilization, dharma, nyāya, nīti, Indic knowledge systems, social order, comparative philosophy, rule of justice, Hitopadeśa.

1. INTRODUCTION

The central concern of this study is whether human society, despite its progress in law, institutions, technology, and economic organization, is moving towards **moral civilization** or merely becoming a more efficient form of **“organized animality.”** Human beings share basic instincts such as eating, sleeping, fear, and reproduction with animals. The *Hitopadeśa* identifies **dharma** as the distinguishing quality that gives human life a higher moral purpose (*Hitopadeśa*, 25).

Modern Western thinkers approached social order mainly through different understandings of power, morality, and social control. **Hobbes** explained political society through the need to overcome insecurity and conflict through political authority (Hobbes, 1651/1994). **Nietzsche** questioned established moral values and emphasized self-assertion, strength, and the “will to power” (Nietzsche, 1886/2002). **Foucault** examined how modern institutions such as prisons, schools, and hospitals discipline and regulate human behaviour (Foucault, 1975/1977).

This study uses **organized animality** to describe a condition in which human instincts such as desire, competition, accumulation, and dominance are organized through laws, markets, institutions, and technology without sufficient moral transformation. The Indic perspective offers a broader understanding in which social organization must be supported by **dharma, justice, responsibility, self-restraint, and spiritual awareness**. The principle *dharmo rakṣati rakṣitaḥ* further expresses the reciprocal relationship between protecting dharma and being protected by it.

The study examines the Indic approach associated with **Spiritual Sovereign, the 79th successor, Jainacharya Shri Yagabhushansuri Maharaj (Pandit Maharaj)**, whose thoughts are rooted in Indian scriptures and philosophical traditions. Drawing on the outcomes of the **“Vasudev Kutumbakam Ki Oar”** conclaves initiated by **Jyot and Gitarth Ganga Research Center**, along with related content available in **published materials and on the Jyot website**, the study identifies nine core values: *Sabhyatā*, *Nyāya*, *Nīti*, *Sadācāra*, *Sadguṇa*, *Maryādā*, *Samskṛti*, *Dharma*, and *Adhyātma*. These values provide a broader foundation for understanding civilization through **civility, justice, social responsibility, moral conduct, culture, universal ethics, and spiritual development**.

2. ORGANIZED ANIMALITY: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The term 'organized animality' here refers to a condition in which human biological and acquisitive impulses are institutionally organized and socially regulated through law, markets, technology, and political structures, but are insufficiently transformed or restrained by moral and spiritual values. It is, paradoxically, highly ordered where markets are efficient, legal systems are elaborate, information flows freely. What is absent is not organization but morality—the sense that human life has a purpose that supersedes the satisfaction of instinct.

The classical Indic diagnostic is unambiguous. The Hitopadeśa states:

आहारनिद्राभयमैशुनं च सामान्यमेतत्पशुभिर्नराणाम् ।

धर्मो हि तेषामधिको विशेषो धर्मेण हीनाः पशुभिः समानाः ॥

Āhāra-nidrā-bhaya-maithunaṃ ca sāmānyam etat paśubhir narāṇām | Dharmo hi teṣāmadhiko viśeṣo dharmēṇa hīnāḥ paśubhiḥ samānāḥ ||

(Hitopadeśa) "Eating, sleeping, fear, and mating are common to both animals and humans. Dharma alone is the distinctive quality of the human being. Without dharma, human beings are the same as animals."

The verse does not deny that humans share biological needs with animals—it affirms this. What it insists on is that human civilization is defined not by the presence of these needs but by the moral framework through which they are managed. When institutions merely organize and regulate these instincts without morally transforming them, human beings may remain, in the deeper civilizational sense, at the level of organized animality—socially regulated, yet insufficiently developed in moral consciousness.

2.1 Selected modern Western approaches to social order

The philosophical roots of organized animality lie, paradoxically, in one of the most sophisticated defenses of political order in Western history: Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651). Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651) provides an important foundation for understanding **organized animality**. He views humans as driven by desires and fears, requiring a strong sovereign to prevent conflict and violence (Hobbes, 1651/1994, Ch. 13). From the perspective of the present framework, Hobbes's political theory may be interpreted as emphasizing the institutional regulation of human instinct rather than the spiritual transformation of human motives. In this view, civilization mainly depends on **law, authority, and security**, with obedience taking priority over virtue, duties, and deeper moral development.

Nietzsche offers a different view of human nature. While **Hobbes sought to control human instincts through political authority**, Nietzsche emphasized the *will to power*, excellence, and the development of human strength (Nietzsche, 1886/2002). He criticized morality for promoting safety, equality, and conformity at the cost of individual greatness. From the perspective of **organized animality**, He tell how desires for power, dominance, and accumulation may operate within modern institutions. Thus, competition, political power, and economic ambition can sometimes represent organized expressions of human instincts, even when they are presented through the language of progress, civilization, or social welfare.

Foucault provides an analysis of how **organized animality** operates in modern society. He explains that power has moved from visible punishment to **discipline, surveillance, normalization, and the management of human life** (Foucault, 1975/1995). Modern institutions influence behavior not only through force but also by shaping habits, desires, and social expectations. Through **governmentality**, individuals are guided to regulate themselves through education, health policies, economic systems, and cultural norms (Foucault, 1978/2007). Thus, people may experience themselves as free while their choices are shaped by wider systems of power. Organized animality therefore becomes subtle, internalized, and socially accepted.

Norbert Elias's *The Civilizing Process* explains how Western European societies developed **manners, self-restraint, and social discipline** through increasing social interdependence and the state's control over violence (Elias, 1939/2000). He shows how people gradually internalized standards concerning behaviour, violence, sexuality, and bodily conduct.

From the Indic perspective, however, such changes represent mainly the **management of human instincts**, not their moral transformation. Good manners and self-control alone do not establish *dharma* or justice. A society may be disciplined and well-mannered yet remain unjust. Thus, the Indic approach distinguishes **social refinement from deeper moral civilization** based on responsibility, justice, and Dharma.

2.2 The Structure of Organized Animality

Organized animality describes a society where human instincts such as survival, power, pleasure, competition, and greed are controlled and organized through laws, markets, and institutions, but are not necessarily guided by moral values. In such a society, **what is legal may be considered right** where,

- freedom may mean the freedom to satisfy personal desires within legal limits.
- Progress is often measured through consumption, income, and GDP.
- Unchecked accumulation may be interpreted exclusively as economic success
- Unrestricted desire as personal freedom
- violence may be justified as strategic necessity
- exploitation as competitive advantage.

Thus, a society may be organized and efficient but still lack **justice, responsibility, self-restraint, and Dharma.**

3. THE INDIC APPROACH: FROM INSTINCT TO DHARMA

3.1 Dharma as the Categorical Differentiator

The Indic response to organized animality begins with a categorical affirmation that human civilization cannot be reduced to the efficient organization of biological drives. The Hitopadeśa's verse cited above is axiomatic, but the principle pervades the entire corpus of Indian classical literature. The Mahābhārata's Śānti Parva, which contains Bhīṣma's instruction to Yudhiṣṭhira on rājadharmā, insists that the king is not above dharma but its custodian—that authority is legitimate only when aligned with justice:

धर्मो रक्षति रक्षितः

Dharmo rakṣati rakṣitaḥ

(Mahābhārata), **Manusmṛti 8.15**) "Dharma protects those who protect dharma."

The Dharmaśāstra tradition generally presents kingship as subject to Dharma rather than as an unrestricted source of law: 'rājā dharmasyakāraṇam'—the ruler exists for the protection of dharma. Law is not the source of justice; Justice is the source of law. This inversion is critical, it is not legality that legitimizes morality but morality that legitimizes legality.

The Bhagavad Gītā's concept of svadharma (one's own duty in one's particular context and role) further individualizes this principle. Each person stands in a web of relationships and responsibilities; civilized life consists in honoring these relationships with courage and integrity rather than retreating into selfish instinct. The warrior who stands firm in svadharma despite fear is vīra—a concept that resonates with the Indic counter to 'survival of the fittest.' Where Darwin's principle is 'baliṣṭhabhogyā vasundharā' (The earth belongs to the strongest—those who rely on physical power and dominant might, reflecting "survival of the fittest" and reducing social order to "might is right," where the strong dominate and consume the earth.), the Indic ideal is 'vīrabhogyā vasundharā' (The earth belongs to the brave in virtue - one who courageously stand firm in Svadharma, uphold Dharma, protect the weak, and embody moral strength, self-restraint, duty, honour, and sacrifice).

3.2 The Nine-Value: A Structural Overview

The Indic approach presented in this study is based on the thoughts of **Jainacharya Shri Yagabhushansuri Maharaj, popularly known as Pandit Maharaj**. His thoughts are rooted in various **Indian scriptures, philosophical traditions, and ethical teachings**. These ideas were presented and discussed during the various "**Vasudev Kutumbakam ki Or**" conclaves initiated by Jyot & Gitarth Ganga and have been further articulated in the teaching notes (Shah, 2024/25). The framework explains social order that inculcates social justice, universal justice and spiritual justice. It identifies **nine important values** Sabhyatā (Civility), Nyāya (Justice), Nīti (Moral Order), Sadācāra (Right Conduct), Sadguṇa (Moral Virtues), Maryādā (Propriety), Samnskṛti (Culture), Dharma (Universal Moral Law), Adhyātma (Spiritual Realization) through which an individual and society can move from basic social order towards moral and spiritual maturity.

Sabhyatā (Civility) is the basic foundation of civilized social life. It means conduct acceptable to a sensible and reasonable society, including appropriate dress (*veśābhūṣā*), respectful speech (*vāñī*), and controlled behaviour (*varṭana*). The principle "*lokaviruddham na ācaret*" emphasizes avoiding conduct that harms social order. From this perspective, Certain strongly individualistic interpretations of liberty may place greater emphasis on individual choice, whereas Sabhyatā emphasizes that freedom must be guided by dignity and self-restraint. When freedom becomes license and basic restraint is lost, social life may move towards "**organized animality**" rather than moral civilization.

Nyāya (Justice) means that rights and entitlements should correspond to a person's effort and contribution. Taking another's rightful share is *anyāya* (injustice). Unlike a purely property-based view, Indic Nyāya connects ownership with responsibility and reciprocity. It asks whether individuals contribute to the social benefits they receive, such as knowledge, trust, natural resources, and institutions. Recognizing these wider obligations leads from Nyāya to Nīti and prevents organized animality.

Nīti (Moral Order) goes beyond individual justice and emphasizes collective responsibility and justice. Every person receives benefits from society, such as knowledge, institutions, traditions, and social systems. Therefore, individuals have a moral duty to contribute to and protect society in return. Nīti makes **reciprocity and social responsibility** essential for a civilized and just social order. The Bhagavad Gītā states this succinctly:

ऋणत्रयं हि पुरुषस्य ज्ञेयम्

Ṛṇatrayam hi puruṣasya jñeyam

"Every human being is born with three debts—to society, to elders, and to ancestors."

Nīti is based on the concept of ṛṇatraya (threefold debt), which recognizes that every person receives benefits from family, society, culture, and previous generations and therefore has a duty to contribute in return. This duty is not optional or exactly measurable; it depends on one's capacity and should benefit both present and

future generations. *Nīti* promotes collective justice in the broader interest of the people. Unlike *Nyāya*, which addresses individual injustice, *Nīti* addresses wider moral responsibility. Thus, law creates order, justice creates fairness, and *Nīti* creates a truly civilized society.

Sadācāra, Sadguṇa, Maryādā, and Saṃskṛti play an important role in maintaining **social order and justice**. *Sadācāra* promotes healthy, disciplined, and responsible conduct in daily life, reducing behaviour that may disturb social harmony. *Sadguṇa* develops qualities such as honesty, compassion, fairness, and generosity, which strengthen trust and cooperation. *Maryādā* establishes appropriate boundaries in relationships and social roles, helping prevent conflict, exploitation, and misuse of power. *Saṃskṛti* preserves and develops noble values through family, education, traditions, and institutions. Together, these values strengthen ethical behaviour, social responsibility, mutual respect, and voluntary compliance with justice, thereby supporting a stable and harmonious society.

Dharma refers to virtuous thoughts and actions that protect life, prevent moral decline, and promote truth, non-violence, compassion, and the welfare of all beings. In contrast, *Adharma* includes actions motivated by greed, excessive accumulation, harmful desires, and conduct that degrades life. **Adhyātma** refers to self-knowledge, inner balance, detachment from excessive worldly attachment, and realization of the pure self (*ātman*). It does not mean withdrawal from society; rather, spiritual awareness strengthens justice, responsibility, and compassion by encouraging recognition of the unity of all beings.

For the purposes of this study, the seven values from **Sabhyatā to Saṃskṛti** are analytically grouped under the category of **social justice**, while **Dharma** is treated as an analytical category representing the universal dimension of **universal justice**, and **Adhyātma** as representing **spiritual justice**. Together, these three dimensions—**social, universal, and spiritual justice**—constitute a comprehensive framework of the “**Rule of Justice**”. The seven values associated with social justice reflect the gradual development of human and social life, beginning with individual conduct and extending towards broader moral and cultural responsibility. As these values develop, moral responsibility expands from the **individual to the family, society, all living beings, and the wider world**. **Dharma** deepens this development by guiding the individual's inner moral life and universal duties, while **Adhyātma** leads towards spiritual development and self-realization. Thus, in the Indic approach, civilization is not limited to individual rights or social agreements; it encompasses **duties, moral responsibility, compassion, self-discipline, justice, and spiritual awareness**, providing a broader foundation for a **just, harmonious, and morally responsible society**.

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The study does not assume that Indic traditions were uniformly moral or that modern Western institutions are uniformly deficient. Rather, it compares the normative resources emphasized by selected Indic texts with selected modern theories of social order

4.1 The Foundation of Social Order

The main difference between the **modern Western and Indic approaches** is their understanding of the purpose of society. In the Hobbesian and liberal tradition, society mainly exists to protect **individual rights, freedom, property, and security**. Individuals are generally free to pursue their interests as long as they remain within the limits of law. Thus, society is largely seen as a means of protecting individual interests.

In the Indic approach, society is not an instrument for individual ends but the medium of human moral development. The purpose of social institutions—from the family (*kuṭumba*) to the state (*rājya*)—is not merely to protect individuals but to elevate them: to create conditions in which human beings can develop the virtues, fulfill their duties, and ultimately realize their spiritual potential. The Kautilyan state, as Arthaśāstra scholars have noted, was not merely a guarantor of security but a 'dharma-dispensing institution': law existed to serve justice, justice existed to serve dharma, and dharma existed to serve spiritual upliftment (Prakash, 2023; IJoIRL, 2025).

This difference also shapes the understanding of progress. A society focused mainly on individual interests may become organized and efficient but can still encourage **organized animality**. The Indic approach evaluates social institutions by their ability to promote **justice, responsibility, self-restraint and human development**, thereby creating genuine moral civilization through social justice.

4.2 Rights and Duties

Modern political philosophy, especially the **liberal tradition**, gives primary importance to **rights**. These include natural rights discussed by Locke, human rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and constitutional rights. Duties are generally understood as responsibilities that arise from respecting the rights of others.

The **Indic approach** gives greater importance to **Dharma (duty)** and **Kartavya (responsibility)**. An individual is not viewed as an isolated entity; rather, life is understood as a network of relationships and mutual obligations. A person receives innumerable benefits from **family, society, nature, and the wider social and cosmic order**. These benefits create a sense of **ṛṇa (obligation or indebtedness)**, which the individual is expected to discharge through **Kartavya**, service, gratitude, and responsible conduct. Thus, in the Indic philosophical perspective, duty is not merely an externally imposed obligation but a **moral responsibility arising from interconnectedness and reciprocity**, through which individual conduct

contributes to **social harmony, collective welfare, and the preservation of the larger order (Dharma)**. From the Indic perspective, **rights are not viewed in isolation but are closely interconnected with the fulfilment of duties**; the exercise of one's rights is balanced by the responsibility to fulfil one's **Dharma and Kartavya** towards others and society. For example, a farmer has a claim over the produce because of the duty and effort involved in cultivation. Similarly, citizens have rights but also responsibilities towards society. **Rights without responsibility may lead to organized animality**, where entitlement exists without accountability.

The *Bhagavad Gītā* states, “*karmany evādhikāras te mā phaleṣu kadācana*”— emphasis on responsible action without attachment to personal reward, thereby shifting attention from entitlement to duty and ethical action not to claim the fruits of one's actions (*Bhagavad Gītā*, 2.47). The concept of **R̥ṇatraya**, or the three fundamental debts—**Deva-ṛṇa** (debt to the divine and natural forces), **R̥ṣi-ṛṇa** (debt to sages, teachers, and knowledge traditions), and **Pitr̥-ṛṇa** (debt to parents and ancestors)—further emphasizes that an individual's life is sustained by forces and contributions beyond the self. These debts create corresponding moral obligations towards **nature, knowledge, family, and society**. Thus, the Indic approach places greater emphasis on **Dharma, duty, responsibility, and reciprocal obligations**, viewing the fulfilment of duties as essential to individual and collective well-being.

4.3 Justice : Legal vs. Moral

An important difference between the two approaches is the difference between **legal justice and moral justice**. Modern legal systems, particularly the legal positivist approach, generally connect justice with following established laws and procedures. An action may therefore be legally valid if it follows the law, even when its social or moral effects may be harmful.

The **Indic** approach takes a broader view of justice. The Manusmṛti principle “*rājā dharmasya kārṇam*” presents the ruler or state as a protector of **Dharma**, rather than the sole creator of justice. Law should therefore serve **justice and Dharma**. When legal rules conflict with moral principles, the Indic approach gives importance to the higher principles of Dharma.

Tax evasion through legal loopholes is legal but constitutes immorality (anīti) as it violates one's responsibility towards society. Similarly, business practices that legally shift environmental costs to communities may still be morally wrong because they misuse resources shared by society. Thus, **legality alone does not ensure justice**. Genuine civilization requires law to be guided by **Nyāya, Nīti, responsibility, and Dharma** (Manusmṛti; Prakash, 2023).

4.4 Governance and the State

Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra* (c. 4th century BCE) provides an important account of Indian statecraft. Although it is sometimes compared with Machiavelli's *The Prince* as a text of political realism, Kautilya's approach also gives importance to **law, justice, duties, and the welfare of people**. The state is described as a “law-giving, justice-dispensing, and duty-enforcing institution” (Sarkar, 1922, cited in Prakash, 2023). Kautilya also states that **the king's happiness lies in the happiness of his subjects** (*Arthaśāstra*, 1.19.34).

The Mahabharata's discussion of matsya nyāya “the law of the fish”, where the stronger destroys the weaker, to explain what happens when **Dharma** & social order decline and organized animality prevails. Foolishness (moha) seizes minds, intelligence is eclipsed, the sense of justice (dharma) is lost, greed (lobha) overpowers reason, desire (kāma) for what one does not possess emerges, and then social order collapses (Mahabharata, as cited in Prakash, 2023). This reflects the idea of **organized animality**, where human instincts operate without sufficient moral control.

Modern governance, by contrast, tends toward the 'Rule of Law' structure where law as written text, justice as interpretation, moral reasoning replaced by procedure and technical compliance. This structure emerged, in the Indian context, through colonial disruption, the British colonial administration systematically replaced the flexible, contextual, dharma-oriented legal traditions of pre-colonial India with a framework designed to serve administrative control rather than indigenous justice (Shah, 2024/25).

5. RULE OF LAW VERSUS RULE OF JUSTICE: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

5.1 The Colonial Genealogy of Legal Positivism in India

The shift from India's **Dharma-based legal traditions** to the colonial **Rule of Law** was not merely a neutral legal change. Colonial rulers presented traditional Indian governance as arbitrary, which helped justify a formal and codified legal system focused mainly on administrative control. Earlier, rulers were expected to govern according to **Dharma**, while colonial governance gave greater importance to written laws and procedures. This influence can still be seen in the modern legal system, where courts mainly interpret laws rather than broader principles of Dharma and Nīti. As a result, **legal compliance may sometimes replace moral responsibility**, creating a gap between what is legally permitted and what is truly just.

5.2 The Structural Comparison

The main difference between the **Indic model and the modern Rule of Law** lies in their understanding of the relationship between law and justice. In the Indic approach, **Dharma guides the ruler, administration, and**

law, so law is a means of protecting justice. In the modern model, **law is created through legislative and legal institutions**, and justice is generally understood through its interpretation and application.

This difference has important consequences. A law may be legally valid but still be **unjust or contrary to Dharma**. Similarly, an action may follow legal procedures but still be *anīti* (immoral). The Indic approach therefore considers **legality necessary but not sufficient for justice**.

This does not mean that judges should freely ignore written laws based on personal morality. Rather, legal education and governance should keep **justice, Dharma, and moral responsibility** at the centre. The key question is not only “*Is it legal?*” but also “*Is it right and just?*”

6. SEN'S NYĀYA/NĪTI DISTINCTION: A BRIDGE BETWEEN TRADITIONS

Amartya Sen's *The Idea of Justice* (2009) provides an important link between **Indic ideas and modern Western political thought**. Sen uses the Sanskrit distinction between **nīti** and **nyāya**. For him, *nīti* refers to rules, institutions, and procedures, while *nyāya* focuses on how justice actually works in people's lives (Sen, 2009; Asia Society, 2010). Sen therefore argues that justice should not be judged only by the quality of institutions but also by their actual results.

This idea is close to the Indic view that **law and institutions should serve justice**, rather than justice being limited to legal procedures. However, Sen mainly focuses on reducing injustice and improving human capabilities. The Indic approach goes further by connecting social justice with **Dharma and Adhyātma**, aiming at moral and spiritual development. Thus, Sen provides a useful bridge between Western political theory and the broader Indic understanding of **Nyāya, Nīti, Dharma, and moral civilization**.

7. IMPLICATIONS

The idea of **organized animality and moral civilization** has important implications for both higher education and governance. A university should not focus only on producing skilled workers for the market. It should also develop **ethical, responsible, and socially conscious individuals**. The Indic approach, including the educational philosophy of the **JYOT and Gitarth Ganga initiative**, views education as a means of developing knowledge, character, values, and social responsibility. **Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS)** can help students understand justice, ethics, society, and human development. This vision is also reflected in **NEP 2020** and **UGC's Mulya Pravah 2.0**, which emphasize holistic education and value-based learning (NEP, 2020; UGC, 2023).

Similarly, governance should go beyond **legal compliance and procedures**. Public institutions should be evaluated by their contribution to justice, welfare, environmental protection, and moral development. Kautilya's principle that “**the happiness of the king lies in the happiness of his subjects**” (*Arthaśāstra*, 1.19.34) highlights that the true purpose of governance is public welfare guided by **Dharma**.

8. CONCLUSION: RESTORING THE MORAL HORIZON

This paper argues that “**organized animality**” describes a social condition in which human instincts such as desire, competition, pursuit of power, and accumulation are efficiently regulated and organized through **laws, markets, institutions, and social systems**, but are not necessarily accompanied by adequate **moral transformation**. Drawing on the perspectives of **Hobbes, Nietzsche, Foucault, and Elias**, the study illustrates how modern societies can achieve a high degree of institutional organization, social regulation, and material efficiency while still facing challenges of moral responsibility and ethical self-restraint.

In contrast, the **Indic framework** presents seven interrelated values of social order—*Sabhyatā, Nyāya, Nīti, Sadācāra, Sadguṇa, Maryādā*, and *Samskṛti*—which, for the purposes of this study, are analytically grouped under **social justice** and form the foundation of **moral civilization**. **Dharma and Adhyātma**, understood in this study as dimensions of **universal justice and spiritual justice**, respectively, extend this framework beyond social organization towards **universal moral responsibility, inner ethical development, self-realization, and spiritual consciousness**. Together, these values emphasize **justice, duty, self-restraint, social responsibility, compassion, and spiritual development**. Human beings are therefore understood not merely as individuals possessing rights, but as persons embedded in a network of responsibilities towards **family, society, ancestors, nature, all living beings, and future generations**, while simultaneously pursuing their **inner and spiritual development**.

The Indic framework, therefore, **does not necessarily reject modern institutions, laws, markets, or systems of governance**; rather, it seeks to complement and evaluate them through a broader moral and spiritual framework. From this perspective, **institutional organization is a necessary condition of social order, but moral transformation is essential for genuine civilization**.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita (8th century CE). Verse 0.24–25. Translated and discussed in Wisdomlib.org and Practical Sanskrit blog.
- [2] Mahābhārata, Vanaparva (313.128)

- [3] Manusmṛti, Chapter 8, verse 15 (मनुस्मृति 8.15)
- [4] Manusmṛti. Verse cited: 'Rājā dharmasyakāraṇam' and 'lokaviruddham na ācaret.'
- [5] Bhagavad Gītā. Key verses: 'karmany evādhikāras te' (2.47) and implied ṛātraya principle.
- [6] Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya (Chanakya) (c. 4th century BCE). On statecraft, dharma, danda, and rājadharmā. Cited in Prakash (2023) and IJIRL (2025).
- [7] Śiva Purāṇa, Saṃhitā 2, Khaṇḍa 5, Adhyāya 32, Śloka 28. 'Virabhogyā vasundharā.' Also reflected in the motto of the Rajputana Rifles and in Kālidāsa's Abhijñānaśākuntalam.
- [8] Elias, N. (1939/2000). The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- [9] Elias, N. (1996 [1989]). The Germans: Power Struggles and the Development of Habitus in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Polity Press.
- [10] Foucault, M. (1975/1995). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- [11] Foucault, M. (1978/2007). Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [12] Foucault, M. (2003). Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976. Penguin Books.
- [13] Hobbes, T. (1651/1994). Leviathan (E. Curley, Ed.). Hackett Publishing.
- [14] Nietzsche, F. (1886/2002). Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future (J. Norman, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Sen, A. (2009). The Idea of Justice. Harvard University Press.
- [16] Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford University Press.
- [17] Dolan, P. (n.d.). Civilizing Processes. Dublin Institute of Technology (Arrow). Retrieved from arrow.tudublin.ie.
- [18] Indian Journal of Integrated Research in Law (IJIRL). (2025). Evolution of Indian Legal Concepts: Dharmashastra to Indian Constitution. ijirl.com.
- [19] Legal Bites. (2025, July 13). Amartya Sen: The Idea of Justice—Niti and Nyaya. Retrieved from legalbites.in.
- [20] Prakash, A. (2023). State and Statecraft in Kautilya's Arthashastra. Public Administration: The One. Retrieved from publicadministrationtheone.blogspot.com.
- [21] Sieallahabad.org. (n.d.). Exploring the Concept of Dharma in Ancient India. Retrieved from sieallahabad.org.
- [22] Political Science for India. (2026). Dharmashastra: Political Thought. Retrieved from politicsforindia.com.
- [23] Vedadhara. (n.d.). The Four Purusharthas: Dharma, Artha, Kama, and Moksha. Retrieved from vedadhara.com.
- [24] Asia Society—Northern California. (2010). Amartya Sen and The Idea of Justice. Retrieved from asiasociety.org.
- [25] Philosophy Institute. (2026, April 12). Hobbes' Social Contract: The Basis of Civil Society. Retrieved from philosophy.institute.
- [26] PolSci Institute. (2026, May 24). Foucault's Genealogy of Power: Discourse and Discipline. Retrieved from polsci.institute.
- [27] Shah, H. (2024/25). Hierarchy of Values and the Rule of Justice: An Indic Framework for Human Civilization [Teaching notes, Values_and_the_Rule_of_Justice.docx]. Shri Govind Guru University, Godhra.
- [28] University Grants Commission (UGC). Mulya Pravah 2.0: Instilling Human Values in Higher Education. New Delhi: UGC.
- [29] Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. New Delhi: MoE.
- [30] JYOT and Gitarth Ganga Initiative. Reclaiming India's Civilizational Wisdom for Contemporary Society. Internal documentation. Under the guidance of HH GAS YBS MS.
- [31] Jainacharya Shri Yugbhushan Suri Maharaj (79th Pattadhār of Bhagwan Mahavir). Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam Ki Oar Sankalan: Ethics of Joint Family as Blueprint of Next Global Order. Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam Ki Oar 2.0 Conclave, 2024.