

# Karmic Ethics in Indian Philosophy and Its Contrasts with Western Moral Theories: A Comparative Inquiry

**AUTHORS:** Dr. Anisha

**AFFILIATIONS:** Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Shri Ram College of Commerce, University of Delhi, Email: anisha@srcc.du.ac.in

## Abstract

This study explores the Indian ethical framework rooted in the principles of dharma and karma and contrasts it with major Western ethical frameworks: Aristotle's phronesis, Kant's categorical imperative, Ethical nihilism, and Rawls' justice as fairness. Drawing from the works of Devdutt Pattanaik and classical Indian texts, the study articulates how Indian ethics emphasizes context-sensitive duties, moral causality, and spiritual purpose. It compares these aspects of Indian ethics with Western approaches to moral rationality, universalism, and procedural justice. The paper ultimately argues that Indian karmic ethics presents a flexible yet accountable framework that addresses the limitations of both ethical absolutism and nihilism. It also reflects on how these unique ancient karmic ethics are now manifesting themselves in the ethical philosophies of Gandhi and Vivekananda in modern India.

**Keywords:** *Indian Ethics, Karmic Ethics, Eastern Ethical Philosophy, Dharma*

## Introduction:

Indian ethical traditions are deeply rooted in the intertwined concepts of dharma (moral duty) and karma (moral causality), which

together form a self-regulating moral framework. Unlike many Western traditions that emphasize abstract principles or universal laws for creating normative ideas of ethics and morality. Indian ethics is highly contextual, drawing on role-specific duties, spiritual

progression, and social harmony (Radhakrishnan, 1929; Bilimoria, 2007). Dharma is not a rigid demand from the self but a dynamic principle that shifts with time, one's social role, and intention, while karma reflects the consequences of moral or immoral actions one bears across lifetimes (Matilal, 2002; Bhawuk, 2011). Both concepts are embedded in the belief system that one lives and relives in a cyclic fashion, and every cycle, one deals with a part of their assigned Karma and Dharma. This creates an ethics of accountability without enforcement, emphasizing internal discernment over external sanctions. In contrast, Western moral philosophy has largely emphasized universalism, rationalism, and procedural justice. Aristotle's virtue ethics focuses on character cultivation and the pursuit of eudaimonia (flourishing) through practical wisdom or phronesis (Aristotle, trans. Irwin, 1999). Kantian deontology insists on the autonomy of rational agents and the binding nature of moral laws derived from reason alone (Kant, trans. Gregor, 1996). Rawlsian liberalism, meanwhile, grounds justice in fairness and impartiality, abstracted from individual identity through the veil of ignorance (Rawls, 1971).

This paper aims to compare these dominant Western paradigms with the Indian karmic-dharmic approach. It also examines Indian ethics as a counterpoint to ethical nihilism, which rejects the existence of objective moral truths and considers morality a human construct (Nietzsche, 1887; Mackie, 1977). Drawing from classical Indian texts and contemporary interpreters like Devdutt Pattanaik, this study argues that Indian ethics offers a pluralistic, context-sensitive, and spiritually oriented model that challenges both Western absolutism and nihilistic relativism.

### **Research Methodology**

The study employs a comparative textual analysis to examine the ethical philosophies of both Indian and Western traditions. By systematically analyzing classical texts, commentaries, and contemporary interpretations, the research aims to identify distinctive patterns and underlying principles that shape ethical reasoning in each context.

### **The Indian Ethical Framework**

#### ***Dharma and Karma***

At the core of Indian moral philosophy lie the allied concepts of dharma (righteous conduct)

and karma (moral interconnection). Dharma is understood as a dynamic principle that alters according to one's age (*ashrama*), caste (*varna*), gender, social role, and situation. For instance, the right action for a soldier (warrior) on the battlefield may differ radically from the right action of a renunciant or a householder (Radhakrishnan, 1929; Sharma, 2006). Instead of a fixed approach, Indian ethics by nature is pluralistic and situational. This is also evident in the concept of *swadharma*, which is broadly translated as one's moral responsibility in a situation. It forms an integral approach to understanding how actions are shaped in the Indian context, and contrastingly, it rejects the idea of universal codes. (Matilal, 2002; Mohan, 2017).

Karma is a moral law of cause and effect that transcends a single lifetime. It theorises that every action, which also includes the verbal or mental dimensions, generates consequences that form the future of the individual, not only in this life but across reincarnations. Unlike externally enforced systems of reward and punishment, the karmic doctrine internalizes justice: individuals are held responsible by the very structure of the cosmos, not by institutional sanction (Bhawuk, 2011; Bilimoria,

2007). Further, the ethics of divinity are the predominant force that guides Indian's ethical actions. This divinity is reflected in the daily actions of the people, chanting prayers, visiting temples, or wearing teeka's on their foreheads. For instance, before a lawsuit or an examination, many people perform divine rituals to strengthen their self-beliefs in the most critical situations.

Importantly, dharma is not merely a social duty but a pathway to spiritual liberation (*moksha*). Ethical behavior is deeply intertwined with one's philosophical journey, interweaving the moral, psychological, and spiritual development. Texts like the *Bhagavad Gita* emphasize acting in accordance with one's dharma without attachment to outcomes—a principle of *nishkama karma* that fosters both ethical detachment and selfless service (Gandhi, 1948; Pattanaik, 2010). In this sense, the Indian ethical system is *self-regulating*, stressing introspection, detachment, and intentionality (Gandhi, 1948; Shankara, 1947).

**Apart from the broader common understanding of Karma and Dharma, there exist some intricate differences in the way they are interpreted through various schools**

of thought. Advaita Vedānta understands dharma and karma as a part of self-inquiry, which prepares oneself for higher liberation that is realising the ultimate truth (Brahman). At that stage, Karma and Dharma have no binding on an individual and their actions (Sharma, 1997; Potter, 1981). Karma is governed by God and gives one the right results at the right time, according to the understanding in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika School, a philosophical system that combines logic with metaphysics. The school views Dharma as a reasoned principle that sustains order and guides actions (Ganeri, 2001; Matilal, 1990). In Buddhism, Dharma is interpreted from Buddha's teachings, such as dependent origination, and Karma is viewed as the detached actions (Harvey, 2000; Gethin, 1998). Jainism views Karma as a crook that keeps one endlessly bound to the outer world. Unlike other schools of thought, dharma has a dual meaning in Jainism; it refers to routine ethical behaviors in daily life as well as a deeper cosmic principle providing guidance (Dundas, 2002; Jaini, 1998). However, even with subtle differences, all these schools are fixed in alignment with cosmic order, detachment, and living a flexible, harmonious

life with the universe.

By rooting ethics in personal evolution and cosmic balance, the Indian tradition avoids the rigidity of moral absolutism and the vacuity of moral relativism. It creates a space for *viveka* (discernment) and *samvedana* (compassion), allowing for context-sensitive judgment while maintaining a serious moral structure. As Mohan (2017) notes, the epics and Puranas consistently present ethical dilemmas that are not solved through legalistic codes but through deeper reflection on dharma and karma, making the Indian tradition inherently dialogic and interpretive.

### *Devdutt Pattanaik and Contemporary Interpretation*

Contemporary Indian author and mythologist Devdutt Pattanaik has been instrumental in revitalizing and reinterpreting classical Indian ethical thought for modern audiences. In works such as *My Gita* (2010) and *Business Sutra* (2013), Pattanaik bridges ancient mythological narratives and contemporary dilemmas, emphasizing that Indian ethics does not rely on fixed moral absolutes but on contextual discernment and relational wisdom. Pattanaik's interpretations underline that epics like the

Mahabharata and the Ramayana are not moral instruction manuals but ethical laboratories. For instance, the Mahabharata presents characters like Arjuna, Karna, and Yudhishtira navigating agonizing moral conflicts without easy resolutions. As Pattanaik (2010) argues, these texts prioritize introspective reflection on dharma over rule-based ethics. The Bhagavad Gita, situated within the battlefield, becomes a metaphor for inner conflict where Krishna advocates action aligned with swadharma (personal duty), detached from outcomes—what Pattanaik terms an “inner compass” approach to ethics.

In *Business Sutra*, Pattanaik (2013) extends these insights to the domain of leadership and corporate ethics. He contrasts Western binaries of right/wrong or legal/illegal with the Indian emphasis on loka-sangraha (the welfare of the world) and yoga (integration of roles, duties, and intent). Here, ethical behavior emerges not from compliance but from self-awareness, empathy (samvedana), and alignment with one's place in the cosmic order. What makes Pattanaik's contributions especially relevant is his insistence that morality in Indian thought is deeply narrative and interpretive. Unlike the deductive structure of Western ethics (e.g.,

Kantian universals or utilitarian calculations), Indian ethics is inductive and experiential—arising from stories, metaphors, and lived dilemmas (Bhawuk, 2011; Mohan, 2017). The epics do not prescribe; they provoke inquiry. Moreover, Pattanaik challenges the modern assumption that clarity equals correctness. He writes that “Indian thought values ambiguity because life is ambiguous” (My Gita, 2010). Moral complexity is not seen as a failure of reason but as a feature of human life that ethics must accommodate, not eliminate. This stands in contrast to much of Western moral theory, which tends to seek universalizable principles or decision procedures to eliminate moral uncertainty (Blackburn, 2001; Kant, 1996).

In sum, Pattanaik's approach offers a hermeneutic lens on Indian ethics: ethics as interpretation, not codification. His reinterpretation of myth shows that ethical insight in the Indian tradition arises from an iterative dialogue between tradition and experience, between the epic and the everyday, and between individual choice and cosmic consequence.

### *Practical Illustrations from Epics and Modern Life*

The Indian epics, particularly the Mahabharata, serve as a moral compass for resolving ethical dilemmas and ambiguities through understanding one's context-specific duties, which are called *svadharma*. Arjuna's hesitation on the battlefield of Kurukshetra, for instance, reflects the universal tension between personal emotion and social responsibility. Krishna's counsel in the Bhagavad Gita emphasizes action by one's *dharma*, detached from the desire for outcomes (*nishkama karma*). These ethical commandments focus on one's inner discernment (*viveka*) and role-bound duty. As Radhakrishnan (1929) observes, Arjuna's dilemma and Krishna's resolution represent the shift from individual preference to cosmic alignment. This fundamentally contrasts with Western moral theories grounded in reasoned universalism. Indian ethical reasoning would assess actions through karmic connection: what are the moral consequences of action, not only legally but spiritually and relationally? As Pattanaik (2013) suggests in Business Sutra, Indian corporate

leaders who act out of alignment with their *svadharma* find themselves dealing with ethical dissonance. While complying with global norms, which are influenced by Western ethical philosophies, the Indian leaders experience long-term disharmony, both personal and institutional. For Instance, a CEO who manipulates earnings to protect shareholder value in the short term. While this may seem justifiable through a utilitarian lens, karmic ethics would caution that intent and dharmic misalignment will yield consequences beyond immediate metrics. Thus, Indian ethics offers not only what is effective or legal, but what is suitable to my role, intent, and spiritual growth. In public life, too, karmic logic underpins many social intuitions. Acts of charity, corruption, or civic neglect are frequently discussed in India through the language of karma: "He will face the consequences," "This is his karma," or "Dharma will catch up." Even many interpreted Raju Ramalingam, founder of Satyam Computer Services (once a leading Indian IT firm), as using his letter to the Board after his exposure for massive fraud, as an attempt at *paśchātāpa* (remorse, repentance). These general expressions are not philosophical

but reflect a deeper moral answerability, where ethical actions are embedded in a long chain of cause and effect (Matilal, 2002). Unlike Kantian ethics, where an action is judged by its conformity to a simple rational principle, karmic ethics emphasizes complex moral process over static rules. Moreover, the moral ambiguity seen in characters like Karna or Draupadi mirrors dilemmas faced by modern actors who occupy multiple conflicting roles and often analyse a situation from multiple perspectives. Indian epics do not resolve these conflicts through clear hierarchies of obligation, but through narrative deliberation, inviting the actor to reflect, internalize, and accept responsibility for chosen actions. As Mohan (2017) notes, “the Indian epics are repositories not of moral answers, but of moral experiments.” In sum, both the epic and modern domains demonstrate that Indian ethical reasoning centres on intentions, relational duty, and fluid consequences.

### **The Western Ethical Framework**

Western moral philosophy has developed multiple paradigms on ethics and morality. These frameworks, while often universalist in tone, reflect deep philosophical debates about

autonomy, justice, human nature, and moral motivation. One such popular philosophy is that of Kant, whose moral concepts are rooted in rational duty to follow one's Categorical Imperative. In other words, moral actions must be guided by principles that could rationally apply to all beings, regardless of personal desires or outcomes (Kant, 1996). Kant emphasized that moral worth resides not in the results of an action, but in the intention to act from duty. However, critics argue that Kantian ethics may become rigid or insensitive to emotional and contextual complexities (O'Neill, 1989). Still, its insistence on respect for persons and principled action has deeply influenced contemporary human rights discourse and medical ethics. On the other hand, Utilitarianism (The Calculus of Happiness), developed by Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and refined by John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), offers an outcome-oriented approach to morality. This approach grants an action its ethicality if it promotes the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people (Mill, 1863). Utilitarianism is admired for its practicality, especially in public policy, law, and economics. However, it has been critiqued for allowing sacrifices of individual rights or rights of the minorities in

pursuit of collective utility. Its understanding of happiness or pleasure is also later questioned, as these were later understood as subjective notions. Nonetheless, utilitarian ethics continue to inform decisions in healthcare triage, environmental policy, and global development, where trade-offs are often unavoidable (Singer, 2002). Furthermore, the Justice theory of John Rawls (1921-2002) often views fairness as a moral foundation of ethical decision-making. Rawls proposed two key principles: Equal basic liberties for all individuals. Social and economic inequalities are justified only if they benefit the least advantaged (the Difference Principle). Rawlsian justice is procedural and institutional, prioritizing fairness over personal virtue or utilitarian calculus. In contrast to the idea of pleasure in the utilitarian approach, Aristotle (384–322 BCE) proposed a framework rooted in the pursuit of eudaimonia, which is delight experienced through a flourishing or fulfilled life (Nicomachean Ethics, 1999). Moral development, for Aristotle, is not about adhering to universal rules but developing character through routinization, education, and thoughtful practice. Central to this is phronesis or practical wisdom. It is the capacity to discern

the right course of action in complex, often conflicting, situations. Aristotle emphasized the Doctrine of the Mean: virtue lies between extremes (e.g., courage between rashness and cowardice). Moreover, at the other end of the Western moral philosophies lies the concept of Ethical Nihilism. It is the philosophical position that rejects the existence of any objective or inherent moral truths. It asserts that concepts of right and wrong are not grounded in any metaphysical reality but are instead human inventions, shaped by cultural, psychological, or biological contingencies. Friedrich Nietzsche, one of the foremost exponents of ethical nihilism, argued that traditional moral systems, particularly those rooted in religion or metaphysics, were fabricated structures of power and control. In *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), he critiques moral values as arising from a "slave morality" that suppresses individual excellence and the will to power. He believes that true morality will come with the "Death of God." Compelling people to engage in a frightening task of creating their own values. J.L. Mackie, in *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong* (1977), offered a more logical defense of ethical nihilism. He famously argued for the "error theory," which claims that while

moral language accepts the existence of objective moral facts, such facts do not exist. All moral claims are, therefore, systematically false. Mackie maintained that moral treatments are estimates of emotional attitudes or preferences, and any attempt to justify them as universally binding is logically unsound. Ethical nihilism presents a paradox: it frees individuals from oppressive or hypocritical moral codes but provides no substantive framework to replace them. The rejection of all value systems can create a moral vacuum, often filled by arbitrary will or societal conformity. As such, ethical nihilism remains a powerful but unsettling critique that destabilizes traditional ethics while offering little constructive guidance for ethical action.

While these Western traditions wander as **deontology** privileges duty, **utilitarianism** focuses on outcomes, **Rawlsian justice** prioritizes fairness, and **virtue ethics** cultivates character, but they share a foundational commitment to **moral reasoning**, **autonomy**, and **human responsibility**. Despite their differences, they presume that morality is a rational endeavor capable of guiding human behavior. In contrast, **ethical nihilism** rejects

this shared foundation entirely, asserting that morality itself is a human fiction without objective grounding.

### Comparative Review of Indian and Western Ethical Frameworks.

Contrary to the Western ethical philosophies of Aristotle or Bentham, which focused on pleasure and pain or eudaimonia. Indian ethics is centred around achieving sorrowlessness (Moore, 1951). This is predominantly the goal of all the Indian philosophies. With deep emphasis on the fact that real achievement is internal and cannot be found in the outer world. In this context, Indian ethics places less focus on ethical absolutism and is more driven towards the situational understanding of morality. Free from the bonds of empirical life and rational mind when the highest ideal of realising the self is achieved, which is dominated by the *Brahman*, every action becomes free from moral judgment. In the spirit, every outward action taken is free from moral boundaries, and it becomes impossible for a wrong action to take place (Goodwin, 1955).

In the practical world, to detach oneself, the Indian ethics also suggests navigating through

a “middle path” (*madhyamā-pratipad*), especially evident in Buddhist thought, emphasizing a balance between renunciation and engagement, reason and compassion, action and detachment (Bilimoria, 2007; Bhawuk, 2011). It is more inclined towards nihilism's central idea that there is no objective truth in the world, but it saves one from its despair, as it propagates the idea of finding an objective truth outside the dynamics of this tangible world. At its core, Indian ethics is anchored in accountability (*karma*), relational responsibility (*dharma*), and spiritual discernment (*viveka*)—tools for navigating the moral landscape without falling prey to its material desires. For example, the *Bhagavad Gita* emphasizes *nishkama karma*, which is action without attachment to outcomes, where Arjuna must fight not for gain or glory, but to fulfill his duty in the cosmic order (Gandhi, 1948; Sharma, 2006). This contrasts sharply with ethical nihilism, which denies that any moral claims are objectively true or binding. Philosophers such as Nietzsche (1887) and Mackie (1977) argued that morality is a human construct, lacking a metaphysical foundation. Indian ethics, by contrast, endures ethical seriousness without tempting to find any

objective universals. *Karma* creates an internal reason of moral consequence, while *dharma* provides a situated guide for conduct. Moreover, Indian traditions engage with consequentialist concerns through the alleviation of the suffering of others, a core Buddhism's Eightfold Path, and Jain *ahimsa* (nonviolence). However, this is followed not through the utilitarian calculus of pleasure-maximization, but through detached compassion and self-discipline, reinforced by the goal of liberation (*moksha* or *nirvana*) rather than worldly utility (Matilal, 2002; Bilimoria, 2007). The motivation to reduce suffering is thus spiritually grounded, not hedonistically motivated. In institutional terms, Rawls' theory of justice offers procedural fairness via the “original position,” whereas Indian ethics does not centrally promote equality in the Western liberal sense, but rather tends to value social harmony even amidst inequality, embracing differences as acceptable and often well understood within a framework of peace and mutual coexistence. It is less about abstract equality and more about nourishing harmony within a metaphysical and social order (Radhakrishnan, 1929). Further, both philosophies share a concern for the weak and

disadvantaged, Rawls' through the "difference principle" and Indian ethics through its emphases on seva (service) and karuna (compassion) for all beings. **Further, Rawls's suggestion of practicing impartiality is rejected by the Indian dharmic perspective, which states that one cannot practice impartiality from a context unless it shifts its focus inward. It acknowledges that moral actions are inevitably influenced by social and familial responsibilities (Radhakrishnan, 1953; Sharma, 1997), unlike Rawls' theory, which calls for impartiality without elaborating on how it can be practiced without being influenced by context. The Indian philosophical system provides an answer to this dilemma.**

On the other hand, Kant propagates having autonomy and adherence to universal maxim, whereas the Indian perspectives judge actions both by intentions and their cosmic consequences. Indian consequentialism is much deeper as it is cosmic and karmic. For example, a Jain monk may choose strict non-violence even in situations where Kantian duty might allow exceptions, because every action leaves karmic traces that muddle/ bind the soul. Further, the Dharmic perspective

**questions the autonomy and puts constraints on free choice (Jaini, 1998; Dundas, 2002).** Instead of orienting the self toward outward or worldly intelligibility, it guides the self towards inner clarity and liberation. It avoids the rigidity of codes (e.g., religious legalism or Kantian duty) and the emptiness of nihilism by rooting moral judgment in relationality, causality, and self-awareness. It calls not for obedience, but for reflection.

There also lies a difference in the concept of Aristotelian phronesis (practical wisdom) and viveka (spiritual discernment). Practical wisdom of understanding what extreme is and therefore maintaining the balance. It is deliberating on what is good and helpful/ valuable in routine life. For instance, one can discipline a subordinate through a balanced approach by being fair at the same time maintaining his/her dignity. The actions are reasoned in a worldly way. On the other hand, Viveka is the wisdom of understanding and distinguishing real from unreal. Understanding of what is transient and what is real helps one make beneficial decisions that can be helpful. For instance, one can discipline a subordinate by exercising more compassion and patience, understanding that

momentary anger can lead to karmic bondage.

Lastly, while nihilism rejects the existence of moral values and God, the dharmic perspective accepts a cosmic order or divine principle backing each ethical action. In nihilism, moral action has no inherent meaning, whereas in dharmic philosophy, it is propagated that one may act ethically in the world, but does so with detachment from personal gain. The ultimate accountability of actions lies beyond worldly outcomes (Sharma, 1997; Radhakrishnan, 1953).

Ultimately, in a fractured world, Indian ethical traditions remind us that morality can be both principled and plural, both individual and collective, and both pragmatic and transcendent.

### *The Modern Economic Values and Morality*

The mythological ethical wisdom was later reflected in the popular philosophies of Gandhi and Vivekananda, which became the applied ethical frameworks for modern life in India. The concepts such as karma, dharma, satya, and ahimsā were reinterpreted in modern teaching. Gandhi's moral philosophy was rooted in the Bhagavad Gītā's doctrine of

nishkāma karma—selfless action performed without attachment to results. His various political strategies, such as satyagraha and non-cooperation, exemplified in the 1930 Salt March, where the act of defying unjust salt laws became a moral duty free from personal gain (Gandhi, 1927/2008), were based on the principles of the Bhagavad Gita. His emphasis on dharma as universal moral responsibility, rather than caste-bound obligation, reflected the epic ideals of Rāma's righteousness in the Rāmāyaṇa. Similarly, ahimsā, a virtue celebrated in the Mahābhārata and central to Jain tradition, became for Gandhi not merely a personal promise but a shared political force, which he used to transform the oppressor. He brought the change through moral appeal rather than coercion. On the other hand, Vivekananda, inspired by the same scriptural ethos, especially the Gītā and Vedānta, refurbished karma yoga as well-organized selfless service (seva) to humanity, seeing the divine in the poor as "Daridra Nārāyaṇa" and urging educated Indians to take up the national dharma of social upliftment (Vivekananda, 1896/2010). His founding of the Ramakrishna Mission was based on the bhakti and tyāga ideals found in Puranic narratives, where

service to the devotee equals service to God. The textual guidance from the mythological scriptures was transformed into practical principles for bringing social reforms by both thinkers. This is a classic example of how the ancient codes are ethically lived in the practical world.

However, based on the foundations of Gandhi and Vivekananda's ideals, India's ancient economic system was initially integrated with morality and material prosperity, with strong societal and governmental enforcement of ethics (Basham, 2001; Thiruvalluvar, 2002), but later, Modern India moved away from these roots (Korten, 1998; Soros, 2004). India's economy moved toward market-driven growth in the 1990s, and the moral economy envisioned by these thinkers is now partly eclipsed by consumerist and competitive values. Despite the change, the deep-rooted quest for truth and meaning has still sustained itself in the rapid adoption of Western moral values. The traces persist in sectors grounded in community trust, ethical entrepreneurship, and social enterprises that blend profit with purpose (Khosla, 2010; Chakrabarty, 2016). Specifically, the informal sector sees the local cultural values still guiding the morality

(Kanagasabapathi, 2002; Patel & Kanagasabapathi, 2004). Trust, mutual help, compassion, and other enduring values remain an underappreciated strength of India's economic fabric (Kumarappa, 1997). The deep rooted imprints of *Karma Yoga* and *Seva bhav* can still be seen in the proactive actions today, such as, India became first country in the world to mandate that companies spend a fixed percentage of their profits on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), with the Companies Act, 2013 requiring firms to allocate at least 2% of their average net profits from the previous three years to CSR activities.

## Conclusion

**This current investigation discloses the distinctive nature of Indian karmic ethics, which rejects rigidity, universalism, and nihilistic emptiness. It elaborates how the Indian ethical understanding is inward-oriented, unlike the essence of rationality, autonomy, and procedural justice in Western philosophies.** As rooted in dharma and karma, it presents a context-sensitive, spiritually anchored, and responsibility-oriented framework for ethical living. Dharma and duties in the Indian context are not performed

to perfect the outer world, but they are the means to achieve inner liberation. The social harmony as an aim of ethical living is not achieved through the outward worldly alignment and love for others, but through the inner understanding that all is self. Additionally, the values such as compassion, non-violence, and inner truth are woven into the modern complex moral self in which ethicality is influenced by the Western ethical framework.

## References

- © Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Irwin T, trans. Hackett Publishing Company; 1999. (Original work published ca. 4th century BCE).
- © Basham AL. *The wonder that was India*. Rupa & Co.; 2001.
- © Bentham J. *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1789.
- © Bhawuk DPS. *Spirituality and Indian psychology: Lessons from the Bhagavad-Gita*. Springer; 2011.
- © Bilimoria P. The idea of moral conscience in Hinduism. In: Bilimoria P, editor. *Indian ethics: Classical traditions and contemporary challenges*. Vol. 1. Ashgate; 2007. p. 301–324.
- Blackburn S. *Being good: A short introduction to ethics*. Oxford University Press; 2001.
- Chakrabarty D. The ethics of economic development: India in the age of liberalization. *Economic & Political Weekly*. 2016;51(7):35–42.
- Gadgil DR. *Planning and economic policy in India*. University of Bombay; 1969.
- Gandhi MK. *The Bhagavad Gita according to Gandhi*. F. Ungar Publishing Co.; 1948.
- Gandhi MK. *The story of my experiments with truth*. Desai M, trans. Dover Publications; 2008. (Original work published 1927).
- Goodwin WF. Ethics and value in Indian philosophy. *Philosophy East West*. 1955;4(4):321–334.
- Kanagasabapathi P. *A study on the unorganized finance sector in India*. Swadeshi Academic Council; 2002.
- Kant I. *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*. Gregor MJ, trans & ed. Cambridge University

Press; 1996. (Original work published 1785).

- Khosla M. The idea of economic trusteeship. *Seminar*. 2010;615.
- Korten DC. *When corporations rule the world*. The Other India Press; 1998.
- Kumarappa JC. *Economy of permanence*. Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan; 1944.
- Kumarappa JC. *Economy of permanence*. Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan; 1997.
- Mackie JL. *Ethics: Inventing right and wrong*. Penguin Books; 1977.
- Matilal BK. *The character of logic in India*. Oxford University Press; 2002.
- Matilal BK. The moral dilemma of Arjuna: A study in Indian ethics. In: Matilal BK, editor. *Ethics and epics: The Mahābhārata and modern thought*. Oxford University Press; 2002. p. 55–78.
- Mill JS. *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn; 1863.
- Mohan A. *Upholding Dharma: The Mahabharata as moral philosophy*. Routledge India; 2017.
- Moore CA, editor. *The basis of social, ethical, and spiritual values in Indian philosophy*. In: *Essays in East–West philosophy*. University of Hawaii Press; 1951. Chap. 17, p. 318.
- Nietzsche F. *On the genealogy of morals*. Kaufmann W, Hollingdale RJ, trans. Vintage Books; 1887.
- O'Neill O. *Constructions of reason: Explorations of Kant's practical philosophy*. Cambridge University Press; 1989.
- Patel S, Kanagasabapathi P. *A study of diamond exporters in Gujarat*. PSG Institute of Management; 2004. Unpublished report.
- Pattanaik D. *Jaya: An illustrated retelling of the Mahabharata*. Penguin Books; 2010.
- Pattanaik D. *My Gita*. Rupa Publications; 2010.
- Pattanaik D. *Business sutra: A very Indian approach to management*. Aleph Book Company; 2013.
- Radhakrishnan S. *Indian philosophy*. Vol. 1. George Allen & Unwin; 1929.
- Radhakrishnan S, Moore CA, editors. A

sourcebook in Indian philosophy. Princeton University Press; 1957.

- Rawls J. *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press; 1971.

- Sandel MJ. *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. Cambridge University Press; 1982.

- Sen A. *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press; 1999.

- Sen A. *The idea of justice*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 2009.

- Shankara. *The Bhagavad Gita: With the commentary of Sankaracharya*. Mahadeva Sastri A, trans. Samata Books; 1947.

- Sharma A. Hinduism and ethics. In: Singer P, editor. *A companion to ethics*. Blackwell Publishing; 2006. p. 70–79.

- Sharma A. *Hinduism and modernity*. Wiley-Blackwell; 2006.

- Singer P. *One world: The ethics of globalization*. Yale University Press; 2002.

- Soros G. *Open society: Reforming global capitalism*. Viva Books Private Limited; 2004.

- Thiruvalluvar. *Thirukkural, along with the explanations of Dr. Mu. Varadarasanar*. The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society; 2002.

- Vivekananda S. *Karma-Yoga: The yoga of action*. Advaita Ashrama; 2010. (Original work published 1896).

- Dundas P. *The Jains*. 2nd ed. Routledge; 2002.

- Ganeri J. *Philosophy in classical India: The proper work of reason*. Routledge; 2001.

- Gethin R. *The foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford University Press; 1998.

- Harvey P. *An introduction to Buddhist ethics: Foundations, values and issues*. Cambridge University Press; 2000.

- Jaini PS. *The Jaina path of purification*. Motilal Banarsidass; 1998.

- Matilal BK. *The character of logic in India*. State University of New York Press; 1990.

- Potter KH, editor. *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies: Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṅkara and his pupils*. Motilal Banarsidass; 1981.

- Sharma C. *A critical survey of Indian*

*philosophy*. 10th ed. Motilal Banarsidass; 1997.

- Sharma C. *A critical survey of Indian philosophy*. 10th ed. Motilal Banarsidass; 1997.
- Radhakrishnan S. *The principal upanishads*. 2nd ed. Harper & Row; 1953.