CHETANA
International Journal of Education (CIJE)
Peer Reviewed/Refereed Journal
ISSN : 2455-8279 (E)/2231-3613 (P)
Impact Factor
SJIF 2025-8.445

Prof. A.P. Sharma
Founder Editor, CIJE
(25.12.1932 - 09.01.2019)

Jain Vows, Hindu Restraints, and the Corresponding Human Rights

Mr. Bharat
Ph.D. Scholar
Department of Nonviolence and Peace
Jain Vishva Bharati Institute, Ladnun- 341306, Rajasthan
E-mail: jajani5@yahoo.com, Mobile: 8333040227

First draft received: 05.11.2025, Reviewed: 18.11.2025
Final proof received: 21.11.2025, Accepted: 28.11.2025

Abstract

This study explores the ethical convergence between the Jain vows (vrata) and Hindu restraints (yama) and the principles of modern human rights. Drawing from primary texts such as the Tattvārthasūtra, Yoga Sūtra, Ācārāṅga Sūtra, and Bhagavad Gītā, it examines how the fivefold moral frameworks—ahiṃsā (non-violence), satya (truthfulness), asteya (non-stealing), brahmacarya (chastity or self-control), and aparigraha (non-possessiveness)—parallel the human rights to life, dignity, property, integrity, and equality. The paper argues that while human-rights discourse emphasizes external, legal guarantees of justice and freedom, Jain and Hindu traditions emphasize internal moral transformation through self-restraint and compassion. These Indic frameworks thus complement and deepen the human-rights paradigm by rooting social justice in personal virtue and metaphysical responsibility. The analysis also highlights key divergences—such as metaphysical versus secular foundations, absolutism versus contextualism, and renunciation versus engagement—while demonstrating their potential synthesis in a globally relevant ethic of spiritual humanism. In an age marked by violence, consumerism, and ecological degradation, the vows of restraint (vrata–yama) offer a timeless moral blueprint for reconciling freedom with responsibility and inner virtue with outer justice.

Keywords*:* Jainism; Hinduism; *vrata*; *yama*; *ahiṃsā*; *satya*; *asteya*; *brahmacarya*; *aparigraha*; *dharma*; human rights; ethics; non-violence; moral philosophy; spiritual humanism; peacebuilding; justice; self-restraint; dignity; equality *etc.*

Introduction

The relationship between moral restraint and human rights represents a deep intersection between ancient spiritual philosophy and modern social ethics. Across the Indic religious traditions, two of the most influential moral systems—Jain vows (*vrata*) and Hindu restraints (*yama*)—articulate disciplined frameworks of ethical self-regulation that resonate with the fundamental principles underlying modern human rights discourse. These systems emphasize the transformation of human conduct through voluntary restraint, cultivating inner purity (*śuddhi*) and social harmony (*saṃyama*). Long before the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948), these traditions had already laid a moral foundation based on respect for life, truth, justice, and equality.

In Jainism, the five *vratas—ahiṃsā* (non-violence), *satya* (truthfulness), *asteya* (non-stealing), *brahmacarya* (celibacy or chastity), and *aparigraha* (non-possessiveness)—form the ethical core of both monastic and lay life. These are not mere rules but expressions of a metaphysical commitment to non-violence (*ahiṃsā paramo dharmaḥ*, "non-violence is the highest duty") and spiritual liberation (*mokṣa*) (Umasvāti, *Tattvārthasūtra* ch. 7). In Hinduism, a cognate set of restraints, the *yamas*, appears in Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra (II.30) as the first limb of the eightfold path (*aṣṭāṅga-yoga*), with the same five names: *ahiṃsā*, *satya*, *asteya*, *brahmacarya*, and *aparigraha*. The presence of nearly identical moral terms in both traditions indicates an Indic ethical vocabulary affirming that inner discipline supports outer justice.

From a comparative standpoint, both Jain *vratas* and Hindu *yamas* function as ethical preconditions for peaceful coexistence and mutual respect, which modern societies strive to enshrine through the language of rights. While the UDHR frames the individual's entitlement to life, dignity, freedom, and equality, the Indic traditions articulate the individual's duty to self-restraint, compassion, and honesty. The emphasis lies less on rights as claims against others and more on moral responsibility as a way of ensuring the welfare of all

beings (*sarva-bhūta-hita*). This shift—from entitlement to obligation—reflects a holistic moral anthropology, in which individual welfare and communal harmony are inseparable.

Moreover, the universality of *vrata* and *yama* transcends sectarian boundaries. Their underlying values—non-violence, truth, non-theft, chastity, and non-possession—address fundamental dimensions of human life and social relations. These principles embody what some scholars describe as the humanization of self through self-restraint, transforming ethical behavior from mere external compliance into the realization of one's higher nature (*ātma-dharma*). Such self-discipline becomes the moral substratum upon which human rights can be meaningfully enacted—without a culture of inner responsibility, rights risk degenerating into hollow legal claims.

In the pages that follow, this article explores the intersections between Jain and Hindu moral codes and modern human rights, emphasizing both convergence and divergence. We examine how *ahiṃsā* corresponds to the right to life, how *satya* upholds dignity and expression, how *asteya* protects property and justice, how *brahmacarya* relates to family and integrity, and how *aparigraha* reflects equality and economic justice. The analysis will also consider the philosophical differences between these traditions (Jain absolutism versus Hindu contextual ethics), as well as their relevance in contemporary global ethics—particularly in cultivating peace, ecological responsibility, and human dignity.

By situating these Indic moral frameworks alongside modern human-rights discourse, the study argues that Jain and Hindu ethics offer not merely historical insight, but enduring paradigms for moral and social transformation. In a world increasingly focused on rights without responsibilities, the principles of *vrata* and *yama* invite a return to the spiritual roots of ethical life—where peace is not imposed by law, but cultivated through discipline, compassion, and reverence for life.

The Concept of Ahiṃsā in Both Traditions

The principle of ahiṃsā, non-violence or non-injury, is arguably the most profound ethical contribution of Indian civilization to global moral thought. Both Jainism and Hinduism enshrine *ahiṃsā* as foundational, but interpret and operationalize it differently. In both, *ahiṃsā* is not merely a prohibition of physical harm but a holistic discipline governing thought (*manas*), speech (*vāk*), and bodily action (*kāya*). It implies an orientation of universal goodwill and compassion (*dayā*) toward all living beings (*sarva-bhūta-dayā*), rooted in the insight that life in its forms is sacred and interdependent.

Ahiṃsā in Jainism: Supreme Duty and Universal Respect

In Jainism, *ahiṃsā* is framed as paramo dharmaḥ (the supreme religion or highest duty). It is the first and most important *vrata*, underlying all other ethical commitments. The *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* begins with the injunction: "All beings desire to live; none wishes to die…" (Ācārāṅga 1.4.1), establishing a universal ethic based on the reciprocity of life. Every act of violence—however small—binds the soul in karmic constraint, and thus *ahiṃsā* becomes both an ethical principle and a metaphysical necessity (Umasvāti, *Tattvārthasūtra*, ch. 7).

The Jain conception of *ahiṃsā* extends to the finest forms of life—plants, animals, micro-organisms, and even microbes. Ascetics practice *apramāda* (constant vigilance) to avoid harm: walking cautiously to not step on insects, filtering water to avoid killing microbes, and minimizing speech to avoid verbal harm. This radical carefulness exemplifies an ethic of total empathy, recognizing that every living being has intrinsic sacredness.

Metaphysically, Jain *ahiṃsā* is tied to the theory of karma: every injurious act attracts karmic particles that cling to the soul (*jīva*), thereby inhibiting its freedom. Abstaining from harm thus purifies not only others but oneself. In this dual movement of self-purification and universal compassion, *ahiṃsā* becomes a moral law safeguarding both individual and collective life.

From the human-rights perspective, Jain *ahiṃsā* corresponds with the right to life (UDHR Article 3), "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person." Yet the Jain horizon is broader: it extends this right ethically (though not juridically) to all sentient entities, transcending anthropocentrism. The Jain motto *parasparopagraho jīvānām*—"all living beings support one another" (Tattvārthasūtra 5.21)—encapsulates such interdependence and mutual dignity (Wisdom Library, *Tattvārtha* 5.21) and is inscribed as a central principle of Jain identity (see "Parasparopagraho Jīvānām," Wikipedia).

Ahiṃsā in Hinduism: Contextual Non-violence within Dharma

In Hindu thought, *ahiṃsā* also holds a revered place, though interpreted within the broader context of *dharma* (moral-cosmic order). For example, *Manusmṛti* (10.63) includes *ahiṃsā* among the five eternal duties (*maha-yajñas*), while the *Mahābhārata* (13.117.37) states: *ahiṃsā paramo dharmaḥ, dharmahiṃsā tathaiva ca*—non-violence is highest duty, yet in rare cases righteous violence may be necessary.

In Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra (II.30–35), *ahiṃsā* is the first *yama*, and its perfection (*ahiṃsā-pratiṣṭhā*) results in the cessation of hostility in one's presence. Patañjali states: *ahiṃsā-pratiṣṭhāyām tat-sannidhau vaira-tyāgaḥ* (II.35), meaning when one is firmly established in non-violence, animosity vanishes around him. Here *ahiṃsā* is not mere prohibition but transformative presence.

Hindu ethics thus interpret *ahiṃsā contextually*. The *Bhagavad Gītā*, for instance, concedes that a warrior's duty may require violence—but only when done without hatred, for the sake of cosmic order, and without attachment (*niṣkāma karma*). Thus, *ahiṃsā* is redefined as freedom from malice and ego; the purity of intention, rather than mere abstinence, becomes central.

Convergence and Divergence in Ahiṃsā

Although Jain and Hindu traditions converge in viewing *ahiṃsā* as both ethical and transformative, their divergence lies in the rigidity and allowance. Jainism demands absolute non-harm, disallowing even unavoidable violence, leading to extreme asceticism. Hinduism, while upholding *ahiṃsā* as ideal, allows contextual judgment via *svadharma* (one's duty) and intentional nuance.

From the vantage of human rights, both enrich the discourse, grounding the right to life not merely in legal frameworks but in spiritual ontology. They insist that

protecting life requires the cultivation of compassion, self-restraint, and awareness of interdependence. In an era of ecological crisis and violence, *ahiṃsā* emerges not as archaic idealism but as a universal ethical imperative connecting personal conduct to planetary responsibility.

Vrata and Yama as Moral Codes of Conduct

The moral frameworks of Jainism and Hinduism rest upon foundational disciplines of restraint—*vrata* in Jainism and *yama* in Hinduism. Morality is conceived not as externally imposed rules but as voluntary self-discipline aimed at spiritual purification and social harmony. The terms *vrata* ("vow") and *yama* ("restraint, control") denote conscious acts of limitation by which an individual regulates desires, impulses, and relationships. They are the first step on the path to liberation—*mokṣa* in Jainism, *aṣṭāṅga-yoga* in Hinduism—and serve as the moral bedrock of higher spiritual practice.

The Jain Vrata: Commitments of Purity and Empathy

In Jainism, *vratas* are explicit moral vows binding both ascetics (*muni*) and laypersons (*śrāvaka*), though in different degrees of strictness. The canonical texts—*Tattvārthasūtra*, *Daśavaikālika Sūtra*, *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*—distinguish between five great vows (*mahā-vratas*) for monks and five minor vows (*aṇu-vratas*) adapted for lay life (Ratnakaraṇḍaka-Śrāvakācāra, cited in Wikipedia "Five Vows"). The five core vows are:

- *Ahiṃsā-vrata* (non-violence)
- *Satya-vrata* (truthfulness)
- *Asteya-vrata* (non-stealing)
- *Brahmacarya-vrata* (chastity)
- *Aparigraha-vrata* (non-possession)

For ascetics, these vows are absolute, demanding total abstention—even of unintentional harm, possession, sensuality. For householders, they become relative or *anu-vrata*, allowing conditional engagement in worldly life under the guiding principle of minimizing injury.

The practice of *vrata* includes both abstention from negative acts and cultivation of virtues—compassion (*dayā*), honesty (*ārjava*), contentment (*saṃtoṣa*), generosity (*dāna*), and detachment (*vairāgya*). The *vrata* thus function as a spiritual technology of self-purification, not merely social rules. They are ontological instruments: by restraining harm, they decondition karmic accumulation and progressively liberate the soul from bondage.

The Hindu Yama: Universal Moral Restraints in Yoga

In Hindu philosophy, the *yamas* constitute the first limb of *aṣṭāṅga-yoga* (Yoga Sūtra II.29–31). The five *yamas* are:

- *Ahiṃsā* (non-violence)
- *Satya* (truthfulness)
- *Asteya* (non-stealing)
- *Brahmacarya* (chastity/moderation)
- *Aparigraha* (non-possessiveness)

Patañjali labels them *mahā-vrata*, "great vows," insofar as they transcend distinctions of *jāti*, *deśa*, *kāla*, and *samaya*, making them universal ethic for all practitioners. The subsequent *niyamas* purify internal life. The *Yoga-bhāṣya* elaborates that establishing *ahiṃsā* (II.35) dissolves hostility in one's presence, and that *satya*, *asteya*, and *aparigraha* lead to those virtues and insights (II.35–39).

In this yogic context, the *yamas* are psychological disciplines—they train the practitioner to subdue ego (*ahaṃkāra*) and harmonize relations. *Satya-pratiṣṭhāyām kriyā-phalāśrayatvam* (II.36) implies that when truthfulness is established, the universe cooperates, and actions align with outcomes.

Comparative Reflection: Structure and Emphasis

The structural parallelism between Jain *vrata* and Hindu *yama* is clear: they share the same five moral restraints in the same order. This convergence reflects a shared Indic ethical vocabulary shaped across centuries of philosophical exchange.

Yet beneath structural similarity lie differences of emphasis:

- Absolutism vs. contextual flexibility: Jainism demands absolute observance; Hinduism allows for judgment according to one's *svadharma* and context.
- Renunciation vs. integration: Jain *vrata* often lead to withdrawal from worldly life; Hindu *yama* are steps toward inner freedom while living in society.
- Metaphysical grounding: Jain *vrata* operate within a dualistic karma framework; Hindu *yama* support non-dual awareness and integration with *ṛta*.

Nonetheless, both systems view ethical restraint as essential to inner freedom and outer harmony. In human-rights language, the *vrata* and *yama* articulate a moral logic preceding juridical rights: individual self-restraint establishes a culture of respect in which rights can flourish. When the laity (in Jainism) or the householder (in Hinduism) live by these vows, their communities become more just, compassionate, and humane.

Ahiṃsā (Non-violence) and the Right to Life

Among the five ethical vows or restraints, ahiṃsā (non-violence) holds primacy. It is both the root and the crown of moral discipline. Its correspondence with the modern right to life is not merely symbolic: in both traditions, *ahiṃsā* forms the moral foundation for affirming life's dignity.

Jain Ahiṃsā: Reverence for All Life

In Jain ethics, *ahiṃsā* is the first *mahā-vrata* and the foremost *aṇu-vrata*. The *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* opens with: "All beings desire to live; none wishes to die," establishing non-harm as universal. Every living being, from the gross to the subtle, possesses a soul (*jīva*) and deserves protection. Jain ascetics practice *apramāda*, scrupulously avoiding harm—from stepping too firmly to swallowing insects in water.

The Jain metaphysical doctrine posits that harm binds karmic particles to the soul, inhibiting its spiritual ascent. Thus, *ahiṃsā* is both a social ethics and a path of self-purification. In sum, Jain non-violence is absolute, comprehensive, and sacramental.

From a human-rights perspective, this non-violence aligns with the right to life, liberty, and security (UDHR Art. 3). But Jainism extends it beyond human beings, giving it an ecological and interspecies dimension often absent in rights discourse.

Hindu Ahiṃsā: Non-violence with Moral Nuance

In Hinduism, *ahiṃsā* also enjoys primacy, yet is balanced by *dharma*. While texts like *Manusmṛti* declare *ahiṃsā* an eternal duty, they recognize scenarios where violence may be necessary (e.g. *dharma-yuddha*). The *Bhagavad Gītā* allows a warrior's duty (when performed without ego and attachment) as morally permissible violence.

Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra (II.30–35) treats *ahiṃsā* as the first yama and asserts that establishing it dissolves hostility in one's proximity. The ideal is that non-violence radiates outward: the yogin becomes a source of peace.

Hence, Hinduism places non-violence on a gradient of intention, context, and duty rather than as an absolute ban. This flexibility may better accommodate real-world dilemmas.

From Vow to Right: Ethical Deepening of Life

In both traditions, *ahiṃsā* provides moral justification for protecting life—not merely as an external legal norm but as an internal imperative. The Jain vow demands scrupulous avoidance of harm, the Hindu restraint invites responsibility without rigidity. Both expand the modern right to life by infusing it with spiritual depth: life is not an entitlement but a sacred trust.

In a world plagued by war, violence, and ecological degradation, *ahiṃsā* challenges us to see rights not only as protections but as invitations to transformation.

Satya (Truthfulness) and the Right to Dignity and Expression

If *ahiṃsā* safeguards life, *satya* (truthfulness) preserves the integrity of speech, relationships, and social trust. Both Jain and Hindu traditions understand *satya* not as raw factual assertion but as veracity in harmony—truth spoken in kindness, avoiding harm to others. This understanding corresponds meaningfully to the modern values of dignity and free expression.

Jain Satya: Truth as Non-injury in Speech

In Jainism, *satya-vrata* is the second *mahā-vrata*. The *Tattvārthasūtra* (7.8) defines truth as that which is not false and does not cause harm. A false statement injures by distorting reality and harming reputation. The *Daśavaikālika Sūtra* enjoins: "Speak only what is true, pleasing, and beneficial." Hence, Jain speech ethics demand that truth should also be harmless (ahiṃsika-vāc).

Silence (*mauna*) is sometimes preferred to speech that might harm. Monastics practice *bhāṣā-saṃyama*, restraining exaggerated or divisive speech. Even lay adherents are encouraged to reflect deeply before speaking. In Jain ethics, *satya* is not independent but embedded in non-violence.

This ethic aligns with UDHR Article 19 (freedom of opinion and expression) and Article 12 (protection of honor and reputation). However, the Jain principle places a moral restraint on speech: words carry power and must be used responsibly.

Hindu Satya: The Harmony of Word, Mind, and Deed

In Hindu thought, *satya* is often equated with the cosmic order *ṛta*. The *Ṛg Veda* urges: *satyaṃ vadata, dharmaṃ cara* (speak truth, do what is right). In the *Mahābhārata*, *satya* is defined as speech that is truthful *and not harsh*. Thus, truth must be tempered with compassion and prudence.

In Yoga Sūtra (II.30–36), *satya* is the second *yama*. The sutra claims: *satya-pratiṣṭhāyāṃ kriyā-phalāśrayatvam*, meaning that once truthfulness is established, acts and their fruits depend upon it. Truth becomes a performative alignment with cosmic harmony.

In the *dharma-śāstras*, kings and judges are admonished to govern with truthfulness (*satyena rājyam dhārayet*), reinforcing social accountability. Thus, Hindu ethics see *satya* as foundational to justice, reputation, and communal integrity.

5.3 Truth, Rights, and Dignity

From a human-rights perspective, *satya* supports two interconnected values: dignity and expression. Speaking truth affirms one's own dignity and the dignity of the listener; hearing truth respects another's personhood. A culture of deceit erodes dignity; a culture of truthful compassion builds it.

Where rights discourse ensures freedom to speak, *satya* insists that speech must be ethical and disciplined. It shifts free expression from license to responsible speech.

Thus, *satya* bridges the right to express and the moral duty to speak rightly—an essential correction to rhetoric that disallows accountability and trust.

Asteya (Non-stealing) and the Right to Property and Justice

The third shared principle in Jain and Hindu ethics is asteya—non-stealing. This vow restrains appropriation of what rightfully belongs to others, extending beyond physical theft to include exploitation, misrepresentation, and corruption. Both traditions view *asteya* as indispensable to social trust and justice. It aligns directly with modern property rights and the broader principle of justice.

Jain Asteya: Respecting All Domains of Ownership

In Jainism, *asteya-vrata* is the third great vow. The *Tattvārthasūtra* (7.10) defines it as renouncing taking anything not given. This includes tangible goods as well as intellectual credit, praise, or proprietary influence. The *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* describes stealing as a form of violence (since it causes suffering and fear).

Ascetics receive sustenance through voluntary offerings (*bhikṣā*) and avoid all accumulation. Even unintentional appropriation (accepting more than needed) is discouraged. Householders practicing the *aṇu-vrata* version must ensure honest commerce, fair wage, and avoidance of corruption.

In the Jain worldview, exploitation, envy, and manipulation are subtle thefts—they usurp another's rightful domain. Observing *asteya* purifies intention and fosters contentment (*saṃtoṣa*) and self-sufficiency (*ātma-paryāpti*).

This aligns with UDHR Article 17 (right to own property) and Article 10 (right to equal hearing). Jain ethics transform property rights into reciprocal moral

responsibility: one may hold property only insofar as one does not infringe others' rights.

Hindu Asteya: Fairness, Trust, and Social Equity

In the Hindu context, *asteya* appears as the third *yama* in the Yoga Sūtra (II.30). The *Yoga-bhāṣya* defines it as refraining from taking what is not given, and overcoming covetousness. The sutras claim: *asteya-pratiṣṭhāyāṃ sarva-ratna-upasthānam* (II.37), meaning when one is firmly rooted in non-stealing, all treasures naturally present themselves—a psychological insight into inner sufficiency.

Dharma texts like *Manusmṛti* and *Arthaśāstra* condemn theft as disorder, threatening social harmony. In Hindu ethics, worldly prosperity (*artha*) must be aligned with *dharma*—wealth is legitimate only when pursued without violation or greed. The tradition of *trusteeship* (e.g. Gandhian reinterpretation) further frames wealth as communal trust, not individual possession.

Justice, Rights, and Moral Reciprocity

In both traditions, *asteya* sustains two foundational rights: property and justice. Whereas modern systems enforce property and punish theft, Indic ethics cultivate honesty as first order virtue. The integrity of property rests not only on enforcement but on the moral disposition of the individual.

By refraining from theft, the ethical person acknowledges the dignity of ownership and the trust underlying social relations. Jain merchants and Hindu practitioners of non-covetousness model justice before courts exist.

In modern socioeconomic contexts—corruption, inequality, exploitation—*asteya* challenges the moral roots of injustice. It reminds us that legal safeguards must be supported by inner restraint, else laws will remain perpetually broken.

Brahmacarya (Celibacy or Chastity) and the Right to Family and Moral Integrity

The fourth shared principle, *brahmacarya*, is commonly rendered as "celibacy," "chastity," or more broadly, self-control over the senses. While modern interpretations often reduce it to sexual abstinence, both Jain and Hindu traditions understand *brahmacarya* as a discipline of mind, speech, and body that channels human energy toward spiritual realization. It serves personal purity and social trust. In modern human-rights terms, it resonates with the freedom to found a family (UDHR Article 16) as well as moral and bodily integrity.

Jain Brahmacarya: Vow of Purity and Discipline

In Jainism, *brahmacarya-vrata* is the fourth *mahā-vrata* and a *aṇu-vrata* for householders. The *Tattvārthasūtra* (7.12) defines it as renunciation of sexual enjoyment through body, speech, and mind. Monastics avoid all contact, adornment, and temptation. Lay followers maintain marital fidelity and restraint.

Sexual indulgence is seen as a source of attachment (*rāga*) and karmic bondage; thus, *brahmacarya* protects mental equanimity and spiritual purity. The vow also includes vigilance over thought and conversation, not merely physical acts.

In human-rights discourse, Jain *brahmacarya* upholds moral integrity and cultivates healthy, consensual relationships. The lay adaptation affirms the right to family life bound by respect and self-discipline.

Hindu Brahmacarya: Self-control and Sacred Partnership

In Hinduism, *brahmacarya* appears as the fourth *yama* in Yoga Sūtra (II.30–38). The Sutra (II.38) asserts: *brahmacarya-pratiṣṭhāyām vīrya-lābhaḥ*—when one is established in chastity, spiritual vigor arises.

Beyond the monastic ideal, Hindu tradition incorporates *brahmacarya* into the *āśrama* system: *brahmacarya-āśrama* (student stage) emphasizes celibacy, study, service and character formation. Later in married life (*gṛhastha*), *brahmacarya* becomes fidelity and moderation, turning sexual life into a sacred partnership.

Vedic and Upaniṣadic texts reframe *brahmacarya* not as suppression but mastery of energy. The *Gītā* (2.47, 2.71) instructs action without attachment, while *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* states: *mā gṛdhaḥ kasyasvid dhanam*—"Covet not others' wealth." The ethic extends to relationships: fidelity, respect, and balance.

Integrity, Family, and Autonomy

In contemporary terms, *brahmacarya* reinforces the right to family life and personal integrity. When interpreted consensually, chastity becomes respect for autonomy, dignity, and mutual commitment. The Jain and Hindu codes thus validate the social institution of marriage while guarding against exploitation, coercion, and transgression.

By cultivating temperance, these traditions show that freedom in intimacy must be coupled with restraint and respect. The result is not repression but balance—promoting intimacy grounded in moral maturity.

Aparigraha (Non-possessiveness) and the Right to Equality and Economic Justice

The fifth and final vow/restraint is aparigraha—non-possession, non-acquisitiveness, or freedom from greed. Etymologically, the root *grah* ("to grab") with *a-* yields *not grasping*. In both Jain and Hindu traditions, *aparigraha* completes the ethical progression: from external non-violence to internal freedom from craving. As social virtue, it fosters equality, sharing, and sustainability; as spiritual discipline, it points toward detachment. In modern human-rights frameworks, *aparigraha* resonates with the right to equality, social security, and adequate standard of living (UDHR Articles 22–25).

Jain Aparigraha: Detachment as Liberation

In Jainism, *aparigraha-vrata* is the fifth *mahā-vrata*. The *Tattvārthasūtra* (7.13) defines it as renouncing attachment to external and internal possessions. External possessions include wealth, social status; internal ones include pride, greed, and craving.

The *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* counsels that attachment roots karmic bondage; renunciation loosens it. Monastics possess nothing—even garb in the case of *Digambara* tradition. Householders practice moderation—retaining only necessary possessions and donating surplus. Society is thus protected from extreme accumulation.

Observance of *aparigraha* includes mental practices: verse 7.8 of *Tattvārthasūtra* describes giving up attachment (*rāga*) and aversion (*dveṣa*) toward agreeable and disagreeable sense objects (ṣaṇkha,

manojñāmanojñendriyaviṣayarāgadveṣavarjanāni) (WisdomLibrary, *Tattvārtha* 7.8). This internal dimension is integral to the vow.

In human-rights perspective, *aparigraha* supports economic equality and social justice by opposing hoarding and promoting equitable distribution. The presence of moral limits on possession amplifies rights to social welfare.

Hindu Aparigraha: Freedom through Detachment

In Hinduism, *aparigraha* is the fifth *yama* in Yoga Sūtra II.30–39. The sutra (II.39) says: *aparigraha-sthairye janma-kathantā-saṃbodhaḥ*—when firmly established in non-possessiveness, one gains insight into the causes of one's birth.

Hindu ethics consistently emphasize that material wealth must be held as a trust, not dominion. The *Gītā* teaches *niskāmakarma*—action without attachment to results. The *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* states: *mā gṛdhaḥ kasyasvid dhanam*—"covet not what belongs to another."

Thus, *aparigraha* is not world-renouncing as much as world-engaging with balance. It supports *dharma* by reducing greed and promoting generosity (*dāna*).

Equality, Justice, and Shared Prosperity

The vow of *aparigraha* reinforces two essential human-rights values: equality and fair distribution. While modern systems rely on regulations and redistribution, *aparigraha* offers an internal corrective—restraint in consumption so as not to deprive others.

In an age of globalization and resource depletion, *aparigraha* demands the moral suchness of sufficiency over excess. It invites societies to address inequality not merely by law but by cultivating moderation.

Thus, non-possession helps fulfill rights to social security, proper standard of living, and economic justice—anchoring them in spiritual and ethical awareness.

Convergence with Human Rights Principles

The moral frameworks of Jainism and Hinduism, via *vrata* and *yama*, converge impressively with modern human-rights principles. Though centuries apart, they share the aim of sustaining life, dignity, and justice. While rights discourse emphasizes external guarantees, Indic traditions emphasize inner cultivation of virtue as the foundation of social harmony. Thus, the *vrata* and *yama* codes complement juridical norms by adding moral depth.

From Duty to Right: Ethical Foundations of Justice

Human-rights theory typically begins by asserting that all humans are born free and equal in dignity and rights. Jain and Hindu traditions begin instead with moral duty (*dharma*). In the Jain worldview, observance of *ahiṃsā*, *satya*, *asteya*, *brahmacarya*, *aparigraha* ensures one does not infringe others' rights. The Jain principle *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (Tattvārtha 5.21) captures the intricate interdependence that underlies modern solidarity.

Hinduism's five *yamas* embody *sanātana dharma*—universal moral law—and correspond to the *mahā-dharma* of truth, compassion, forgiveness, generosity, and self-control found in the *Mahābhārata*. The ideal of *sarva-bhūta-hita* (welfare of all beings) parallels the global rights ideal of equality and justice.

While rights discourse protects individuals from violation, Indic ethics seek to transform individuals into moral agents incapable of violation. In so doing, they address injustice's root causes: greed, anger, ignorance, and attachment—realms no court can fully reach.

Shared Moral Values and Ethical Parallels

Despite different idioms, *vrata*/*yama* and the UDHR converge on central moral values:

- *Ahiṃsā* → Right to life and security (UDHR Art. 3)
- *Satya* → Right to dignity and truth (Arts. 12, 19)
- *Asteya* → Right to property and fairness (Arts. 10, 17)
- *Brahmacarya* → Right to family and integrity (Art. 16)
- *Aparigraha* → Right to equality and social welfare (Arts. 22–25)

These parallels reflect that Indic moral systems prefigure rights, though they express them in the language of duty rather than entitlement.

Both systems also emphasize moral unity: violating one virtue imperils others—violence undermines truth, greed erodes justice, disregard corrupts dignity. The integrity of the *vrata* and *yama* parallels the indivisibility of human rights.

Complementarity, Not Equivalence

However, the *vrata* and *yama* are not identical to human rights in the political-legal sense. Their foundation is metaphysical and soteriological, not contractual. Rights emerge from secular rationality; *vrata* emerge from spiritual insight. But their complementarity is profound: rights without virtue become instrumental; virtue without rights lacks institutional force.

Indic moral philosophy thus offers a corrective to human-rights discourse: by emphasizing duties over entitlements, it tempers the inflation of rights into egoistic claims. It also offers non-anthropocentric ethics, extending moral concern to animals and nature—anticipating modern movements for environmental and animal rights.

Global Relevance and Ethical Universality

In a world beset by ecological collapse, inequality, and fragmentation, Jain and Hindu ethics offer moral resources. *Aparigraha* counters consumerism; *ahiṃsā* resists structural violence; *satya* confronts misinformation; *asteya* combats corruption; *brahmacarya* restores relational dignity. Together, they propose a moral architecture of peace.

Meanwhile, human-rights instruments provide the institutional scaffolding for protecting these virtues. Rights and moral discipline operate on different planes but serve a common purpose: building a world where justice is not only proclaimed, but lived through virtue.

This synergy gestures toward spiritual humanism: a vision of humanity not as claimants but as beings bound by reciprocal responsibility. Rights become the

expressions of duty; duty becomes the grounding of rights. In Gandhi's words, "The true source of rights is duty. If we all discharge our duties, rights will not be far to seek."

Divergences and Challenges

While the affinities between Jain–Hindu ethics and human rights are many, significant divergences and challenges must be acknowledged. These arise from differences in foundation, orientation, and application. Human rights is secular, legalistic, and universal; Jain–Hindu ethics is spiritual, internal, and contextual. Understanding these tensions clarifies the difficulties of translating ancient spiritual ideals into modern socio-political frames.

Metaphysical vs. Secular Basis

Modern human rights are grounded in the assumption of inherent human dignity, independent of religion or metaphysics. The individual is a rational autonomous agent whose rights are protected by contract and law. By contrast, Jain and Hindu ethics rest on a metaphysical vision of the self: the *jīva* in Jainism and *ātman* in Hinduism, each bound to *saṃsāra* until liberated by discipline.

In Jainism, restraint (*saṃyama*) is required to avoid karmic bond; in Hinduism, it preserves harmony with cosmic order (*ṛta*) and reveals the divine Self. Thus, moral duties are instrumental to spiritual ends, not social contract. The challenge lies in reconciling transcendental moral vision with secular legal universality.

Absolutism vs. Contextualism

Another divergence lies in rigidity versus flexibility. Jainism tends toward moral absolutism—acts like harm or lying are always wrong. Hinduism allows contextual nuance, through *svadharma*, *niṣkāma karma*, and intention. The *Bhagavad Gītā* permits righteous violence, while Jainism prohibits all harm.

The absolutist ethic safeguards purity but risks impracticality. The contextual ethic handles complexity but risks moral relativism. In rights discourse, this tension challenges the formulation of universal moral norms compatible with plural contexts.

Renunciation vs. Social Engagement

Another challenge concerns spiritual withdrawal vs. civic responsibility. Jain monastic ethics idealize withdrawal from worldly spheres to avoid harm and attachment. Social engagement is secondary. In contrast, Hinduism—through *karma-yoga* and *lokasaṅgraha*—encourages active participation while maintaining inner detachment.

Modern human rights require collective action and public institutions. Reconciling the ideal of renunciation with social activism demands reinterpretation: treat *aṇu-vrata* (lay vows) or *gṛhastha-dharma* as models of engaged spirituality without attachment.

Historical Hierarchy, Gender, and Exclusion

A more difficult divergence arises from historical social structures. While *vrata*/*yama* are theoretically universal, their practice historically occurred within caste, gender, and ritual hierarchies. Women or lower castes often faced restricted access to scriptural learning or ascetic roles.

Modern human rights demand equality and nondiscrimination (UDHR Articles 1 and 7). Contemporary Jain and Hindu thinkers have gradually reinterpreted traditions to include women ascetics (*āryikā*, *sādhvī*) and women yoginīs/gurus. But fully harmonizing spiritual universalism with egalitarian social ethics remains ongoing work.

Anthropocentrism vs. Universal Compassion

Another divergence concerns the moral boundary. Jain–Hindu ethics extend concern to animals, plants, and micro-organisms. Rights discourse remains anthropocentric. While this universal compassion anticipates environmental/animal rights, it complicates pragmatic human prioritization.

For instance, Jain vows may forbid certain medical or agricultural practices. Hindu *ahiṃsā* must be balanced with *dharma* when harm is unavoidable. The challenge is to articulate a hierarchy of compassion that preserves reverence for life without paralyzing ethical action.

Institutional vs. Individual Enforcement

Modern rights rely on institutions: constitutions, courts, enforcement mechanisms. Jain–Hindu ethics rely on personal discipline, supported by community norms. Law ensures universality externally; conscience ensures authenticity internally. But both face limits: law without virtue becomes mechanical; virtue without law lacks reach.

The challenge is to synthesize: build institutions that reflect moral consciousness and cultivate conscience that respects institutional norms. The Indic concept of *dharma* may help fuse external order with internal responsibility.

Evolving Dialogue and Cross-Cultural Ethic

These divergences should not be seen primarily as obstacles but as creative tensions enabling dialogue between civilizations. The Indic emphasis on restraint and spiritual transformation can deepen modern rights' ethical grounding, while human-rights discourse can widen the social reach of Indic ethics.

Modern reinterpretations—Gandhian *satyagraha*, *sarvodaya*, trusteeship—demonstrate that traditions can evolve responsively. The task is not to impose one model on another but to cultivate cross-cultural universals, grounded in shared human experience: compassion, justice, and dignity.

Contemporary Relevance and Application

The moral systems of Jain and Hindu ethics—through *vrata* and *yama*—remain strikingly relevant in addressing contemporary moral, social, and environmental crises. Far from being relics of ascetic culture, these ancient vows offer timeless principles that can guide individuals, institutions, and societies toward sustainable peace, justice, and human dignity. Their integration into human-rights discourse deepens the moral fabric, balancing freedom with restraint, progress with compassion, and rights with responsibility.

Moral Renewal in an Era of Ethical Fatigue

In the modern age, many speak of ethical despair—a gap between moral knowledge and action. Technological amplitude, consumerism, and individualism erode moral accountability. The Jain and Hindu emphasis on self-discipline (saṃyama) and non-violence (ahiṃsā) offers

an antidote. These traditions teach that freedom is not license but mastery; justice begins within before it radiates outward.

Jain *ahiṃsā* trains awareness toward structural and subtle violence; Hindu *satya* guards against misinformation and polarization. By reinterpreting these virtues as global citizenship habits, societies can recover moral coherence in public life.

Economic Ethics and Social Justice

Modern economies, driven by maximized consumption, are riddled with inequality and environmental degradation. The vow of *aparigraha* (non-possession) grounds ethical economics, promoting moderation, equitable distribution, and sustainability. *Asteya* (non-stealing) addresses corruption and unjust enrichment. Together, they provide spiritual foundations for social policy and corporate responsibility.

Gandhi's trusteeship reflects this synthesis: wealth is held as a trust for society. By embedding *vrata* ethics into economic institutions, one can align development with moral purpose.

Gender Equity, Intimacy, and Consent

The principle of *brahmacarya*, when reinterpreted consensually, becomes central to navigating sexuality, gender equity, and bodily integrity. Chastity is reframed as a respect for autonomy, dignity, and mutual commitment. Indic traditions thus support modern rights to marriage, bodily autonomy, and consent when liberated from oppressive patriarchy.

By combining discipline and equality, these traditions invite holistic moral education in sexuality, emotional maturity, and relational integrity.

Nonviolence, Conflict Resolution, and Peace Studies

In contexts of conflict and injustice, *ahiṃsā* is more relevant than ever. From inter-communal tensions to environmental violence, the world needs strategies that integrate moral and psychological transformation. The Gandhian model of *satyagraha* operationalized ancient *vrata–yama* ethics in modern political action—non-violent protest, self-purification, constructive work.

In peace education and human-rights activism, *ahiṃsā* offers both principle and method—inner discipline fueling nonviolent responses to injustice.

Environmental Stewardship and Ecological Ethics

Facing ecological crisis, Jain and Hindu traditions offer unmatched moral resources. Jain doctrine *parasparopagraho jīvānām* (all living beings support one another), and the Upaniṣadic insight *īśāvāsyam idam sarvaṃ* (the divine pervades all), present a non-anthropocentric worldview. The vows of *ahiṃsā* guard life; *aparigraha* limits consumption; *asteya* forbids exploitative extraction.

These principles can inform climate ethics, environmental law, and sustainability education—transforming environmental justice from policy to spiritual responsibility.

Education for Moral Literacy and Global Citizenship

One promising application is in human-rights education. The *vrata–yama* framework can provide a cross-cultural moral foundation—teaching emotional intelligence, conflict resolution, and ethical awareness. Institutions (schools, NGOs, universities) can embed *ahiṃsā*, *satya*, *asteya*, *brahmacarya*, *aparigraha* as living practices.

Such moral literacy transforms rights from external norms to internal disciplines. It aligns with the UN's call for "education for global citizenship," bridging the Indic spiritual ethos with 21st-century civic aims.

From Personal Transformation to Global Renewal

The enduring power of *vrata* lies in its scalability: beginning in individual transformation, extending outward to societal change. Each vow is both personal discipline and social principle: life, truth, justice, integrity, equality. Together, they constitute a moral ecology supporting human flourishing, community harmony, and ecological balance.

When rights are grounded in inner virtue, societies shift from culture of entitlement to culture of responsibility; from competitive exploitation to cooperative coexistence.

Recontextualizing Ancient Wisdom for the Future

Applying Jain and Hindu ethics today is not about revivalism but recontextualization. Their moral values must be translated—not transplanted—into modern life, respecting pluralism, human rights, and equality. Freed from dogmatic rigidity, the *vrata–yama* traditions emerge as living moral languages guiding the human future.

As the ancient adage states, *ahiṃsā paramo dharmaḥ*. But non-violence, truth, humility, chastity, and non-possession are not only religious ideals—they are ethical imperatives for our shared future. Their meaningful integration into human-rights praxis ensures that justice is not only institutional, but embodied, grounded in conscience, sustained by compassion, and lived through restraint.

Conclusion

The moral systems of Jainism and Hinduism, expressed through the five *vratas* and *yamas*, reveal an ethical architecture deeply consonant with the modern human-rights agenda. Though their origins lie in spiritual metaphysics rather than secular jurisprudence, both traditions converge on a shared vision: that sustaining life, dignity, and justice requires not only external rights but internal discipline. Where the UDHR emphasizes protection, Indic traditions emphasize formation.

The fivefold framework—*ahiṃsā*, *satya*, *asteya*, *brahmacarya*, *aparigraha*—constitutes more than moral counsel. These virtues correspond to rights: to life, dignity, property, integrity, equality. But more profoundly, they cultivate the moral agent capable of living by rights, rather than merely claiming them.

The deepest gift of these traditions is their insistence on duties as the ground of rights. They invert the standard paradigm: rights culminate where self-restraint begins. The stability of social justice thus hinges on inner maturity. Without self-discipline, rights devolve into egoistic claims; without rights, virtue may remain isolated.

In the contemporary world—scarred by violence, inequality, and environmental collapse—the *vrata–yama* ethos offers a moral compass. Their focus on restraint tempers excess; their reverence for life counters exploitation; their commitment to truth resists deception; and their demand for moderation challenges

consumerism. These principles point toward a spiritual humanism capable of renewing global ethics.

A shared moral horizon emerges: rights and responsibilities, external law and internal conscience, spiritual insight and civic order. The vow (*vrata*) and the right (*adhikāra*) are complementary—not opposed; one inward, one outward; one formative, one protective.

In this synthesis lies a hopeful possibility for global ethics—one in which dignity is not only defended by law, but cultivated by virtue; where freedom is not license but disciplined maturity; and where humanity honors that which makes rights meaningful: *compassion, truth, equality,* and the sacredness of life.

May the traditions of *vrata* and *yama*, when reinterpreted for our age, contribute to a world where justice is not only proclaimed but embodied—in hearts, institutions, and lives.

Acknowledgments

This research was carried out as part of the author's doctoral work in the Department of Nonviolence and Peace, Jain Vishva Bharati Institute (JVBI), Ladnun, Rajasthan, during his tenure as an ICSSR Doctoral Fellow (2023–2025). The author gratefully acknowledges the financial support provided by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi.

References

- Ācārāṅga Sūtra, *Chapter 1.4.1*.
- Patañjali. *Yoga Sūtra*, II.30–39.
- Umasvāti. *Tattvārthasūtra*, ch. 7 (e.g., verses 7.8, 7.10, 7.13).
- "The observances for the vow of non-attachment (aparigraha)" (Tattvārthasūtra 7.8) (WisdomLibrary).
- "Parasparopagraho Jīvānām," *Tattvārthasūtra* 5.21 (WisdomLibrary / Wikipedia).
- Schmidt-Leukel, P. *Buddhism and the Idea of Human Rights.* (PDF).
- Damien Keown, *Buddhism and Human Rights* (Routledge).
- Schmidt-Leukel, P. "Buddhism and the Idea of Human Rights," in *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*.
- "Tattvartha Sutra (with commentary)," Wisdom Library online.
- Jain, Vijay K. (ed.). *Tattvārthasūtra with Commentary*.
- "Introduction to Tattvartha-sutra," JainWorld.
- "Modern Jainism Defined," Arihant Institute.
- Wikipedia: "Five Vows," "Umaswati," "Sarvārthasiddhi," "Parasparopagraho Jīvānām".
- LibreTexts: "Jainism: Aparigraha and non-attachment."
- Scholarly articles and anthologies on Buddhist precepts and human rights contexts (e.g. Keown)