

# **PROUT Primer**



**Acarya Abhidevananda Avadhuta**

**PROUT Primer**

by Acarya Abhidevananda Avadhuta

Originally published as **PROUT Manifesto**

Copyright © 1978. All rights reserved by the author.

*With grateful appreciation to Shrii P. R. Sarkar for His tremendous inspiration, which alone made possible the writing of this book.*

**Dedicated to those who suffer social injustice**

## Preface

This book attempts to present the essential principles of PROUT in a concise and easily understood form. The **PROUT Primer** does not seek to offer a rigorous intellectual proof of PROUT, nor does it strive for a comparative analysis in any regard. Most of the ideas presented are almost inexcusably brief in their exposition. Much has been hinted at, and much more has been left unsaid. For all of this, an apology might well be offered, but rather let me say simply that other books and greater scholars will surely provide that which I have neglected or chosen not to do.

As this book is the effort of one other than the living propounder of PROUT, it is well-conceivable that there are some errors contained herein. If this book be read with an open mind and a loving heart, then no doubt the spirit of PROUT will be grasped and any mistakes on the part of the author will be exposed and corrected. It is my sincere hope that this book will serve the basic purpose for which it was written – to provide an answer to the vital question: “What is PROUT?”

Acarya Abhidevananda Avadhuta  
June 1978



## Contents

|   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| Article 1.  | The Nature of Human Society .....      | 1  |
| 1.1   | Introduction .....                     | 1  |
| 1.2   | The Social Contract .....              | 1  |
| 1.3   | The Motivity of the Social Cycle ..... | 4  |
| 1.4   | Regulating the Motivity.....           | 8  |
| Article 2.  | The Need for Revolution .....          | 10 |
| 2.1   | Introduction .....                     | 10 |
| 2.2   | Revolution versus Reform .....         | 11 |
| 2.3   | Harmlessness versus Nonviolence .....  | 14 |
| 2.4   | Revolutionary Morality .....           | 15 |
| Article 3.  | The Social Ideal .....                 | 16 |
| 3.1   | Introduction .....                     | 16 |
| 3.2   | Sadvipra Society .....                 | 16 |
| 3.3   | Rotating the Social Cycle .....        | 19 |
| 3.4   | Establishing a World Government .....  | 22 |
| Article 4.  | The Five Fundamental Principles .....  | 24 |
| 4.1   | Introduction .....                     | 24 |
| 4.2   | A New Socioeconomic Theory .....       | 25 |
| 4.3   | The Principles Elaborated .....        | 25 |
| Principle 1 (Social Ethics) .....                 | 26                                     |    |
| Principle 2 (Economics).....                      | 27                                     |    |
| Principle 3 (Education, Relief, and Welfare)..... | 29                                     |    |
| Principle 4 (Administration) .....                | 31                                     |    |
| Principle 5 (Social Metaphysics) .....            | 34                                     |    |
| 4.4   | The Challenge.....                     | 36 |



# Article 1. The Nature of Human Society

## 1.1 Introduction

Human society is but one universal family. Until and unless humankind realizes this vital truth, we will remain entrenched in pointless sectarian clashes that impede the progressive march of society. Those who seek always to divide humanity into various castes or creeds or other obvious groupings tear asunder our world family, often in pursuit of their selfish interests.

Some Communists who divide the world into two classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, encourage the annihilation of the former class. But the truth is that the so-called bourgeoisie have certain skills beneficial to society as a whole and hence it in no way serves our interest to eliminate them. In one family, a particular brother might have skills as a farmer and another as a businessman. The farmer will never think to destroy the businessman, because they are part of the same family and when they work cooperatively it is surely to the greater benefit of that family.

Nazism teaches that the Jews are an inferior race, and in South Africa the present government<sup>1</sup> treats the Blacks as an inferior race. Not so long ago the British kept all of India in bondage, and by their imperialistic blindness they convinced themselves that Indians as a rule are nothing but godless savages. All of these concepts have now been exposed as false. History bears testimony to the great contributions made by the Jews, the Blacks, and the Indians. Hence, how then can we dream of benefiting humanity by the suppression of any race? These racial differences are nothing but different colors that lend a greater beauty to this world when we see humanity standing united.

The exact same argument applies when we look at the suppression of women on the basis of their gender. On every level of existence, women have contributed much in the past, they are contributing much in the present, and they will surely contribute even more in the future.

Similar observations may be made regarding the foolishness of inter-religious and inter-national strife.

No human being is the enemy of society. Our enemy is the divisive sentiment that gives rise to the tendency for selfish exploitation of others at the expense of the collective welfare. Human society is like a vast multicolored bouquet of flowers. Each flower has its distinctive fragrance and beauty. When we come close together and intermingle, the resulting bouquet is truly magnificent.

## 1.2 The Social Contract

Society is not a static entity. Rather, it is always in motion. Hence, we must understand society's motivity so that this motivity may always be adjusted or regulated for the greatest welfare and happiness of all. Accordingly, we have two questions that demand our attention:

- What is the system of motivity of society?
- How can this motivity be controlled for the greatest benefit of humankind as a whole?

Taking the first question, let us consider the basic concerns of society. When examining the individual human being, we find three sides to his or her existence: *physical*, *mental*, and *spiritual*. The physical and mental sides are generally well understood already. By "spiritual", what is meant is the pursuit of infinite happiness through a process of expanding the mind. For this purpose one requires the deep realization of unity or oneness of all things – the feeling of all in one and one in

---

<sup>1</sup> This was written in 1978, when apartheid was still rampant in South Africa.

all. Such a state of awareness is possible for the individual but not for society at large. Society is the aggregate of countless diverse individuals, and its *raison d'être* is to serve the differing needs and to utilize the differing capabilities of those individuals. Towards this end, society may advance collectively in the physical and the psychic realm; but with regard to spirituality, although society may encourage everyone for spiritual pursuit, still it is hardly conceivable that society as a whole can enter into the spiritual realm. Even in its highest condition, society can never sufficiently transcend the dualistic outlook resulting from immense diversity in order to realize a sense of oneness.

Due to the aforementioned diversity of constituents, total sameness is never possible or even desirable for society. This is why justice, not equality, is the ideal for social administration. (The principles whereby this socioeconomic justice is achieved are known as the Five Fundamental Principles of PROUT, listed at the end of this article and elucidated in Article 4 “The Five Fundamental Principles”.) Thus, the acme of social development is found not in the spiritual sphere but in the psychic sphere as society strives to achieve a state of benign cosmic harmony based on a sense of familial love.

Accepting that spirituality must ever remain an individual attribute and not a social practice, what then is the true function of society? In answer, we may observe that society starts from a point of primitive moralism or basic attempts to properly regulate the various socioeconomic interrelationships and then proceeds towards an ultimate condition of universalism (or universal humanism)<sup>2</sup>. This we may call social progress. The true function of society then is to provide a congenial environment for physical and psychic development of the collectivity while simultaneously encouraging all human beings to reach for divinity. (It is crucial to note here that a spiritual aspirant need never shirk any of his or her social responsibilities; rather, to do so would be contrary to the highest ideals of spirituality.)

From this viewpoint, it is clear that society effectively performs only two specific services on behalf of the entire collectivity. The first service is basically related to the maintenance of the physical existence of the individuals, whereas the second service is essentially related to their mental development. In the physical sphere, law, economics, and various sciences exist to ensure that everyone has sufficient food, clothing, shelter, medical facilities, and basic education to survive and to grow. In the mental sphere, efforts are made for the expansion of the collective mind.

Looking closer at the physical sphere, the concepts of food, clothing, and medical facilities are self-explanatory, although (as with all of the five basic physical requirements mentioned above) the nature and amount of these will surely vary with regard to changes in time, space, and form.

Under the concept of shelter, this is not just a question of housing. It is also assumed that society has the requisite physical force to give some reasonable assurance of safety or security to its citizens so that they may carry on a relatively peaceful coexistence.

With regard to education as a basic social obligation, here our concern is with the provision of some minimum level of education to everyone. The minimum level certainly will vary also with regard to changes in time, space, and form; but mostly what is meant is a general understanding of the ways and means of functioning in one's environment – for example: how to catch a city bus, what is the currency system in one's own country; how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide; how to drive a car; what are the various social responsibilities peculiar to one's own country; and so on. Here, we must also stress literacy, moral education, and socioeconomic (including political)

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1981, the propounder of PROUT, Shrii P. R. Sarkar, amplified the concepts of universal humanism under the name of *neohumanism*. For more information, see *The Liberation of Intellect – Neohumanism*.



education. Furthermore, as we incline more and more towards a global community, we must also arrange for imparting instruction in the world language and also, though less significant, the world script. (While this is, of course, subject to change in future, at present English will be the most convenient world language, and Roman script the most suitable world script.)

One final point should be made about education. Certainly we must encourage everyone towards higher education. With that in mind, we must make higher education readily available. In the absence of this provision, persons having a more developed intellectual capacity would not be mentally satisfied, and society as a whole could not benefit fully from their greater potential. However, this point of higher education must be classified as relating more to the mental development of the individuals than to their physical development, and hence this matter is not really pertinent here.

When talking about providing these minimum physical requirements to all, it should not be taken to mean a handout. Everyone will still have to work for their living by providing some social service, whatever variety it may be. However, everyone (regardless of race, creed, gender, or any other social classification) must be given the opportunity to earn these minimum requirements by working at a job or by performing any other social service that is harmonious with their interests and skills. No one should suffer want due to old age, youth, medical disability, or lack of suitable employment.

Of course, simultaneous with providing these minimum essentialities to all, appropriate amenities will have to be supplied to those having special merits, according to the degree thereof. For example, when everyone is supplied with a motorcycle, a doctor might be provided with a car. Furthermore, the doctor must also be given the various tools of his/her trade, although those having greater skill or use might receive a finer quality or more advanced type of equipment. We must also give some reward to those who work harder than the rest, as this will provide incentive to all to work harder and thus to perform a greater social service.


Hence, we see that at any given time, everyone must be guaranteed the minimum requirements of life; however, the meritorious will certainly receive greater amenities as compared to the standard of minimum necessities. Society's effort then should be always to minimize this gap by constantly trying to raise the standard of minimum necessities. So, for example, while providing a motorcycle to everyone, a car may be given to the meritorious. Then all effort must be made to provide everyone a car, and after this has been largely achieved the meritorious might be provided with airplanes. In this way, efforts for raising the minimum standard of life should go on unabated. This increase in the standard of living of the masses is the best measure of the vitality of society. It is on this endeavor that the all-round worldly prosperity and development of the human race depends.

Turning now to an examination of the mental sphere, once again society desires expansion. Here the status or progress of the collective psychology may be measured in terms of six factors: spiritual philosophy, spiritual cult, socioeconomic theory, social outlook, scriptures (including spiritual philosophy, social sciences, pure sciences, literature and art, and so on), and preceptor (the past and present legacy of heroes, teachers, and leaders – the human example of the ideal individual). The mental development of society is found in the degree of refinement of these six factors and the degree to which the individuals in society have correctly understood or implemented them. Therefore, in the mental realm, education is the *sine qua non* for social progress.

Both the physical and the mental sides of life coexist in society. They are inseparable, just like the body and mind of the human being. However, it is important to note that the progress of society occurs by a systaltic movement rather than a straight-line movement. Society is forever engaged in

maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between the two poles of its existence. In other words, society moves ahead by alternating its efforts – first in the physical sphere, then in the mental sphere, again in the physical sphere, then again in the mental sphere, and so on (see Figure 1-1).

**Figure 1-1 Social Progress**



The best analogy is the human organism. With the human being, when the body is more active, the mind becomes less active; and when the mind is more active, the body becomes less active. So when we are running, our mind becomes less capable of deep thought; and when we are in deep thought, our body becomes more still and even our breathing slows down. We can think of this social progress as a sort of two-fold process, like breathing in and breathing out. For proper respiration, we must have both the inhalation and the exhalation. For social progress, we must have movement in both the physical and the mental spheres. Human life is based on parallelism between body and mind. At some point, a greater refinement in one requires a corresponding refinement in the other. Such also is the case with society as a whole. In those countries where the basic concerns of physical existence have been largely alleviated, we also find the greatest advancement in the various sciences. On the other hand, whenever we discover a community or tribe that has been forced, due to whatever factors, to maintain itself physically on a more or less primitive level, we find that the mental growth of that tribe or community has also been stunted.

It must be pointed out that the mental sphere is ultimately of far greater significance than the physical sphere. Though development of the physical sphere ensures our survival, development of the mental sphere ensures our happiness. Human life is much more an ideological flow than a physical existence. Human history is primarily a history of advancement in the collective psychology rather than a mere conquest of the elements of nature. However, this advancement in the collective psychology can never occur without providing for a corresponding advancement on the physical plane of existence.

### 1.3 The Motivity of the Social Cycle

We are now ready to examine more closely the motivity of the social cycle. Here it is of primary importance to stress that this motivity is not only systaltic but also cyclic. Human history progresses in a natural evolution, moving from one era to another just as any individual might be said to grow up. In any given age (or rotation of the social cycle), there are four distinct eras.

In the first era, the masses are assembled and autonomous, but due to their inefficiency and immaturity of expression, there is chaos. Hence this initial era is short-lived.

To provide safety to the people and an equitable distribution of the material wealth, the warrior class takes over the administration of society. (Here and hereafter, the term *class* denotes a social grouping having similar psychic qualities. A class may or may not be distinguishable economically.)

After society attains an acceptable level of security in respect to the physical requirements, the people naturally look next to the mental side of life. Although the warrior class has the qualities of bravery and sacrifice well-expressed, their intellect is insufficiently developed to administer society during the next era. Hence, administrative control passes into the hands of the intellectual class.


Again after some time, the people grow tired of acquiring mental goods and reassert their physical wants or needs. At this stage, what the collectivity requires is a greater material wealth, which the intellectual class cannot provide. Thus administrative control passes hands one more time – this time to the capitalists, a special variety of intellectuals with a material or worldly bent to their minds.

Capitalists have the capacity to increase production and to create a more refined physical condition in society, but the crude direction of their intellect eventually tends to make them greedy, thereby overcoming whatever generous spirit that they may have had. In other words, although they have the capacity to increase material production, they lack the consistent spirit of sacrifice needed to provide an equitable distribution of wealth. As a result, the masses, though befooled for some time by the early accomplishments and the subsequent tall talk of the capitalists, eventually become more and more frustrated. In a like way, the warriors and the intellectuals also get frustrated due to the corrupt administration of these degraded and hypocritical capitalists (pseudo-capitalists), which ruthlessly exploits or abuses the talents of the warriors and intellectuals without providing a commensurate reward. At this point in history, a revolution occurs and a new age is born, with administration passing hands through the same four eras once more – first the masses, then the warriors, next the intellectuals, and finally the capitalists, culminating in the next revolution.

Here one might well ask why the administration must pass into the hands of the capitalists when their nature is ultimately to exploit. The answer is that every class performs a useful service at the appropriate time but eventually tends to exploit if it remains in power for too long. The administration of both the warriors and the capitalists focus primarily on the physical side of life, but their approach is different. With regard to economy, there are two aspects vital to the collectivity. The first is production, and the second is distribution. While the warriors have a talent for distribution, they lack the sort of worldly wisdom required for substantially increasing production. Conversely, while the capitalists have sufficient intellectual capacity for increasing production, they lack the generous spirit required for a just distribution. After the administration by the intellectual class, the people desire a higher standard of physical existence; and, in a sense, we may say that this is also necessary in order to maintain a physical parallelism with the more refined mental condition brought about by the intellectual class). The need of the day then is for a greater economic production. Should the administration of society revert to the warriors at this stage, they would not be able to satisfy the hunger of the people for long. Hence, either by force or by natural course, the administration would quickly pass again into the hands of the intellectuals or onwards into the hands of the capitalists. The capitalists definitely do increase production; and by their token gestures of distribution and their empty promises, they manage to satisfy or pacify the collectivity for a while. However, their exploitation becomes more and more rapacious as time goes on. When the discontent is sufficient, the masses wrest control of society from their hands

and soon turn over the reins of socioeconomic administration to the warriors who had led the revolution and who can arrange an equitable distribution of the increased wealth (in actual or potential form) produced by the capitalists (see Figure 1-2).

**Figure 1-2 Social Motivity**




Here another important question comes to mind. Our social cycle is composed of four eras, each era dominated by a different sociopsychic class. The question that arises is why there is no fifth class and no fifth era. To understand this, we must return to the concept given in the introduction of this article. Human society is best conceived of as one universal family. In any family we can perceive four distinct age groups that exist – infants, youth, adults, and elders. Each of these age groups differ in their potential and in their expression. With regard to infants, their potential is great, but their expression is very weak due to physical and mental immaturity. The youth provide the peak of physical development and the courage to express it in a glorious fashion. Adults have the ripeness of intellect but less physical capacity. Finally, elders tend to become introverted, turning their intellect towards the mere preservation of their physical body or else detaching themselves from worldly concerns and preparing for death.

With this understanding let us turn to an examination of society. Society is first and foremost the aggregate of all its individual citizens, but this compound entity also has its own distinct and highly significant existence. Often in nature it is found that a compound is somehow greater than the sum of its parts. This scientifically observed phenomenon is called synergy. Take the human body for instance. The physical body is composed of more than one million million cells. Most of these cells (with the notable exception of the nerve cells) have an average lifespan that is calculated in days, weeks, or months; and these cells have a very limited capacity for expression. However, the aggregate of these cells, the human body, has a lifespan averaging more than seventy years and the unpredictable ability to run, to jump, to sing, and even to procreate under suitable conditions. So also society is the aggregate of its citizens, but society's lifespan is far greater than the lifespan of its citizens, and society's potential for expression is virtually incalculable. Where one person unassisted might run the distance of a kilometer in three minutes, society races along at far greater speeds in cars and airplanes. Where one person unassisted might jump as high as two or three meters, society has already jumped to the moon by means of rocket ships. Where one person unassisted might throw his or her voice over a distance of fifty or even a hundred meters, society is sending its radio signals virtually across the universe.

In society we find the same four age categories as we find in its citizens – childhood, youth, adulthood, and old age. As we are considering an aggregate entity, all four age categories are expressed simultaneously; however, at any given time, depending on the age of the social cycle, one or another of these age groups dominates the collective psychology and hence, typically, is in the position of administrative control as well. Here it must be remembered that our concept of class is not physically based but rather mentally based. We may say that the masses are like children, the warriors like youth, the intellectuals like adults, and the capitalists like elders. In other words, the masses, like children, have great potential to learn and to be guided, but little capacity to lead. The warriors, like youth, have a great physical potential, courage, and a spirit of sacrifice, but they are still lacking in mental maturity. The intellectuals, like adults, have mental maturity and greater knowledge, but they are less physically outgoing. Finally, the capitalists, like elders, have a great store of worldly wisdom that they can share, but they are inclined to think more for themselves than the society at large as they turn their intellect increasingly towards the comfortable preservation of their own existence.

So we see that our concept of the social cycle is one of natural life progression. Just as human life proceeds from childhood to youth to adulthood to old age and finally to death, so also human society makes exactly the same journey. First the collective psychology is dominated by the masses (children), then the warriors (youth), next the intellectuals (adults), and finally the capitalists (elders). Here the concept of domination is primarily that of a subtle, psychic predominance that occurs naturally and that also manifests on the physical plane in the social arena but is not necessarily something that is blatantly obvious to the naked eye. Moreover, it might happen occasionally that the social cycle temporarily reverts to a preceding era instead of progressing, but such an unnatural condition is always short-lived. Every age in human history consists of a journey through these four eras – domination by the four sociopsychic classes – in succession. The reason why there is no fifth era, no fifth class, in our social theory is simply because death inevitably comes after old age. After the administration by the capitalists, society must die. It does so in the fire of revolution. Then out of the ashes, like the legendary phoenix, a new society is born. In this manner, humanity progresses collectively towards sublimity in an ever-ascending spiral (see Figure 1-3).

**Figure 1-3 Social Cycle**



While discussing the subject of synergy, we did not consider the question of society’s ability to procreate. Can society procreate? Clearly, society can set up new outposts of civilization. It can also *adopt* relatively primitive communities and impart to them a more advanced technology or a more refined conduct. But the real procreation occurs when an old society – having advanced

through its four eras (childhood, youth, adulthood, and old age) – undergoes a necessary revolution to facility death and subsequent rebirth. It is not easy for society to procreate successfully, but if we examine history closely we find that society definitely does procreate and moreover that society apparently has a very strong urge to do so. Therefore, let us not view society as something abstract or, even worse, lifeless. Society is a living entity, subject to the natural laws of life, death, and rebirth.


The various forces that shape society’s progressive march are the same as those that determine growth in individual life. In the same way as an individual develops through a process of physical clash, psychic clash, and attraction of the great while passing through countless incarnations, society is also impelled by the same three forces on a progressive march that passes through successive life cycles. By struggling with the elements and pitting our minds, either individually or collectively, against the tremendous dilemmas that constantly confront us, human society not only grows in stature but also strives to attain the elusive yet most attractive greatness that is the blissful ideal of social welfare – the superb stance of universalism.

### 1.4 Regulating the Motivity

Every age in the history of society consists of one rotation of the social cycle. This is the way of life and nature. At any given time, depending upon the phase of the age, the masses or the warriors or the intellectuals or the capitalists dominate a society by their administrative position. Should any of these four sociopsychic classes maintain its hold over the administration for too long, the tendency will be to become corrupt and exploitative. Instead of benefiting the collectivity, that class then does harm. Therefore, it is not advantageous to let full social control be possessed by any of these four classes.

For benevolent social control, a group of declassed personalities is required. These declassed individuals are known as sadvipras, and their social position is at the hub and at the spokes of the social cycle rather than on its periphery. Sadvipras have the good qualities of all four classes without attachment to any particular class. They are hard-working, courageous, intelligent, worldly wise, and spiritually minded. Through their personal and collective discipline, their strict moral adherence, and their intense devotion to the Supreme, sadvipras always remain united. By their vigilance and readiness to fight against any and all fissiparous forces, sadvipras are able to regulate the motivity of society by rectifying any wayward tendencies in the government or by rotating the social cycle whenever the administration by any particular sociopsychic class becomes corrupt and exploitative (see Figure 1-4).

**Figure 1-4 Sadvipra Society**



To correctly understand the concept of *sadvipra* leadership, one must note carefully that *sadvipras* do not necessarily require formal political power nor do they necessarily strive to attain it. *Sadvipras*, by their very nature, act as informal leaders wherever they might be. Jointly, all *sadvipras* in society (dispersed throughout the various walks of life) form the nucleus and the spokes of the social cycle. It is this type of dispersed nuclear control that *sadvipras* maintain for the welfare and happiness of all.

In pursuit of the social ideal of universalism, PROUT seeks to establish a *sadvipra society*. Only by that means can humanity ever see the dawn of a collective existence worthy of human intellect and ingenuity. Marching ahead, all together, towards the supreme desideratum and living in harmony as one blissful universal family – this alone can be considered the perfect paragon for human society.

## Article 2. The Need for Revolution

### 2.1 Introduction

Human life, in order to find a healthy and proper expression, always requires a congenial environment. In adverse conditions such as hunger or cold or ignorance or bondage, human intellect, not to speak of the higher human values, is often lost to view in the mad scramble for physical subsistence.

The most effective tool possessed by humankind for effectively providing the necessary congenial environment for human life is the social organism. In the same way as the human mind gets expression through the medium of the physical body, the composite human being is expressed through the social organism. Without that social body, the human body would be in jeopardy; and when the human body is in jeopardy, life itself is endangered.

Thus it becomes clear that for the healthy existence of the individual, a healthy society is required. Should society fail in any of its duties to the individual citizens, then those citizens might well become corrupt and those corrupt individuals will then pose a threat to society at large. In a tyranny, the sole reply to criminality is a ruthless and repressive police force. Though some degree of police protection is generally required to guarantee security to the innocent and peaceable citizens, this obviously is not any realistic solution to the long-term problem of crime prevention. What then can society do from a positive point of view in order to curb the inclination toward criminality?

First of all, society can, and must, guarantee to all the basic physical and psychic requirements of life. A shortage of either of these often impels or compels individuals to take up a life of crime. For example, those with insufficient food to feed themselves or their families might well conceive of no alternative but crime in order to survive. Similarly, ignorance of the law or ignorance of right and wrong might lead to criminal behavior.

On the other hand, the opposite adverse condition – that is, the non-utilization of over-accumulated physical or mental goods – also leads to crime. Those who hoard excessive money develop a mental disease whereby they incline toward all manner of inhuman and often illegal activities to feed their greed. Moreover, the very existence of unutilized and over-accumulated material wealth makes others greedy to possess it. On the intellectual plane, persons who have developed many academic skills but cannot find appropriate employment often turn their intellect to a life of crime out of sheer frustration. Therefore, a healthy society must arrange for the full utilization and also a reasonable distribution of these goods.

Finally, society, if it is to take all affirmative measures to prevent crime, must guard against stagnancy in both the physical and the psychic spheres. Life is characterized by motion. This entire universe is in a condition of perpetual change. For this reason, stagnancy is an unnatural condition that is conducive to criminal outbursts. Whenever society, ignoring its potential for expansion and growth, tries to cling to outmoded forms of technology or antiquated dogmas, some people invariably protest. Often that protest takes a purely destructive and unhealthy course of expression. Thus, a healthy society must strive always to develop more and better forms of physical and psychic nutrients to fulfill the ever-increasing demands of its citizenry.

In summary, PROUT distinguishes three unhealthy conditions that society must guard against: insufficiency of either the physical or psychic pabulum required for human life, non-utilization of over-accumulated physical or psychic pabulum, and stagnancy in the physical or psychic strata.




## 2.2 Revolution versus Reform

To achieve social progress and avoid the aforementioned three unhealthy conditions, administrative control of society passes hands from one sociopsychic class to another in a natural succession. The motivity of the social cycle has already been explained in Article 1 “The Nature of Human Society”. What concerns us here is the manner or technique whereby progressive alterations in the socioeconomic framework of society are effected. In other words, our present discussion centers on a comparative study of the two essentially contrary approaches of reform and revolution.

To explain the difference between reform and revolution, we can take the fanciful sequence of diagrams in Figure 2-1.

**Figure 2-1 Reform and Revolution**



In all of these diagrams the circle represents the social organism. In Diagram 1, a particular social or economic program has been started. In Diagram 2, that program has been modified somewhat. In Diagram 3, two new programs have begun. Finally, in Diagram 4, we find what appears to be an entirely different and definitely superior social organism.

If we analyze the movement from Diagram 1 to Diagram 3, we may say that reform has been done. But from Diagram 3 to Diagram 4, assuming that it is in fact the same social organism, the best description of the method that effected the drastic changes is revolution. Here the definitions of reform and revolution are not the traditional ones. Rather, these definitions are slightly modified in order to convey two different approaches to social progress.

In the first approach (Diagrams 1 to 3), the methodology is to change as little as possible – to make simple modifications or additions wherever it is felt to be necessary. (It is interesting and significant to note that often these additions and even sometimes the modifications are hailed somewhat hypocritically as being “revolutionary” reforms.)

In the second approach (Diagram 3 to 4), the methodology is more radical. Beneficial change is effected by first eliminating what is harmful and then by installing something significantly different in its place, often with the addition of new programs.

The former technique we are calling *reform*, and the latter *revolution*. There is also a third

category of technique that exists, and that is *evolution*. For evolution, the same approach as revolution is used, only this approach involves less force or it takes place over a longer period of time than revolution. Hence, for the purpose of this article, we have classified evolution under the same heading as revolution.

Before going any further, we must be very clear that here our concepts of evolution, revolution, and even reform are not merely techniques for idle change but rather systems for a progressive alteration. By progress, we mean that which tends toward the greater happiness and welfare of all, that which takes society closer to the ideal of universalism. To accomplish this progressive movement, the social cycle rotates in a natural way as has already been explained. Should a moderate force be used to revert the social cycle to a preceding rather than a succeeding era, such a change would not be progressive. In that case, we must call it *counter-evolution* rather than evolution. Similarly, should the amount of force used to revert the social cycle be comparatively great, in that case we must call that change *counterrevolution* rather than revolution. Both counter-evolution and counterrevolution are unnatural conditions. They cannot persist for a long time. Due to the greater difficulty in bringing about and maintaining a counterrevolution, counterrevolution is even more short-lived than counter-evolution.

Now let us have a closer look at the concept of reform. Surely it is a pleasant idea that wherever possible we should make the needed amendments to our socioeconomic framework by leaving all other things the same. This is a sort of straight-line approach, simple in concept and moderately useful in the short run. But over the long run, reform is generally unrealistic both in principle and in practice. There are at least two scientific reasons to support this judgement.

First, we have the problem of empty space. In order to add something, to make a reform in a fashion that affects nothing else, we must find some empty space. Nowadays, however, we have come to realize that there is no such thing as empty space. Even the void is full of energy. The same situation exists with our socioeconomic framework. Even where there is no formal structure, there will be some informal structure. Hence, there can be no such thing as pure addition. Something must be displaced or revised. Even in our Diagrams 1, 2, and 3, our imagination was variably affected and constricted with each additional mark appended.

The second scientific objection to the notion of reform is one of interrelationship. In life, all entities and conditions are interrelated, part and parcel of the same universal tissue. Whenever one area of life is affected, some repercussion (whether great or slight) is felt in all areas. Thus, in actuality, it proves impossible to modify just one area of life while leaving all other areas the same. We may think of this situation in terms of a simple analogy. When we throw a stone into a pond, there are waves that immediately emanate from the point of impact and spread to cover the entire surface of the pond. Not only is that so, but if we have a very fine measuring tool, we will note that the level of the water has risen to some extent. In other words, each and every drop of water in the pool has had to adjust its position slightly.

Thus we see that there can be no such thing as a pure and simple reform. When we move to change one thing or even to simply add one thing, everything is affected. That which was before is lost forever. Something new takes its place.

Reform is largely an unrealistic idea. When progress is achieved in the natural course of human affairs, reform might suffice. But in the long run, the technique of reform becomes utterly useless, because corruption is a very common tendency. When exploitation becomes rampant or even when exploitation merely rears its ugly head, then reform can no longer solve the problem or serve the purpose. Then revolution (or evolution) is the only sensible solution. In order to create, we must first destroy. This is the essence of revolution. Revolution never seeks to advance in a straight line. Rather, it makes a systaltic advancement – to go forward, first a few steps backward are taken


(like moving backwards to get a running start on a jump or a strategic retreat to launch a more effective offensive).

This might sound somewhat contradictory, but there are countless examples in life where opposites are complementary. In order to get, we must often give. In order to be first, we must first be last. In order to have peace, we must first fight. In order to know, we must first realize our ignorance. In order to become a butterfly, the caterpillar must die. For a flower to bloom, the seed must be broken. Those whom the gods would destroy, they first exalt. Those whom the gods would exalt, they first abase. The list could go on and on. It even finds parallel in the assertion of current physics that matter and energy are related. Matter, which is generally considered to be static, may also be understood in terms of energy, which is dynamic. Hence, the electron is simultaneously viewed by physicists as both a particle and a wave, as both motionless and in motion.

Perhaps it will be easiest if we simply give this concept a symbolic representation. Mystic philosophers have always noted that life is the product of union of the male and female principles. Hence, in India, we often find the Godhead represented symbolically as Sita-Rama or Radha-Krishna. Similarly, Shiva Maheshvara, another form of the Godhead is occasionally depicted as both male and female simultaneously or as having three faces (Trimurti). The right face is supremely virile. The left face is charming and attractive. The middle face is a sublime union of the primal man and the primal woman – serene and transcendental.

In China, this same concept has been illustrated by the well-recognized *T'ai-Chi T'u*, the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate (see Figure 2-2).

**Figure 2-2 Yin Yang Symbol**



This symbol is meant to portray a rotational symmetry that signifies continuous systaltic movement between the two opposite poles known as *Yin* and *Yang*. Yin (on the right) is variously described as feminine, dark, maternal, receptive, intuitive, contemplative, earth, and so on. Yang (on the left) is variously described as male, bright, paternal, creative, rational, analytical, heaven, and so on. When combined, these two sides of life form a perfect union, as represented by the circle. The two dots symbolize the theory that each time either of the two forces reaches its extreme expression, it contains within itself the seed of its opposite expression, in the same way as a coil expanded to its limit has within itself the latent tendency for contraction and vice versa. With this understanding, we can think of the technique of revolution as just one aspect of the *T'ai-Chi T'u*. The theoretical basis of revolution, as mentioned earlier, is simply that true creation must be preceded by destruction, just as destruction must obviously be preceded by creation.

## 2.3 Harmlessness versus Nonviolence

At this point, there are no doubt those who would opine that such a course of action violates their moral stand of nonviolence. However, if we look closely at the concept of nonviolence, it proves to be but another offshoot of the same reformist philosophy that is perennially propagated by hypocritical politicians. In fact, it is absolutely impossible to live for even a few minutes without being violent. With every breath we take, innumerable microorganisms are slaughtered. With every step we take, none can guess how much life has been crushed beneath our feet. The food we eat was once alive and must still be alive to some extent if we are to derive any vitality from it. So, for all of us, the real questions that must be faced are only how, when, and how much violence to exert.

What then is the true moral principle that concerns us? It is harmlessness. Harmlessness primarily means the intention never to do harm to any living creature by thought, word, or action. Of course, in life we may often cause pain to others; and that pain, strictly speaking, may be taken as harmful in the short term. But our intention must never be to cause pain. When a mother slaps the hand of a child who has run negligently into the street, her actual intention is only to teach that child some crucial rules of safety. Though violence is done, though pain is felt, still the motive is benevolent, and the action is helpful rather than harmful. This then is a moral principle that people can live by. And once again we see the conjunction of opposites. In order to help, we must often hurt.

Does this concept extend so far as to allow the actual killing of another human being? This question must be examined from both the individual and the social points of view. Individually speaking, it is a very rare situation when killing a human being actually becomes an act of mercy towards the victim. This situation is known as euthanasia, and without doubt it must be a morally acceptable position. Since time immemorial we have been providing the same compassionate service to domesticated and even non-domesticated animals. Hence, to refuse this type of relief to a human being would be not just inhumane but also hypocritical.

There is another individual condition in which killing is justified. Here the application of mercy concerns the individual doing the killing rather than the one who is killed. In this case, the one killing must be doing so to save his or her own life or, much the same, those relatives or property that justify or support his or her own life. In this example, the victim was actually an aggressor, whose very action was such as to jeopardize the life of the concerned individual. Hence, on the universally recognized right to self-defense, it also becomes morally justifiable to kill.

When we examine the question of killing from the social point of view, we find that these same two basic justifications also apply. First, from the standpoint of mercy or compassion towards another or others, we are sometimes compelled to take action against a third party. Whether it be the case of a witnessed rape or attempted murder or any such action, our social duty is to protect the innocent. With this benevolent intention, the aggressor may well have to suffer death at our hands. If we extend this example to the international arena, we find that one country (or perhaps a world army) might have to go to war to protect the citizens of a neighboring invaded country.

In the second social instance, we must enlarge the concept of self-defense. Thus, if one's own city, state, country, or world is wrongfully attacked by an outside party, one might have to fight to preserve that which is the basis of one's physical existence. Similarly, the right to self-defense can be applied on the social plane under classic conditions for revolution. Here we have the case of extreme oppression or suppression of the people by a lawful ruler. Under such conditions, the revolutionary asserts the fundamental right of citizens to seize power by forcible means whenever their government abuses its position in a fashion that endangers the health of society. As mentioned in an earlier discussion, the life of the individual is endangered whenever the health of the social organism is in peril. This happens whenever any specific administration fails to provide

for the citizens sufficient physical and mental nourishment or fails to utilize the over-accumulated physical or mental pabulum or fails to generate a sense of progress being made.

Fundamentally speaking, the pre-revolutionary condition is one of static or black peace. It is the thesis to which revolutionary war is applied as a dialectical antithesis. The resulting synthesis is another type of peace – a sentient or white peace. In this way, whenever the forward momentum of society is threatened or lost due to the exploitative administration of any particular sociopsychic class in power, the moralists of society unite and apply either the technique of revolution or the technique of evolution to bring about the necessary rotation of the social cycle that will eradicate the prevailing black peace and establish or re-establish a white peace.

## 2.4 Revolutionary Morality

In conclusion, we must briefly distinguish between morality and legality. Morality is a code of ethical principles founded on cardinal principles like justice and universalism, and varying in expression with regard to changes in time, space, and form. Legality, on the other hand, is a more rigid set of human-made rules that ideally seek a practical balance between socioeconomic necessity and morality. In reality, legality can often be so amiss as to be far from that ideal. Hence, we find that there is often conflict between morality and legality.

Even under the best of circumstances, that which is immoral may occasionally be legal. And under a corrupt administration, that which is moral is often illegal. For example, it is generally immoral to encourage prostitution, abortion, drug abuse, and alcoholism; however, due to social or economic necessity, we might have to legalize them. On the other hand, due to corruption in a government, a moralist might work for the overthrow of that government by force; but such action is never legal. Under a healthy administration, a moralist rarely, if ever, must violate the law. But under a crooked administration, moralists are pushed more and more outside the ambit of legality. Those in power and those with vested interests feel rightly threatened by moralists, and therefore they resort to all sorts of immoral but usually legalistic means to isolate or eradicate the moralists.

In this way, the revolution becomes essentially a war of survival. Under such conditions, the moralists, fighting on behalf of the entire society, adopt a new code of conduct that we may describe as the rules of the battlefield. All sorts of compassion and support must be accorded to coworkers and sympathizers (whose number the revolutionary always tries to increase); but, towards the enemy, the rule is basically to kill or be killed.

The goal of a moralist is never to destroy life; however, the success of his or her revolutionary mission is dependent upon the capture, so far as possible, of the full socioeconomic administration of society. Until this goal is achieved on behalf of the suffering collectivity, moralists cannot afford to jeopardize their sublime objective by giving any quarter to the enemy. Of course, after victory is gained, then surely the most humane steps must be taken to rehabilitate the offenders, in just the same way as any criminal would ordinarily be awarded correctional treatment. But while the revolution is raging, a peacetime morality becomes not just inappropriate but also suicidal.

Finally, summing up this topic, take particular note of two vital points about revolution and reform. First, revolution is both natural and scientific, whereas reform is little more than a dreamland theory primarily propagated by the weak-minded and the self-serving. Second, revolution is not just morally defensible; rather, at the appropriate moment, it is, despite any question of legality, morally obligatory.

## Article 3. The Social Ideal

### 3.1 Introduction

The goal of PROUT is to establish human society as one blissful universal family. To accomplish this sublime objective, the spiritual bearing of society will have to be elevated. As it is unrealistic to imagine the entire society performing any arduous spiritual practices, this end may be accomplished only by increasing the number of real spiritual aspirants in society. In other words, the purification of society is dependent upon the purification of more and more individuals. And even the purification of a large number of individuals will not be of much value should these saintly persons remain aloof from social concern. Hence, for the materialization of the social ideal, humanity requires a special type of spiritualist – one who is both a spiritual aspirant and a social activist. Those spiritual revolutionaries who by strictly adhering to the principles of morality work in a well-thought, preplanned manner to bring about progressive changes for individual and social advancement in any or all of the spheres of life may be called *sadvipras*. It is only by increasing the number of *sadvipras* that society will be able to forge ahead with speed toward its supreme desideratum.

### 3.2 Sadvipra Society

Human society requires a superior form of leadership. The level of civilization is first and foremost understood by the quality of society's leaders. Where leadership is good, society progresses. Where leadership is poor, society degenerates. Hence, the ideal leadership for society is found in the *sadvipras*, and that society which has a sufficient number of *sadvipras* to guide its motivity we may call *sadvipra society*.

To establish *sadvipra society*, three things are required. First, we must create *sadvipras*. Second, we must locate and maintain these *sadvipras* at the nucleus and at the spokes of the social cycle. In other words, the *sadvipras* must be situated and must remain in a suitable position to control society. Third, *sadvipra* leadership must be justified in the eyes of society.

So now let us take these points one by one. First, we must see the means whereby *sadvipras* are created. The character of a *sadvipra* is that s/he is courageous, intelligent, and disciplined. In practice, s/he is always ready to fight against any and all opposing forces to the progressive march of society.

To develop courage, three things are required. First, the body and mind must be made strong by following a regular and healthy routine. There should also be some training to increase one's physical capacity, for in the absence of power, or the knowledge and ability to use that power, a feeling of helplessness might still arise in the mind. However, it must be stressed that despite the value of physical fitness, it is not at all the same as courage or even power, and these different concepts should not be confused for one another. Second, and more important, is the practice of autosuggestion to strengthen one's determination and will power. For this purpose, some dharmic oaths will certainly increase one's courage. Finally, and most important, is the strict adherence to the code of morality<sup>3</sup>. In fact, there is only one true kind of courage, and that is moral courage.

---

<sup>3</sup> Following are the ten points of yogic morality, known as *Yama-Niyama*. With all of these moral rules, it is the spirit and not the letter of the rule that matters most.

1. Harmlessness – Not to inflict suffering on any harmless being by thought, word, or action.
2. Benevolent Truthfulness – Action of mind and use of words with the spirit of welfare for one's fellow beings.

Courage guided by any selfish motivation may best be termed as daring or foolhardiness or greed or even criminality; but the selfless bravery guided by morality has no other connotation but courage. By strictly observing all the points of morality (and most particularly the point of benevolent truthfulness), the mind gets more and more pure, and as a result the will power increases. In any direction a moralist might turn his or her mind, success is guaranteed; and this self-confidence also is with the moralist. Morality is always accepted as the starting point of spirituality, because morality alone can provide the requisite inspiration and ability to overcome the hardships on the difficult path of individual and collective welfare.

Intelligence is the second quality of a sadvipra. By intelligence is meant practical knowledge or wisdom. There is a story about a philosopher and a boatman who were crossing a river during a storm. All along the way, the philosopher was haranguing the boatman: "As you have not studied metaphysics or epistemology, so half of your life has been wasted." Then suddenly the boat sprung a leak and started to sink. The boatman asked the philosopher if he knew how to swim. When the philosopher replied in the negative, the boatman said: "In that case, all of your life has been wasted."

With regard to intelligence, the sadvipra is concerned with practical knowledge and not with bookish knowledge. This practical knowledge the sadvipra uses in order to benefit the rest of society. Thus we find that there are three main aspects of intelligence that concern the sadvipra. If s/he is to truly benefit the people, then s/he must be clear, consistent, and complete. These are the 3 C's of practical intelligence. There is a fourth C, and that is *correct*; but correctness is assumed, as the moral code of a sadvipra will not let him/her mislead the people.

First, with regard to clarity, the sadvipra must have a clear understanding of any subject and must be able to communicate that understanding clearly to others. As the function of a sadvipra is not just that of a courageous and efficient leader but also that of an effective and uplifting teacher, so this clarity of expression becomes essential.

3. Non-Theft – Not to take possession physically or mentally of what belongs to others or by omission to deprive others of their due.
4. Ideation of the Great – To remain attached to the Cosmic Consciousness by treating all of the various objects with which one comes into contact as different expressions of that one Cosmic Consciousness and not just as the crude forms.
5. Non-Possessiveness – Non-acceptance of such amenities as are superfluous to the preservation of one's physical existence.
6. Cleanliness – Purity and cleanliness, both physical and mental, internal and external.
7. Contentment – To accept ungrudgingly and without complaint the outturn of the services rendered by one's own physical or mental labor.
8. Atonement – To make efforts for achieving the perfect human status despite such efforts being associated with physical or mental discomforts.
9. Spiritual Study – To study (by reading scriptures, attending classes, or any other means) to assimilate true knowledge.
10. Dedication to the Supreme – To establish oneself in the cosmic shelter by accepting with implicit faith the Supreme Being as the ideal and as the controller of life, and to move with ever-accelerating speed towards that divine goal.

Second, wherever there is confusion, corruption sets in. Similar is the case with the need for consistency. Inconsistency implies falsehood or ignorance. Wherever any inconsistency is found in one's teachings, doubt arises as to the validity of those teachings and also the validity of the teacher. Should the inconsistency in the sadvipra's teachings go largely unnoticed, still that inconsistency will be a breeding ground for future confusion and corruption.

The final and the most important attribute of a sadvipra's intelligence is completeness. The sadvipra must be well-rounded. S/he must give due importance to all sides of human existence. Each propensity of the human being must be appreciated and utilized for the upliftment of the individual and society as a whole. Every form of service has its time and place; hence, the sadvipra must incorporate within himself/herself the good qualities of all four psychic classes – the masses with their capacity for diligent manual labor for nursing or assisting others, the warriors with their bold spirit of self-sacrifice for fighting on behalf of others, the intellectuals with their glowing ability to uplift others by their teachings and example, and the capitalists with their worldly wisdom and a potentially generous spirit that lets them upgrade the standard of living of others. Once again, we find the same danger as before – wherever there is incompleteness, there is the likelihood of confusion and corruption. Hence, the sadvipra's knowledge must not only be practical, clear, and consistent, but it must also be complete – it must be all-sided.

The manner whereby this wisdom is gained is fairly straightforward. It, too, is threefold, that is, through perception, inference, and authority – all conducted by means of personal study, attendance at seminars and discussions, and association with others of greater wisdom. As a natural extension of the last-mentioned approach (association with others of greater wisdom), meditation must be mentioned. Meditation is a direct means of expanding the mind by ideating on the source of all knowledge, the infinite Consciousness.

So the sadvipra must have knowledge in all realms of existence – physical, mental, moral, social, and spiritual. The sadvipra must also know how all of these realms are interrelated. And, finally, the sadvipra must be able to communicate her/his knowledge to others. It is for this very reason that PROUT, a socioeconomic theory, is being propagated for the first time in history, and that propagation is being spearheaded by spiritualists.

The third quality of a sadvipra is discipline. To guide the human society, more than one sadvipra is required. These sadvipras, to be effective, must be well-united; and for unity there must be discipline. This discipline is threefold. First, some external code of conduct must be followed so that the sadvipras may work harmoniously with each other. Second, and more important, the sadvipras (as spiritual aspirants) must observe some strict rules of personal conduct in pursuance of their life goal. And so, even apart from other sadvipras, the individual sadvipra will be looked upon as a highly disciplined human being. (From this it is apparent that the discipline of a sadvipra is far more the result of voluntary, internal inspiration than imposed, external pressure.) Finally, and most important, the sadvipra's discipline stems primarily from a firm devotion to the Supreme Commander, the Cosmic Controller. This is partially a function of the tenth principle of morality<sup>4</sup>, which may be called dedication to the Supreme or surrender to the will of God. The sadvipras unitedly form an army of spiritual revolutionaries under the direct command of the one Divinity. Their common attraction to the formless Infinite Being is what binds the sadvipras most firmly to each other. This is the main source of their intensely keen unity.

As mentioned earlier, in the applied sphere the sadvipras are always ready to fight any force whatsoever that may oppose the progressive advancement of society. Here it must be clearly

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, point 10.



understood that this fight may or may not be physical. In actuality, this fight can be any sphere of life (physical, mental, moral, social, or spiritual), and its expression can be either internal or external. What is most significant is that the sadvipra must make the appropriate fight with regard to changes in time, space, and form. The goal of the sadvipra is thus to do all the good that s/he can, in all the ways that s/he can, wheresoever s/he can, for so long as ever s/he can.

One last point must be mentioned concerning the creation of sadvipras. The point is that the concept of *creation* of sadvipras is a misnomer. Sadvipras are not so much created by any training course as they are developed by their own efforts and by the grace of God. Hence, we are not describing a new elite or even a fifth sociopsychic class. The sadvipras are simply those human beings who are most highly evolved by dint of their extraordinary physico-psycho-spiritual practices.

The second requirement for establishing sadvipra society is the location and maintenance of these sadvipras at the nucleus and at the spokes of the social cycle. Again, we are dealing with something of a misnomer. It should be clear already that, by their very nature and by their very expression, the sadvipras automatically reside at the nucleus or at the spokes of the social cycle. Hence, what we really mean here is that those on the periphery of the social cycle and most especially that sociopsychic class that is currently dominating the social cycle should be conscious of the sadvipras and should be attentive to their leadership, preferably out of love but also out of fear if need be. Our main point here is the proper recognition of sadvipra leadership. Should any particular class that happens to be in government ignore the role of the sadvipras and should that class then abuse their administrative authority by exploiting society to suit their narrow group interests, then the sadvipras must assert their position in order to rotate the social cycle and thereby initiate a new era or even a new age.

Finally, the last factor in the establishment of sadvipra society is the justification of sadvipra leadership. This is achieved through effective, intensive and extensive, socioeconomic relief and welfare programs and through a widespread and healthy education system. This point is fairly straightforward and self-explanatory. The people cannot be convinced by words alone. They also require action. So the sadvipras, in addition to their duty to propagate dharma, must also keep themselves engaged in various types of positive social or economic service activities.

The sadvipras do not seek control of the social cycle for any type of personal gain. Their sole interest is the all-round welfare of the entire society. The only proof of their sincerity is their arduous spiritual practice, their selfless service, and their sacrifice.

### 3.3 Rotating the Social Cycle

At this point in our discussion of sadvipra society two questions arise. First, how is it that the sadvipras, remaining at the hub and at the spokes of the social cycle, will rotate the social cycle. Second, what form of government or political administration is preferable in a sadvipra society? To answer these questions properly, it will not be possible to be very specific, as these questions concern systems or techniques that must surely vary with regard to time, space, and form. However, some abstract explanation can be offered.


As has been explained earlier (see Article 1 “The Nature of Human Society”), the social cycle revolves in a natural order with administrative control passing hands successively from the masses to the warriors to the intellectuals and to the capitalists. (These social classes are defined by their differing psychic inclinations and capacities rather than by any simple economically based distinctions.) During the capitalist administration, exploitation becomes so severe, so rapacious, that not only the masses but also the warriors and the intellectuals become little more than slaves to the capitalist elite. Under these conditions, the shift in the social cycle cannot come about by

natural course or even by evolutionary pressure. The only solution open to the sadvipras is to instigate a revolution by mobilizing the discontented warriors and intellectuals. (It will be recalled that evolution requires a relatively mild application of force, whereas revolution requires a greater force. For details, see Article 2 “The Need for Revolution”.) After the revolution, the masses take power briefly but soon pass that power over to the warriors who led the revolution. In this way a new age commences. One full rotation of the social cycle may be considered complete when the administration has passed through the hands of the masses, the warriors, the intellectuals, and the capitalists, and finally revolution has transpired.

It may be remembered that as we are talking about a historical process involving successive domination by different sociopsychic classes, it was convenient to compare this social cycle to a human life cycle. We did so by drawing upon the similarities between the masses and children, the warriors and youth, the intellectuals and adults, and finally the capitalists and elders. Thus we found the social cycle to be a form of natural life progression.

Now, in order to elucidate the manner whereby the sadvipras rotate the social cycle, it will be useful to note that the sadvipras may also be divided into three age categories. These age categories for sadvipras are not purely psychic (as is the case with the four classes), but rather they are physico-psychic distinctions. In any family, there are four general age groups – children, youth, adults, and elders. Each of these age groups varies in its potential and in its expression. Because the expression of children is both physically and mentally immature, we cannot expect leadership of society from them. Therefore, it is unlikely that we will find sadvipras among them. However, among the youth, the adults, and the elders, we find maturity of expression, though differing in emphasis, and therefore it is possible to think of sadvipras in these three age groups. Although possessing the qualities of all four sociopsychic classes, still the youthful sadvipra has a greater potential and inclination for warrior-like service, while the adult sadvipras have a greater potential and inclination for intellectual-like service, and the elderly sadvipras have their greatest potential and inclination for capitalist service (meaning thereby the tendency to gently guide others by distributing their vast wealth of physical, psychic, and spiritual experiences). These differences among the sadvipras are not lifelong differences, but rather the natural effect of the aging process. Hence, in one lifetime, the same sadvipra might be classified as a youthful sadvipra, then later as an adult sadvipra, and finally as an elderly sadvipra. With the establishment of sadvipra society, the number of sadvipras will be sufficient that at any given time there will always be a significant presence of all three types of sadvipras simultaneously. Thus we may envisage the human society as seen in Figure 3-1.

**Figure 3-1 Sadvipra Society**



To rotate the social cycle, the Sadvipra Board (representing all of the sadvipras in society) simply

rotates the administration of the sadvipras. When greater emphasis is given to the youthful sadvipras, these sadvipra youth work in harmony with the moralist warriors to bring about a revolution that will overthrow the capitalists and establish the warrior era of the new age. Similarly, when greater emphasis is given by the Sadvipra Board to the adult sadvipras, these sadvipra adults work in harmony with the moralist intellectuals to bring about the rotational change from the warrior era to the intellectual era. Finally, when greater emphasis is given by the Sadvipra Board to the elderly sadvipras, these sadvipra elders work in harmony with the moralist capitalists to bring about the rotational change from the intellectual era to the capitalist era. Thus the social cycle is rotated in a fairly direct fashion.

Figure 3-1 is very simplistic and not at all precise in detail. It must be remembered that in general sadvipras are not lumped into obvious groupings on the basis of physical age but rather dispersed in all of the various walks of life, largely irrespective of age. Nevertheless, the diagram should serve some purpose in giving a feeling for the manner in which the social cycle is rotated. In the same way as an axle rotates the hub and that hub then turns the wheel at the periphery by means of the spokes, so also the Sadvipra Board rotates the hub, and by means of the spokes (that is, the youthful, adult, and elderly sadvipras dispersed in all of the various occupations), the social cycle is turned. This movement may also be likened to the steering of a car. By rotating the steering wheel, the road wheels are affected and in consequence the car turns in the appropriate direction.

The shift from warrior era to intellectual era and from intellectual era to capitalist era is relatively simple. These changes come naturally, and should the sadvipras apply any force at all, it is more likely to be a mild or evolutionary force than a revolutionary force. It is natural for the youth-like warriors to be influenced by the youthful sadvipras; and when that influence wanes, it is still natural for the pseudo-warriors then to be influenced by the moralistic intellectuals and the adult sadvipras. Similarly, it is natural for the adult-like intellectuals to be influenced by the adult sadvipras; and when that influence wanes, it is still natural for them to be influenced by the moralistic capitalists and the elder sadvipras. But the elder-like capitalists, having a materialistic bent to their minds, may be impressed only by age (experience) or physical force. When they lose their reverence for the elder sadvipras, they then listen to no one, and their selfish exploitation of the collectivity becomes more and more rapacious. At that stage, there is no alternative for the sadvipras but to resort to extreme force, in other words, revolution.

After revolutionary victory is attained, there might be a brief period of chaos as the masses celebrate their restored freedom, but soon thereafter the sadvipras will be able to establish a moralistic government by installing those warriors who led the revolution (and with whom the sadvipras have had close contact) in the highest positions of government.

It may be that some sadvipras will also enter into the government and public service; however, it is most improbable that at any time in the foreseeable future there will ever be a sufficient number of sadvipras to dominate the administration of society by direct or formal means. In any event, to establish a dictatorship would be totally unpsychological as the people would rebel all too soon against this type of elitist hegemony. The sadvipras also would not be tested and tempered sufficiently by difficult or adverse conditions, and so there would be an increased likelihood of their corruption. At the very least, the motivity of society would inevitably decelerate. Hence, the control that sadvipras exercise over the collective body tends to be more or less indirect. The sadvipras control society by their own formal or informal influence in the various sectors of society and through the medium of the moralists in any given administration. When the number of moralists in the administration becomes too few or their standard becomes too low or the progress of society becomes too slow, the sadvipras reassert their actual leadership by rotating the social cycle and by bringing beneficent changes through the moralists of the new administration.

Now let us consider what type of political system will be preferable in a sadvipra society. As

mentioned earlier, nobody wants to tolerate the hegemony of others. Hence a purely dictatorial form of government would probably not be satisfactory. Moreover, in an absolute dictatorship, there is the greatest possibility for early corruption to set in, if not immediately then after a few generations. On the other hand, pure democracy also has defects. Those in power or those with vested interests generally find it fairly easy to manipulate elections by buying votes or by arranging excessive publicity for their candidates, not to speak of the various more direct methods of rigging an election such as rezoning techniques, stuffing the ballot box, and political arrests. Even in a so-called fair election, determination of the candidates is rarely the result of a popular decision; and when it comes to voting, the best that can be achieved is a majority rule rather than a popular rule. It is only a myth that the maximum voting franchise achieves the ideal condition known as “rule of the people by the people for the people”. Rather, the whole concept of elections becomes a farce in the absence of three critical qualities in the electorate: morality, education, and socioeconomic (including political) awareness.

Therefore, the system of government presently preferred by PROUT is neither a pure dictatorship nor a pure democracy. At present, PROUT generally supports a selecto-electional system with a restricted voting franchise based on the three qualifications of morality, education, and socioeconomic awareness. According to this system, the government devises and administers a test based on the aforementioned three qualifications, and only those persons achieving a minimally acceptable score or more in all of the three areas will be permitted to vote. Regarding the candidates for office, they must at least come from the electorate, and they might have to be selected or approved by the government or, preferably, some independent election authority. In this manner, the administration at the outset of any particular era establishes a minimum standard for the electorate and, as a result, a minimum standard for the government.

In the beginning of any era, the government must necessarily be of a superior quality in comparison to the average standard of the general electorate. As time passes, this gap tends to diminish. It might be that the leadership of the next era will emerge in a natural course through this system. In that case, they would then establish the next era and raise social standards as well. However, should such a point in time arise when there is little distinction between those in government and the general electorate, then that government no longer offers any substantial leadership. At that stage, the society begins to stagnate, and it becomes necessary for the sadvipras to step in and rotate the social cycle once more.

To be more specific than this would violate one of the fundamental tenets of PROUT, namely flexibility regarding techniques of implementation. Thus, for example, during the warrior era, the government might apply a very firm control over selection of candidates or the operation of the various social boards that govern the different areas of life. In the subsequent intellectual era, this control might be relaxed considerably. The manner in which this socioeconomic control is adjusted varies in accordance with changes in time, space, and form. Therefore, it is impossible to fix any particular techniques that will be eternal and universal. Even this very selecto-electional process might prove useless or even harmful in the far-distant future or on some higher or lesser evolved planets. Really speaking, all that may be safely specified as a general rule are the fundamental principles towards which human society should strive. For more information, see Article 4 “The Five Fundamental Principles”.

### **3.4 Establishing a World Government**

At the time this article is being written, there is not a single PROUTist government on planet Earth. Nevertheless, the day is not far distant when this whole world will be guided by PROUT. The manner whereby this will be achieved can be set out here.

In the near future a few countries will establish PROUT on the national level. As soon as this is accomplished, those countries will form a league of PROUTist nations by sending elected or appointed delegates to the same. At that time, those countries still adhering to the relics of the past, communism or capitalism, will be largely operating in collusion with each other to prevent the further spread of PROUT. The league of PROUTist nations will be a necessary defense against the antagonistic stance of the capitalist and communist countries.

The league of PROUTist nations will formulate a strategy of survival for the PROUTist countries, and it will also work to encourage more countries to adopt PROUT at the earliest. Eventually, PROUT, being the most modern and progressive ideology, will surely cover the globe.

When every country will be guided by PROUT, then the league of PROUTist nations will have lost its original function. At that stage it will no longer be a league of nations but rather a world government.

At first, the various nations may be somewhat apprehensive of a world government. Hence, the world government will start off with the restricted power of legislation only. Gradually, however, the nations of the world will gain confidence in the world government, and they will cede to it the additional power of administration as well.

In this way, in a very short time, the banner of PROUT will fly over the entire world. On that historic day when a world government will be firmly established, human society on this planet will have achieved its first collective victory in the battle for establishing universalism.

## Article 4. The Five Fundamental Principles

### 4.1 Introduction

From the study of epistemology, the science of knowledge, it is apparent that all knowledge may be classified into two categories – temporal and eternal. That knowledge which tries to fixate in any way the condition of this world or this universe must eventually fall to the relentless onslaught of time. A map of this world in the year 1960 is no longer accurate by 1970. A photograph of a boy of ten will bear little resemblance to that same boy at twenty. Even the most respected formulas of science come and go – become obsolete over time. One day scientists thought the world to be flat; later they understood it to be round. Previously matter was thought to be inert; later scientists have proclaimed that it is active.

Is then this temporal knowledge absolutely useless? Of course it is not. Modern technology, based on just such temporal knowledge, has provided increased food production to cope with larger populations, has provided improved medical facilities to extend human life expectancy, has increased human security by gaining more control over the formidable forces of nature, has harnessed electricity to create a more congenial environment for human existence, has provided countless advantageous facilities to help humankind.

What then is the defect? The only defect is the impermanence of temporal knowledge – its instability. No sensible person would construct a house on a fault-ridden or shifting foundation, because the defective foundation may some day cause the collapse of the entire building. In the same way, no sensible human beings would base the mode of their individual or collective existence on any temporal knowledge, because sooner or later their life struggle might well prove worthless.

So it is clear that for proper development of the individual and the social organisms humanity requires some guiding principles that will remain stable for all time and under all conditions. Is such a system possible? The answer is yes, but only if it has a firm basis in the practical principles of metaphysics.

Metaphysics is the science of life on all levels. Where biology seeks to explain the manner by which life is maintained in the various living organisms, metaphysics strives to explain the fundamental questions of life – what is the purpose of existence, what is the relationship between the individual and the universe, and so on. While the principles of biology may be developed by purely objective methods, this is not at all the case with metaphysics. To appreciate metaphysics, one requires a subjective approach. Even to test fully the principles of metaphysics, not to speak of enunciating them, one must develop a deep intuitional awareness through meditation or some related spiritual cult. It is for this reason that the greatest exponents of metaphysics have always been spiritualists.

If we look at the ethical teachings of the great spiritual preceptors<sup>5</sup> (which amount to the bulk of their practical instruction), we find a great similarity therein. This is the natural consequence of their same or similar metaphysical understanding. Of course, this consistent metaphysical understanding was founded on an even more stable base – their common ontological conception of the one formless, omnipresent Supreme Being. However, it will not be necessary to enter this realm of discussion here. It is sufficient to note that as regards the ethical teachings of the past and present spiritual masters, there is hardly any discrepancy and these teachings appear to be eternal.

---

<sup>5</sup> There may be dispute about who is included as a “great spiritual preceptor”, but this topic will not be discussed here.

Even those moral teachings propounded thousands and thousands of years ago still hold true today.

In the past, all of the spiritual teachers concentrated their instruction in the field of human psychology and individual life. They taught the people how to live in this world as individuals, but they did not teach any system for the management of society. Today, a great spiritual master has finally furnished the missing link. With the Five Fundamental Principles of PROUT, Progressive Utilization Theory, Shrii P. R. Sarkar has given the eternal and universal axioms that form the stable foundation of any healthy socioeconomic system.

## 4.2 A New Socioeconomic Theory

A theory is an exposition of the general principles that govern some aspect of life. Hence, every theory must have a function. Generally speaking, that function may be either explanatory or practical, though in fact any successful theory must necessarily be both. True knowledge is always both useful and usable information.

As PROUT is a socioeconomic theory, its purpose is to facilitate the happiness and all-round welfare of every living being. Towards this end, the Five Fundamental Principles have been propounded, for they embody the practical essence of this theory.

Although there are five principles, the theory is essentially one: for the development of a healthy social organism, there must be progressive utilization of everything. Though this concept of progressive utilization sounds obvious, its implications require some elaboration. For this reason, the theory has been broken down into five basic principles. Each of these principles enlarges on the preceding principles. In other words, Principle 2 becomes practical only after applying Principle 1, and Principle 3 becomes practical only after applying Principles 1 and 2. In this way, each successive principle not only adds insight into the theory of progressive utilization, but it also adds dimensions to the principles that precede it. Hence we may liken the practical aspects of PROUT to a lotus flower having five layers of petals. The outermost layer represents the first principle, and the innermost layer corresponds to the fifth principle.

The Five Fundamental Principles of PROUT are as follows:

1. There should be no accumulation of wealth without the permission of society.
2. There should be maximum utilization and rational distribution of the crude, subtle, and causal resources.
3. There should be maximum utilization of the physical, mental, and spiritual potentialities of the individual and collective organisms.
4. There should be a proper adjustment among the crude, subtle, and causal utilizations.
5. Utilizations vary in accordance with time, space, and form; these utilizations should be of a progressive nature.

## 4.3 The Principles Elaborated

In no way would it be humanly possible to give a complete explanation of these Five Fundamental Principles. The influence of Principle 5 alone would make the task gargantuan, even if we were to restrict ourselves to the known world and the present time. But if we remove those restrictions (as Principle 5 also demands), then how would it be possible to explain progressive utilization in terms of places unknown and times yet to come?

Nevertheless, despite our limitations, some further elaboration is definitely required. As it is not

the purpose of this Article to tender any specific policies, a detailed analysis would be superfluous; however, the following brief explanation may prove helpful for attaining a clear understanding of these five principles.

## Principle 1 (Social Ethics)

*There should be no accumulation of wealth without the permission of society.*

The first concern of any society is to maintain its integral survival. Towards this end the question of property immediately arises. This universe is ever changing; every one or two hundred years virtually the entire population of the planet (including plants, animals, and humans) has been completely replaced by a new population. Hence, we may best think of the human beings and other living organisms as temporary tenants in this universe. While here, we all surely have the right and ability to use the various wealth of this universe, but technically speaking, it is not possible to own anything. A man who claims ownership of a plot of land dies, but the land remains behind. When he was unable to take that land with him, how then can we say he owned it? At best, he may have had some sort of usufructuary right. Certainly that usufructuary right becomes more and more important the closer it relates to one's survival – food, body, mind, or even self – however, when closely examined, ownership will always elude us.

Correctly speaking, everything in this universe is cosmic property. The living beings have some limited usufructuary rights, but nobody has the right to abuse anything. Even society has limitations, for it also changes. Therefore, society as a whole may best be considered as the caretaker of this cosmic property, but not the landlord. The duty of society is to see that all of the cosmic property is used properly and to protect any property that is threatened.

The question arises as to what is property or wealth. In this regard, it is difficult to draw any lines. Nowadays, everyone recognizes the material objects as wealth. We also recognize ideas or inventions as wealth. Sacred treasures such as relics related to past spiritual masters are wealth. Plants and animals are wealth. And in most countries of the world, even human beings are legally treated as wealth. For example, although slavery has been generally abolished, still women are mostly treated as slaves and even the laws tend to favor woman's exploitation.

Understanding wealth in this broad fashion, it becomes obvious that society must permit some hoarding of wealth to its citizens. Otherwise, they cannot exist. Here the term *hoarding* means setting something aside for personal present or future use. Clearly, each human being must be permitted to hoard his or her own body and on earnest behalf of that body. On the other hand, if we want to ensure each human being the right to hoard one human body and its requirements, then we must prevent anyone from hoarding anyone else's human body and we must restrict everyone's right of hoarding in the areas of human requirements in order to prevent over-accumulation in some quarters and a resultant under-accumulation in other quarters. Society would be derelict in its duty if it permitted unrestricted accumulation of wealth, as this would surely lead to abuse or waste of some wealth. Toward this end, society must discourage the tendency for excessive hoarding in its citizens, because such activity is flagrantly antisocial. Hence, the first Fundamental Principle of PROUT advocates no hoarding of any kind of wealth without the permission of society. In other words, society should set some general and special limits on accumulation of wealth; and, to exceed those limits, it should be necessary to secure permission from society. Without such restrictions, it would be absolutely impossible for society to guarantee the minimum necessities to all or to work efficiently for the constant increase in the general standard of living.

Naturally, Principle 1 is intended to set up some restrictions on individual liberty. According to PROUT, no individual should be given such freedom that s/he may do serious harm to the collectivity. Since time immemorial, this concept has been accepted in principle and enforced to a



greater or lesser degree. No society can ever allow absolute freedom to the individual. More and more we are realizing the need for restricting the wayward inclinations of human beings on not just the physical plane but also the mental and even the spiritual planes of existence as well. Thus, for example, most people today have come to understand that some aspects of science, such as the techniques for building nuclear weaponry, should best be kept out of the public domain. For similar reasons, the practical techniques of spirituality are preferably imparted only to those who are well-established in the abstinences and observances of a strict moral code. Hence, Principle 1 strives for a condition in which maximum freedom to the individual is guaranteed, restraining or neutralizing only the extremely unhealthy or antisocial proclivities in the higher interest of collective and individual welfare. Later on, it will be seen that PROUT is simultaneously striving from the positive point of view for a balanced and healthy pattern of human existence and growth by calling for the all round development of individual potentialities in Principle 3 (Education, Relief, and Welfare).

The question still remains as to how the permission of society is to be obtained in ordinary or extraordinary situations. Without meaning to avoid this question, suffice it to say that the techniques for accomplishing this are many and varied and will depend on the decision of the government. If the government is organized in terms of departments and boards, one would approach or be contacted by the appropriate department or board on the appropriate level. For more information, see Principle 4 (Administration).

## Principle 2 (Economics)

*There should be maximum utilization and rational distribution of the crude, subtle, and causal resources.*

Whatever wealth or resources that exist in this universe should be used and developed for the benefit of the living beings. These resources may be categorized as crude, subtle, or causal. We may subdivide these resources by distinguishing between the so-called inanimate and animate worlds. Hence, the crude resources may be either *mundane* or *physical*; the subtle resources may be either *supramundane* or *mental*; and the causal resources may be either *divine* or *spiritual*.

The mundane includes all inanimate matter that may be perceived by the senses in either the natural or the converted form (for example, mud or bricks). It also includes that portion of the cosmic mind that directly controls the forces of nature such as earthquakes, storms, or the orbit of a planet.

Supramundane refers to the subtle cosmic mind and its supersensible manifestations such as spiritual philosophy, spiritual cult, social outlook, socioeconomic theory, scriptures (that is, the information, not the storage medium), and preceptors (that is, the personality, not the person).

Divine resources include the causal cosmic mind and particularly its more concentrated vibratory manifestations in some sensible or supersensible objects (for example, the relics related to past spiritual masters and mantras).

With regard to animate objects, physical resources are the bodies and brains of the living beings as well as that portion of the individual minds that controls the physical functions, instincts, and drives.

Mental resources are the individual or collective subtle minds with their capacity for experiencing pleasure and pain as well as the powers of contemplation and recollection. Here we find the accumulated beliefs, learning, experience, and wisdom of society (as expressed by both individuals and the collectivity).

Finally, spiritual resources are the self of the individuals and collectivity, with the powers of

creativity and intuition, the capacity for discrimination and detachment, and the sense of devotional or spiritual attraction. Spiritual resources also include a wide array of greater or lesser occult powers ranging from ordinary extra-sensory perception to various forms of control over the universal order.

All of these mundane, supramundane, and divine, physical, mental, and spiritual resources are the economic wealth of this universe. Non-utilization or under-utilization of this wealth leads to frustration or stagnation in society, which in turn can precipitate all sorts of social diseases. Therefore, there should be maximum utilization of all these crude, subtle, and causal resources. By maximum utilization we do not mean constant utilization; rather, we mean that everything should be used to its fullest or best possible extent, considering the evolutionary limitations of society and the practical limitations of a particular object. Thus farm land might be allowed to lie fallow for some time so that in the long run its overall produce may be of greater quantity or quality. However, if alternating crops can achieve the same purpose, then that approach would be preferable.

No resource should be under-utilized. No potential wealth should be lost. Take the example of solar energy. Where sun rays have long been utilized for medicinal or agricultural purposes, they have not yet been widely harnessed for providing a general power source. As we become aware of this possibility, the principle of maximum utilization demands that society not waste this valuable resource.

This principle is primarily an economic principle. Any economic system is concerned with essentially two objectives – optimum production and distributive justice. Production is optimized by maximum utilization of resources. Distributive justice is achieved through rational distribution of the resultant wealth.

Equal distribution is neither fair nor sensible. Variety is the law of nature. No two forms in this universe are exactly the same. People are different, and so their needs and desires differ. Hence, rational distribution means that the accumulated wealth of society should be reasonably distributed after due judgement and deliberation. Apart from meeting the minimum necessities of all, society will have to provide suitable reward or incentive for the meritorious as well as requisite treatment or facilities for various special cases. Here *meritorious* refers to those having a relatively rare skill or quality that is especially valuable to society.

No more precise meaning may be given to either the concept of maximum utilization or rational distribution. The practical implications of these terms may vary from time to time or from place to place. The meaning also varies with regard to that which is being utilized or distributed. However, many things must be considered with regard to rational distribution. In some cases, it might be preferable to distribute buying power rather than goods. In other cases, the opposite condition applies. In the case of common and necessary items, distribution means to award full usufructuary rights. With more rare goods, we might prefer to merely rent or loan them. The most rare and valuable items might remain in the public trust with nothing more than general or restricted access.

Rational distribution of technology also raises the interesting question of economic decentralization. This subject is further complicated when we consider that resources may be either movable or immovable. It is fairly easy to distribute the movable resources; but if we want to distribute immovable resources, then people must be distributed (and not the resources). In this regard, some system of incentives must be arranged, and it will be very advantageous to provide cheaper and more efficient transportation.

Actually speaking, distribution is just one aspect of utilization. Not only that, the process of setting limits to hoarding is nothing but a necessary corollary of distribution. Similarly, in

Principle 4 (yet to be discussed), the concept of proper adjustment among the various utilizations is also obviously just another aspect of utilization. Thus it is clear that all of the Five Fundamental Principles are entirely concerned with the subject of utilization. However, for the sake of clarity, these particular aspects of utilization – namely, restricted accumulation, rational distribution, and proper adjustment – have been distinguished.

### **Principle 3 (Education, Relief, and Welfare)**

*There should be maximum utilization of the physical, mental, and spiritual potentialities of the individual and collective organisms.*

The collective welfare lies in the individual welfare, and the individual welfare lies in the collective welfare. By doing good to the individuals, the collectivity is benefited. By doing good to the collectivity, the individuals are benefited.

For doing good to the individuals, the development of the collective body, collective mind, and collective spiritual bearing must be effected. Toward this end, Principle 3 advocates maximum utilization of all physical, mental, and spiritual potentialities of the individual and collective organisms.

Life consists in growth. Therefore, the greatest social welfare can only be accomplished when we provide for the future possibilities that are latent in the individuals and collectivities. (Here, *collective* may be interpreted on any level from the smallest family to the entire society.)

Principle 1 dealt with social ethics, and Principle 2 dealt with economics. Principle 3 deals with the areas of education, relief, and welfare. The fields of individual and social relief work, both preventative as well as curative, come within the scope of this third principle. Thus, most of the ecological precepts dealing with any form of life are contained in this principle (for example, saving the dying species and prevention of cruelty to animals and plants).

Here we also find the guidelines for a total education system. True education consists of imparting more than just physical development or worldly wisdom. The mind and spirit must also be developed. Hence, a complete education must include a correct understanding of corporate living (both the knowledge involved as well as a sense of service) and spirituality (in combination with spiritualistic mentality).

Also embodied in Principle 3 are the ideals related to the field of welfare work. Take for example the so-called penal system. Society should administer justice to criminals in the form of correction, not punishment. Although a mistake may have been committed, this does not mean that a person's life no longer has value or potential. Revenge is not the principle behind either human or divine justice. The principle is rectification. Hence, capital punishment is an inhuman absurdity. The major problems of deterring criminal behavior will have to be solved not through fear or repression but through the processes of a proper education and a healthy socioeconomic system.

A discussion of Principle 3 cannot be complete without noting the unique viewpoint of PROUT on the relationship between the individual and the collectivity. According to PROUT, no conflict exists between the interests of the individual and the collective welfare. What is good for one is good for all. What is good for all is good for one. To properly understand this point, one must have a spiritual outlook rather than a materialistic outlook. If one takes a materialistic view, then there will surely be conflict between individual and collectivity. This supposed conflict of interests may be theoretically resolved in favor of the individual or the collectivity (depending on whether one's economic theory is capitalist or communist); however, upon close examination, we find that always both individual and collectivity suffer as a result of the unbalanced view of materialists. Alternatively, a spiritualist, like any mature individual, is not blinded by short-term

happiness but rather looks for a long-term and more lasting condition. From the spiritual point of view then, society must find a well-balanced medium between individual and collective interests if we are to maximize the happiness and welfare for one and all.

At this point, the question of liberty arises. All of the materialistic social philosophies prominent today promise liberty to the people. Whether the credo be “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” or “liberty, equality, fraternity”, or “bread, peace, and liberty”, communists, capitalists, anarchists, and even the most ruthless dictators eventually tend to justify their regime on the promise or the carefully conjured illusion of liberty for the people. The fact of the matter is, though, that this liberty does not exist, never did exist, and never will exist. Society has not the power nor is it the true purpose of society to provide liberty to the people. Wherever we find more than one object, neither entity can claim total liberty. Society is obviously the conglomeration of numerous entities. In our social context, we each of us are constrained by countless restrictions and responsibilities.

Should we weigh in the balance our various rights on the one hand and our duties on the other hand, it is always duty or responsibility that will tip the scales. Hence, in this relative world, there can never be absolute freedom. Complete liberty is only possible for the individual in the subjective sphere when unit existence merges into the infinite, primeval and eternal Consciousness. Only then, with the full awareness that everything in this universe is but an extension of one’s own being – only then when one has the full sensation that all is one – can real liberty be realized. Liberty is in essence a transcendental experience, not a common social right. If one truly has liberty, then none can take it away. If one does not have liberty, then no government of this world can provide it. For this reason, all of the great spiritualists throughout history have viewed life in this relative world as a type of bondage and have understood the real purpose of life for the individual to be struggle for emancipation. Thus, these spiritualists often spoke or speak of the supreme human condition (or, perhaps better to say, the supra-human condition) in terms such as *liberation* and *salvation*.

If we accept that liberty is an unreasonable, unnatural, unattainable, and even undesirable social goal, then what is the sensible ideal for human society? Only one ideal can enthrone the highest potential of society. That ideal is universalism. And, in order to achieve universalism, humanity must establish an exploitation-free community. In a PROUTist society, the words *freedom* and *liberty* can only mean freedom from exploitation. The basic rights of every individual must always center around the concept that none should be exploited for the selfish gain of any individual or even the collectivity. This is not to say that the living beings should not be utilized. Rather, universalism places great responsibility upon each individual to contribute to the collective welfare, and it is certainly fitting for society to encourage a healthy contribution from everyone. However, each individual’s utilization should at least be natural, even if that utilization might not be completely voluntary. For example, society’s duty to the individual is to provide the basic physical requirements of life. Nevertheless, it is not at all desirable for society to provide these basic necessities in the form of a handout, as such an approach might well lead to social stagnation and individual corruption. Everyone should be encouraged and given the opportunity to work for their living, thereby providing some useful social service. However, the doctrine of anti-exploitation demands that this employment be in accordance with the individual’s interests and skills. Failure to provide such employment must be taken as a social lapse, with full responsibility resting in the administrative deficiency of the relevant governmental body.

Principle 3 provides the remaining elements in PROUT’s social ideal of universalism that were lacking in Principles 1 and 2. But the Progressive Utilization Theory is not finished at this point. Some practical and existential questions must yet be answered. It is still conceivable that more than one approach might reasonably fulfill the demands of the first three principles. Hence, for our

socioeconomic theory to be complete, a solution must be offered to the following questions and their like: how should social decisions be made, who should make these decisions, on what basis should these decisions be founded, what degree of flexibility should be allowed in the decisions, how frequently must the decisions be reevaluated, and so on. Ultimately, there still remains the problem of not merely establishing universalism but also of optimizing its expression. Without taking this into account, universalism itself is threatened. Hence, Principles 4 and 5 provide a stable and a practical base for universal society as well as the vision whereby the glory of society may ever be expanded.

## Principle 4 (Administration)

*There should be a proper adjustment among the crude, subtle, and causal utilizations.*

Due to nature, it is not humanly possible to do everything at once. Often, doing one thing precludes the possibility of doing another. Each and every action has its various repercussions and side-effects. Hence, society must give due consideration to all of these interrelationships. Inspired by the thought of individual and collective benevolence, society will have to work in such a way as to maintain a healthy parallelism and concord among all the crude, subtle, and causal resources. Society must set priorities as to the type of work to be done, and also it must guide the way in which that work is accomplished. In the words of Principle 4, "There should be a proper adjustment among the crude, subtle, and causal utilizations." Here the term *proper adjustment* calls for a decision based on a consideration of the inherent value of the resource set against the background of socioeconomic necessity.

What are these crude, subtle, and causal utilizations? As mentioned earlier, they may be broken down with reference to the so-called animate and inanimate worlds. The animate world contains physical, mental, and spiritual utilizations. The inanimate world contains mundane, supramundane, and divine utilizations. Hence the problem of proper adjustment must be tackled in terms of three different interrelationships.

First, there must be proper adjustment among the mundane, supramundane, and divine utilizations. For example, a single plot of land may be used for agriculture, higher education, or as a center for spiritual awakening. If the environment is particularly suitable for meditation or has some sacred significance, its best use may well be the latter. Otherwise, it may be more suitable as a college or university or, lastly, it may be best utilized for agriculture. The first instance is generally more rare than the second, and the second more rare than the third. A plot of land will usually be utilized in accordance with its rarest potential; however, making a proper adjustment demands that the decision as to the actual utilization of that plot of land be taken not only on the basis of that plot's greatest capacity but also in the context of all of the land that is available to the community and the real value of that land in light of the socioeconomic needs of the community.

In the second case, there must be a proper adjustment among the physical, mental, and spiritual utilizations. Here (and in the third case) the analysis varies little whether we consider these physical, mental, and spiritual utilizations in terms of the individual or the collectivity. For convenience, our example will take the individual point of view. Thus, a particular person may be endowed with mainly physical capacity and little mental or spiritual capacity. Such a person should obviously do service in accordance with his or her physical capacity, rather than the mental or spiritual capacities. Should a person be endowed with two capacities (generally, physical and mental), society will benefit more by taking greater mental service and less physical service from that person. This also will probably be more satisfying to the concerned individual. Finally, in those instances where three endowments are present (that is, physical, mental, and spiritual), society benefits most by taking greatest use of the spiritual services, less use of the mental services, and least use of the physical services. This, too, will probably be most satisfying to the

individual.

The spiritual capacity is rarer than the mental capacity, and the mental capacity is rarer than the physical capacity. Those with only physical capacity can do little by themselves. Rather, they toil at the instance of those with mental and spiritual power. Even the intellectuals have a limited vision. Hence, they are best guided by the spiritualists due to their universal or comprehensive understanding and sympathy. Those with spiritual capacity can do the greatest service to society, while those with mental capacity but not spiritual capacity can do less. Those with only physical capacity, though not unimportant, can do the least service to society.

It also should be noted that while taking physical or mental service from persons, the different skills of the individuals and collectivities must be considered. It would be foolish to use a car mechanic as a receptionist or a mathematician as a surgeon. Even in the spiritual realm, different degrees of attainment or capacity must be noted and catered to. Of course, while taking services from the living beings per Principle 4, we must not forget the dictates of Principle 3, which call for a constant effort to expand the various capacities or skills of the individuals and collectivities.

Finally, in the third case, we are concerned with a proper adjustment with a proper adjustment between the animate and the inanimate worlds. In other words, we must find the best way to distribute the mundane, supramundane, and divine wealth to the individuals and the collectivities, and we must make maximum utilization of both the animate and the inanimate resources. For example, society is committed to provide the minimum necessities to all, but if society simply doles out these goods on a silver platter, then the individuals will become lazy. Therefore, society need only make provision that each individual may acquire these minimum necessities in exchange for his or her labor as per capacity. Furthermore, recognizing the differences in individual taste, it will give greatest pleasure to the individuals should society distribute these necessities indirectly by furnishing the individuals with money or buying power rather than the actual commodities. So also, while raising the standard of minimum necessities, it will be best simply to enhance the individual's buying power (and, also, the standard of product that the individual can buy).

In the mental and supramundane spheres, a proper adjustment implies that the supramundane commodities will be provided to the individuals and collectivities in a congenial fashion. For example, education is a must, but it will have to be presented in such a manner as to be enjoyed and appreciated by the students.

Another important factor to consider with respect to distribution of supramundane wealth is the elasticity of that wealth. Mundane wealth has very little elasticity. What one person has, another person generally cannot have. So, depending on supply and demand, relatively strict constraints must be placed on the way mundane wealth is distributed. But supramundane wealth often has great elasticity. For example, an inspiring song that one person enjoys can easily be enjoyed by others as well. Therefore, as far as possible, people should be encouraged to seek acquisition of supramundane wealth rather than mundane wealth.

With regard to the spiritual and divine spheres, the divine resources must be distributed in such fashion as to maintain their sacred nature. For example, a mantra or meditation technique might be given only to those qualified individuals, and even then it could best be given privately and with provision for maintaining secrecy. Similarly, a shrine or relic related to some past spiritual master will have to be strictly maintained in order to preserve its holy vibration.

With regard to maximum utilization of both the animate and inanimate forms, we can take a simple agricultural example. In this era of mechanization, tractors, if available, should preferably be used for the toilsome work of plowing a field. This will generally increase efficiency and also provide greater scope to the oxen or human beings for other, possibly more productive endeavors.

At this point one might enquire as to the distinction between Principle 4 and Principle 2. While it is true that Principle 4 has much to do with optimum production and rational distribution, the difference is that Principle 4 is concerned mainly with the manner whereby that optimum production and rational distribution is achieved. For example, making a proper adjustment in light of the dynamic nature of life means to set up various incentives in the socioeconomic system. Thus the concept of incentives is one contribution of Principle 4 that is not contained in Principle 2. Similarly, Principle 4 offers a guideline on the difficult problem of setting priorities for the different utilizations. Moreover, by extending the principle of proper adjustment among the physical, mental, and spiritual utilizations of the individuals and collectivities, Principle 4 sheds light on the controversial issue of political leadership. Thus we see that Principle 4 is largely a principle that guides the various aspects of administration.

Who should hold the reins of socioeconomic administration? As mentioned earlier, the human beings vary as to their endowments in the physical, mental, and spiritual realms. Those with mainly physical capacity, the so-called masses, are not capable of governing society. Those with both physical and mental capacity have the ability to govern, and so it is useful to examine them more closely. These persons with greater mental capacity may be broken down into three sociopsychic classes. Those with psychic capacity aimed towards worldly gain are called *capitalists*. Those with psychic capacity aimed towards worldly conquest are called *warriors* (including adventurers, athletes, soldiers, and the like). And those with psychic capacity aimed towards creative knowledge or the supramundane are called *intellectuals* (including artists, writers, scientists, teachers, and the like). Although these groupings are very general, they are not arbitrary, for governmental control has passed hands among these three sociopsychic groups throughout history with only brief interludes when the masses held power and chaos reigned.

It is clear that these three psychic classes are technically capable of administration; however, this does not mean that they should be in full control of society. If we look closely at history, all of these three groups have exhibited the eventual tendency to abuse the position of leadership for selfish exploitation of the rest of society. Hence, they should never be entrusted with full social control. This social control should ideally be in the hands of those possessing all three endowments of physical, mental, and spiritual capacity. Only they have the universal outlook, courage, and intelligence to best administer society on a permanent basis.

Does this mean then that government should be directly controlled by the spiritualists? In fact, this is not advisable today. For many reasons, it proves disadvantageous to mix politics and spirituality too closely. Whenever this happens, both the politician and the spiritualist are compromised. The politician is viewed as being self-righteous or as having a holier-than-thou attitude, which makes him or her unpopular in some quarters. The spiritualist is seen as being interested only in worldly power, which makes people distrustful. Therefore, it will be best if the spiritualists control society indirectly by working through the governmental administrations of the capitalists, warriors, or intellectuals as the case may be or by changing that administration through evolutionary or revolutionary processes whenever necessary. Of course, in the future, it may prove desirable and acceptable for spiritualists to take a more direct control over social administration; however, at present, this is definitely not the case.

With regard to the detailed management of society, it is not necessary to be much more specific here. No doubt there will be countless social boards, federations, or unions to look after the needs or rights of the individuals and collectivities on the different levels (village, district, and so on). These boards will also have to educate the individuals and collectivities as to their various social responsibilities as well. To what degree the government will control these various boards may well vary; however, there is no possibility of the government controlling the spiritualists (or the Board of Sadvipras). This is due solely to their comprehensive knowledge, their universal outlook, and

their moral commitment to serve society on all levels. That transcends any question of ordinary legalistic constraints.

## Principle 5 (Social Metaphysics)

*Utilizations vary in accordance with time, space, and form; these utilizations should be of a progressive nature.*

Absolute truth is that which is stable and unchanging. This universe is relative truth. Although its existence cannot be denied, still it never remains the same. Rather, it is always changing.

This perpetual change is observable with regard to three factors: time, space, and form. Each of these three factors also has three dimensions. In time, there are past, present, and future. In space, there are length, width, and depth. And in form, there are heterogeneity, homogeneity, and endogeneity. In other words, to properly identify any form, we must take into account all of the possible heterogeneous, homogeneous, and endogenous considerations. To further explain the three dimensions of form, let us take as an example the left arm of a boy named Tom. First of all, the mention of the term “boy” conveys the message that we are concerned with a human being rather than any other of the myriad heterogeneous possibilities. This then locates our form in the human family rather than any other of the many heterogeneous possibilities. Secondly, by specifying a “boy”, we also eliminate many of the homogeneous possibilities within the human genus such as girls, women, and men. Furthermore, we also narrow down the homogeneous field by referring to a particular boy named “Tom”, as opposed to any other boy. Finally, we find the endogenous distinction of the “left arm”, which is distinct from any other portion of the body.

Really speaking, this entire universe is nothing but a cosmic formation. Within this super-form, we find all of the nine dimensions. For completeness, we might envisage a tenth dimension of pure Consciousness; but as Consciousness is the rudimental cosmic concomitant – infinite, indivisible, and eternal – it is not really a practical measuring tool or dimension. The tenth dimension is purely theoretical.

Because this universe is constantly in motion, nothing can remain stable. Space expands or contracts, time shifts, and form metamorphoses. Time, space, and form are all intertwined. Whenever one varies, the other two also vary. Form is affected by space in that it must adapt with the environment. Time also changes form through processes like aging and erosion. Time is affected by space, because distance from an object creates a time lag between that object’s present condition and what an observer witnesses. Moreover, one moving through space at higher velocities may discover later that time had slowed down. Time is also affected by form. Depending on the metabolism and irritability of the different creatures, both the life span and the sense of passing time will vary. Space is affected by form. Different forms emit different vibrational fields, as for instance the gravitational force of the earth or the magnetic field of a lodestone. Finally, space is affected by time, as evidenced by the effects of the changing seasons of the year. Hence, as a result of these perpetual changes in time, space, and form, utilizations must inevitably change also. Like it or not, utilizations must and do vary. Society has no choice but to be dynamic. Those who want to maintain the status quo or want to revert to outmoded conventions can offer no assistance in this ever-changing universe. Rather, they can only do harm to society.

As utilizations must change, these utilizations should be of progressive nature. Progress implies increase in quantity and quality. The standard of physical and mental existence should increase, and also the higher human sentiments and expressions should become more common. Moreover, the speed with which these progressive changes are made should also increase and continue to accelerate. Human life is like a great folk dance that goes on picking up speed as more and more



individual dancers spin off into the void while even more new dancers take their place or create new positions. As the dance goes on and the speed increases, the dancers become more adept, more agile. Their steps become more and more complex. Meanwhile, with the centrifugal and centripetal force created, the circle widens, aiming to embrace the entire universe. This is progress. Those who would direct society's cosmic dance must have a vision of the goal as well as an up-to-date and accurate understanding of the present conditions. With this knowledge, they must work in a practical fashion to keep society moving ever onwards and upwards. And also they must act as a strong nucleus to hold society together – to keep society from fragmenting into petty groupings based on cliquish sentiments.

Principle 5 is the basis of all socioeconomic planning. It calls for maximum flexibility and creativity in guiding society's collective movement toward universalism. Those with responsibility for socioeconomic planning will have to constantly adjust their programs to account for changes in time, space, and form. For example, time may be present, future, or past. Agricultural programs must vary with the seasons, while the various needs of society must be plotted out years in advance. Now, as we enter an age of space travel and exploration, we may come across planets less civilized and evolved than our own. Under such conditions, our behavior toward them will have to be very carefully considered. Here our responsibility will be very great to guide such a planet toward a progressive civilization, and consequently we will be far more concerned with developing the living potentialities existing on that planet than with exploiting the animate or inanimate resources there for our own selfish purposes. It must always be remembered that imperialism is neither the guiding philosophy nor the ultimate goal of PROUT. The consummate ideal of PROUT is universalism.

Similarly, we must be progressive with regard to space. Whether we be exploring the universe or developing the planet surface or farming the ocean floor or drilling for mineral reserves deep within the bowels of the earth, we must face all big or small obstacles courageously and with a humanitarian spirit.

Finally, with regard to form, we must be progressive in the practical use of every object and every concept. The strength of a human being that is being used for lifting rocks today should be multiplied thousands of times tomorrow with the help of mechanized cranes developed by scientific research. The governments that separately control nations today must be unified under the guidance of a world government tomorrow, and the world governments must be united under the benevolent administration of a universal government thereafter. The hundreds of spiritualists today must become thousands tomorrow and millions the next day. All of these progressive adaptations in form must be taken up with due consideration for the highest practical and evolutionary potentials of the concerned object or objects.

Really speaking, though utilization varies in accordance with time, space, and form, still it is mainly form that we utilize. To be precise, we actually utilize the Consciousness that is manifest in the diverse forms. Rarely do we think of utilizing time or space; or, if we do so think, it is generally with reference to some particular form or else we convert that time or space into a type of form. For example, we may think that the human being has a limited lifespan or that there are only twenty-four hours in a day. Thus we say that human beings should make best use of their time. Actually, what we mean is that best use should be made of the human being, considering the constraints of time. Similarly, we may say that we are utilizing space when we go to one country for mining coal and another country for mining uranium. In fact, we are only utilizing our mining equipment to recover the coal and uranium that exist in different spaces. Hence, we see that time and space are only variations with regard to form, which also varies with regard to itself. Form is our major concept, and it is form that we utilize. And as form is always changing, always in motion, accordingly our utilizations of form must vary with respect to time, space, and form. For

example, if the form be water, then by variation of space from warm climate to cold or by variation of time from summer season to winter, that same water might be either liquid or solid. It then is obvious that the utilization of water and the utilization of ice must differ.

Principle 5 breathes life into the Five Fundamental Principles of PROUT. It is the source of PROUT's universality and eternity. Because the outlook is progressive, Principle 5 also provides perfection, so far as life allows. Social perfection is never any fixed or stable state of being. It is, rather, a state of dynamic and healthy growth. Hence, we may say that Principle 5 provides the metaphysical source of living perfection, upon which the other four fundamental principles are well founded.

#### **4.4 The Challenge**

Any reliable theory must be based on sound observation and insight. A reliable theory must also have some practical application, for it is only by applying a theory that it is tested.

PROUT is a socioeconomic theory. Its purpose, as already mentioned, is to facilitate the good and happiness of all. Toward this end, the Five Fundamental Principles embody the essence of PROUT's practical theory. These Five Fundamental Principles have been based on a keen observation of history, humanity, and this universe, coupled with a deep insight into the nature and purpose of life. The theory is complete. Nothing remains but the test.

Now, on behalf of all of the suffering plants, animals, and people of the world, a gauntlet has been flung down on planet Earth. That gauntlet is PROUT. Let all those who are the true lovers of society rise to the occasion. Let us pick up this gauntlet and accept the great challenge. Moralists of the world – unite!