

CHAPTER : V

SOME MODERN PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY

Common man's aversion to philosophy :

Philosophy has to face many problems; what while modern common man has practically no philosophical problems as such. He feels he can do without philosophy and is confident that he fares well without it. Why to bother about it ? Reality is reality. What is there to fear and philosophise ? Why raise hair-splitting and abstract arguments about it?

In a sense he is right. It is a common belief that there is reality. There needs no philosophy to prove and plead for it. It is assumed by all. Each and every being consciously or unconsciously believes that there exists reality. Things and activities of universe and life are a proof of it. Reality is ~~it~~ in the nature of things. It is their essence. It is by their reality that things are what they are. Otherwise, anything would have been everything or nothing. And as reality remains reality, common man in modern times seems unmindful of or averse to the philosophy proper, philosophy of the ultimate reality.

He does not say to the scientist : "Away with the atomic theory ! A cup of tea is a cup of tea and never a sea of dancing electrons to me. No human eye can perceive your electrons. They are merely abstractions^c and are a matter of hypotheses and generalizations. Why bother about them ?

The world is not atomic. It is of things and beings." On the contrary he takes interest in the technical affairs of atomic energy as the mediaval man took interest in the clergyman. This tendency of a modern man is not without a basis. Science and technology can make or mar human civilization. It may take man to moon and bring heaven upon earth perhaps ! What can philosophy and religion do ? Great wars have been waged in the name of religion ! Centuries have been wasted over the problem of perception and conception and philosophers have neither perceived nor conceived anything epoch-making !

Man's progress partial :

Science and technology are indeed awe-inspiring. Man takes interest in it either out of fear or fondness. Apparently as they can make or mar the whole of human civilization, man is obliged to give attention to them, no doubt. But why man affords to remain ignorant of his own personality and powers which really have given birth to this science and technology ? One can easily understand that man himself and not God is the creator of those mighty weapons, works and wonders of atomic energy. And yet he is going to be the creature of his own creations. Cannot modern man realize his defeat in his victory^{of} his failure in his success ? Can he not find out the cause of this critical, contradictory and trying situation in his dynamic life ?

If man is merely and human, his higher aspirations cannot allow him to remain contented with his one-sided progress. Man of land and water, of air and space is nearly a superman. It is a man of intelligence. But where are we to find man of wisdom ? Man of intelligence is not a full man, he is

partial. We want a full man, a real man, which is almost unknown and ignored !

Man's drawback :

Something is wrong with man. What is it ? Science and technology is too much with him that he is lost therein heart and soul. With all his high civilization and culture he is materialistic in aims and efforts. It is suicidal. "Despite its stupendous ^{OU} insanity, the world of matter is too narrow for him. Like his economic and social environment, it does not fit him."

Dr. Radhakrishnan writes ~~about~~ about our modern world : " There is not a necessary connection between learning and wisdom.....Our modern world is maintaining the cleavage between learning and wisdom".¹ He further quotes Urban : "Perhaps at no other time have men been so knowing and yet so unaware, so burdened with purposes and yet so purposeless, so disillusioned and so completely the victims of illusion. This strange contradiction pervades our entire modern culture, our science and our philosophy, our literature and our art !"²

Our Task :

What should we do then ? What is our task ? " We should liberate man from the cage created by genius of physicists and astronom^ers, that cage in which, since the Renaissance, he has been imprisonedWe cannot adhere to the faith in its exclusive reality. We know that we are not altogether comprised within its dimensions, that we extend somewhere else outside

1. Principal Upanishads, p. 541.

2. The Intelligible World, p. 172.

the physical continuum."¹

Flight of Philosophy :

Philosophy itself which had once summoned all sciences to its aid in making a coherent image of the world and an alluring picture of the good, found its task of co-ordination too stupendous for its courage, ran away from all these battle - forms of truth, and hid itself in recondite and narrow lanes, timidly secure from the issues and responsibilities of life. Human knowledge had become too great for the human mind."²

"222

"Perspective was lost. Facts replaced understandings; and knowledge, spirit into a thousand isolated fragments, no longer generated wisdom".³

The task before philosopher :

Philosophy is said to be love of wisdom. So, now in such a situation, when wisdom is needed most, what is the task of philosophy ?

Will Durant hopes for "the time.....when philosophy will again be understood as the synthetic interpretation of all experience rather than the analytic description of the mode and process of experience itself. Analysis belongs to science and gives us knowledge, philosophy must provide a synthesis for wisdom."⁴

Joad writes about its function : "The function of philosophy, as I conceive it, is the endeavour to understand every aspect of universe. Philosophy, that is to say, takes cognizance not, like physics or biology,

1. Alexis Carrel : Man the Unknown, p. 297.

2-3-4. Will Durant, : The story of philosophy, Preface.

of a special department of the universe, but of the whole mass of data to which the moral intuitions of the ordinary man, the religious consciousness of the saint, the aesthetic enjoyment of the artist, and the history of the human race, no less than the discoveries of the physicist and biologist, contribute."¹

Again by quoting C.A. Moore it would be more clear.

"Philosophy, to be philosophy, must be universal. It must be the study of all time and all existence, and its data must include the experiences and the insights of all mankind. The total truth is the very life-blood of philosophy as well as the essential need of the world.

"Whatever else it is, philosophy must be dominated by the attitude of total perspective - call it one-world perspective or the study of all time and all existence."²

Moore, he quotes Gregg M. Sinclair : "It must be borne in mind that philosophy is the basis of individual and social behaviour. Just as pure science precedes applied science so pure thought precedes applied thought. Herein lies the importance of philosophy."

So this means firstly the study of all time and all existence, one-world perspective, rather the omniscience view, or totality view, atleast according to human capacity, is the first necessity for its being philosophy.

1. Philosophical Aspects of Modern Science. p. 340-341.

2. Essays In East-West Philosophy, : Introduction.

Secondly, as it includes experiences and insights of all mankind, it must be wisdom of mankind earned through ages.

Thirdly, it being a basis for behaviour, it must be a key to living up to the human ideals to reach the ultimate goal of mankind.

How great is the task? On realising its grandeur and responsibility Brinod Rajchandra has stated that 'metaphysics (tatva-dharma) should be established or preached on the authority or the capacity of omniscience.'

But the matter does not rest there. It is not everything. The view of the totality itself is not wisdom. The wise has some purpose behind it, whereby knowledge serves the wisdom. "There are seven purposes", he writes, "in stating what is known through omniscience or Absolute knowledge -
- kevaljñāna :

1. In order to state reality as it is or to state things in their reality.
2. In order to contemplate over the things.
3. In order to make one believe in them.
4. In order to have a right belief or view, *ananyakṛtva*.
5. In order to observe soul-compassion.
6. In order to have enlightenment.
7. In order to attain liberation by destroying faults and vices.

Our first question will be, why the reality of things be stated on the strength of kevaljñāna^a, omniscience. The task of philosophy is tremendous^e.

It must have totality view of all the reality. Omniscience alone can know perfectly things the things in their reality, and it alone can know all the reality, it alone can give us a view of its totality. It can know all reality in its different aspects both separately and synthetically.

When and then alone can man have a thorough insight into the life and universe and can arrive at supreme eternal values on the strength of which he can build up his civilisation and vitalise the eternal life, having eternal bliss as its final goal.

Man has to think over the reality thus known, has to have right view of it and attain enlightenment so as to turn out able to help all souls in pursuing the right path of self-purification and perfection for attainment achieving the supreme bliss - liberation.

Sure and shorter approach :

So now ^{to} have knowledge of all time and all existence is the first problem. And we come to the same formerly observed Upanisadic question : " Is there anything which being known everything can be known ? " The question is in keeping with the philosophic spirit, no doubt; for, philosophy = tatvajñāna = means knowledge of reality = the essence of things that make things what they are. It is commonly believed that there is reality in things. It is generally a faith of philosophers that there must be some ultimate reality as the basis of all this. If that ultimate reality is known we can have a clue of final solution of all the problems. It would really serve as a key to knowledge and wisdom of the universe. Hence the search of philosophers for the ultimate reality, which being

known everything else becomes known - ' ekan jñāten sarvam jñānam bhavati' -
 Egam jānai sō sarvam jānai. This principle has been preached and pre-
 -achised by Srīmad Rajachandra, following in the foot steps of the Great
 Mahaveer and innumerable enlightened seers.

Now what is that one ? It is nothing but the self, the soul within.
 As we have already seen in the first chapter that Srīmad, while
 interpreting the key principle - ' egam jānai sō sarvam jānai', clearly
 states that " By knowing the soul alone, thou shalt know the whole
 universe and all." Now what is that soul or self ? To make us realise
 that soul he has written the gospel called the self-realisation, Ātmavi-
 -śāhi which is described by Dr. Sukhlalji Pandit as Srīmad's Ātmapanīśad.

The six principles, a basis for solution :

Now it remains for us to see whether the six principles established
 in that booklet serve as a key for the solution of our major problems of
 philosophy. In order to avoid repetition we shall simply mention them
 precisely and shall put our problems and shall seek solution their solution
 by applying mainly these key principles. These six key principles laid
 down by Srīmad are precisely as follows :-

1. There is immaterial soul, ever conscious by nature, distinct
 from matter and body, senses vital and mind.
2. The soul exists eternally. It is un-created and indestructible.
 It persists substantially through all the formal changes,. Though
 united with body, it is not made by any union of other elements.

Though it undergoes birth^h-cycles it is above births and deaths.

3. All things are having their own activity, all things are seen ever with some or other manifestation of activity. The soul too is having its own activity. As it is having activity it is in fact the Agent. The soul is the agent in three ways :
From the absolute point of view, the soul by modification of its own nature is the agent or the author of its own self-manifestations whereby it maintains its own natural selfhood. Secondly as the soul has entered into union with the matter, from the^a rational point of view, when conversant with other things the soul is the author of its mundane actions. Thirdly, as conventionally attributed, the soul is the manufacturer or an architect of buildings, cities and the like.
4. Soul being author of its own actions it is responsible, for them and undergoes the consequences of their fruition.
5. There is the state of liberation wherein Soul stands omniscient^t absolute, pure and perfect, enjoying eternal bliss.
6. There are means for liberation like enlightenment, right belief (faith) and right conduct - the path of self-purification called religion - dharma.

Problem of ultimate reality :

First and foremost problem of philosophy is to know ultimate reality. Philosophy and religion have been evolved out in our search of ultimate reality when man was dissatisfied with his piecemeal approach he set himself to the task of viewing the world in its totality. When the man was dissatisfied with this changing world he ^{went} view on searching out

something ultimately real, in it. Philosophers wanted something ultimate as the basis of this world, something as ultimate criterion for truth, some ultimate source of all knowledge, some ultimate standard for ethics, some ultimate goal for realization or perfection, some ultimate abode for enjoying eternal bliss.

They started with different approaches and drew different conclusions regarding it. So no final agreement is reached among themselves and the common man remains puzzled in his problems unsolved. Now let us try if we can justify this very self as ultimate in various ways.

Self shown as ultimate epistemologically :

The most puzzling thing is the problem of epistemology and it has dealt a fatal blow in the modern philosophy. Will Durant writes : "The author believes that epistemology has kidnapped modern philosophy and well-nigh ruined it."¹ But if we take the spiritualistic approach of Srimal, we can set the epistemologists right. The sceptic is caught as if red-handed, while doubting about the soul as a conscious self in the doubter. At the extreme of scepticism one comes to realize something within as ultimate which cannot be doubted. Positivist believes positive experience as the source of knowledge and takes objects of the sense experience as existent. But nothing is more positive, in any such experience than the experiencing self within, without which experience is never a possibility. Srimal questions him and sets him right : " You know the pot and cloth and therefore believe in their existence and yet do not believe in the knower himself, then what can be said of your knowledge ?" (ASG.55).

1. The story of Philosophy.

No knowledge is valid without the ultimate basis or authority of the knower - the soul. No knower, no knowledge. For any type of knowledge knower is the first requisite. Source of all knowledge is the knower - the conscious self. It is ultimate and immediate in all events of know^{ing}ing. Sensationist can account of sensations on the strength of senses but the senses work not of their own accord, they are merely the tools of the soul, which perceives through senses. "The body does not perceive, nor do the senses, nor the vital; all function by the power and presence of the self." (A.S.55). The Phenomenalist is made to realize the soul - the seer of the phenomenon above phenomenon and momentariness - The holder of phenomenalism within, turns out to be the soul/~~the~~ who survives momentariness. (A.S.69). Science develops on the strength of senses and reason, on percepts and concepts; but the holder of percepts and concepts is verily none but the soul. So there too we find soul as the ultimate upholder of scientific and rational knowledge. Empiricism bases itself on the strength of genuine experience, but when it insists only on sense experience and ignores the experiencing element, the soul without which no experience is possible it cuts the very grounds under its own feet. Empiricism in order to be a philosophy proper must take the experiencing self and all its experiences in account, and when it comes to this proper stand of it, it will realize soul as the ultimate and instant and immediate element in every experience. Srimad's answer to the empiricist is: "The seer of the sight, the knower of the form and one that prevails as an uneliminated experience is verily the soul." (A.S.91).

So to conclude, the sceptic, the positivist, the phenomenalist, sensationist, the empiricist, the rationalist and the scientist one and

all cannot stand without accepting soul as ultimate for establishing their facts. Intuitionist and the mystic do not admit senses or mind as the source of intuition. They feel that there must be something at the basis of them all and it cannot be other than conscious element, ^{obviously} the soul itself.

It will be convenient to consider afterwards the soul's ultimacy in epistemology from the Idealist's and Realist's view points, as there is metaphysical involvement.

Perspective of the totality:

As we have observed that it is the task of philosophy to give man a perspective of the totality of things, of the whole reality, in order to make him realise his status, goal, responsibility and duty in the world - the universe at large. It requires a world perspective.

Śrīmad's view of the cosmos:

So now let us consider first Śrīmad's view of the cosmos and find therein soul's place and then shall we turn to man, his status and responsibility, his goal and duty. This view of cosmos we are considering to have a setting for his six key principles regarding self, the ultimate reality. They are comprised within the frame of metaphysical setting of cosmos viewed here. Śrīmad writes:

"There is infinite space.

Therein lies the universe composed of the conscious and the non-conscious.

The universe is limited by the two non-perceptible original substances (dravyas) which are called Dharmastikāya and Adharmastikāya (the supporting principles and of movement and stability).

The soul and the matter (atoms) the two are active original substances.

All the original substances are substantially eternal.

Souls are infinite.

Atomic matter is infinitely infinite.

Dharmastikāya is single.

Adharmastikāya is single.

Space is single.

Time is also a dravya." (S.R. p.919)

"Universe is beginningless.

Space is all-pervading.

There in is situated the Loka.

The Loka (the Cosmos) is full of the conscious and the non-conscious.

Dharma, and Adharma, Space, Time and Padgal (the matter) are the non-conscious (jada) substances.

Soul is conscious.

Dharma, Adharma, Space and Time are imperceptible (Amūrta) substances.

In reality Time is a derived substance (aupacārika)."

(S.R. pp.930-931).

Six original substances (dravyas) considered:

Now let us consider how far they are reasonable and go to provide a proper structure of the universe.

Supposing there would have been absolutely no things. What else would have been there ? Plainly, the ~~a~~ vacant place that we call space. Even in absence of matter and soul there cannot be absence of space. Space is a principle of place. We can place a thing where there is space. So space is proved to be ever and everywhere. Now ^{what} are the limits or boundaries of space, or how far can it stretch ? Let us take anything as a centre and think of space from it on all sides stretching on and on. It will seem infinite, limitless. Now think of infinite atoms and souls scattered in infinite space. They would have been almost lost in so infinitely vast space, if there were nothing to bind them together and limit their movement. But as these planets, stars and suns, however far from one another seem to be united there must be some principle limiting them. Things seem moving and moving things stop. If there were no principle to help their stability once moved one won't be able to stop, and ~~was~~ were there no principle to help movement, steady things won't be able to move. So principles helping movement and stability are existing together with the active substances - souls and matter. But if the principles helping the movement were spread along with infinite space, then these souls and the matter would have been almost lost and won't remain limited and would not have a binding to have any structural form among them. These two principles being limited in space serve for the cosmos or the world as a background for becoming a composite whole. Otherwise they would have scattered in infinitely infinite space.

The six dravyas and their relations:

Now let us consider them in their relation. Śrīmad writes:

"Universe is beginningless.

Soul is anēdi.

Atoms - the pudgals - are anādi.

The union of the soul and the karmas (pudgal)
is anādi.

* * * *

The union is not by their nature but by vibhāva -
extraneous tendency." (S.R.p.800)

"The soul is natural.

The atom (paramanu) is natural.

Souls are infinite in number.

Atoms are infinite in number.

The union of the soul and the pudgal (matter) is anādi.

So far soul is united with the pudgal it is called
Sakarma jiva - the ^{soul} having karmas.

The soul is the author of the bhāva karma.

Bhāvakarma is called by another name Vibhāva.

It is due to the bhāvakarma (the extensiveness)
that the soul grasps the pudgal (the matter).

And thereby the soul gets embodied in the etheral,
the physical and other similar forms of body.

If it turns ~~and~~ averse to the bhāvakarma it
naturally becomes self-manifesting." (S.R. p.827)

The detailed view of the universe:

Let us have some detailed view of the universe from Srinad's
translation of Panchastikāya

3. "The substance-composite in the form of the union of the five original substances (existent entities) is called Loka by the omniscient, Vitaruga. Beyond it in the form of mere infinite space there exists limitless Aloka.

4-5. "The soul, the matter, Iharua, Adharua and the space - these substances by law of nature have remained bound in their own existence, are inseparable from their own existence, are extensive to many space limit points. Those that are by nature existing with many quantities and modifications (forms) are the (existents) astikaya. The world is composed of them.

6. "These Astikayas function as existent for all the three times i.e. eternally, they as well as time which has reflection as its characteristic are called Dravya.

7. "These Dravyas - original substances enter into one another, give space (room) to one another, unite with one another and part with one another, but do not give up their own nature.

8. "From the viewpoint of existence i.e. as the form of being all the substances maintain their integrality and identity. That being is by nature of infinite kinds, and is having infinite qualities and modifications (forms). The being is having utpada, vyaṃ and dhruvatva i.e. it bears change and permanence and commonness and uniqueness.

9. "As they function in their own modifications or manifest as their own self, they are called the dravya, which is identical and one with its own existence or being.

10. "The characteristic of the dravya (original substance) is *ant* (being) which is having *utpāda* = *vyaya* = *dhruvata* i.e. change and permanence, is the abode of qualities and modifications (forms), says the omniscient God.
11. "The dravya is without creation and destruction. It is existent by its very nature. *Utpāda*, *vyaya*, *dhruvata* are owing to modifications.
12. "There cannot be dravya without modifications, nor modifications without dravya. Both are co-existent, and never separate.
13. "There cannot be quality without dravya and dravya without quality, therefore both are inseparable.
14. "The existent is above destruction and the non-existent cannot come to existence. Creation and destruction are due to the very nature of quality and modification.
15. "The soul is the original substance. Its quality is consciousness - sentience, God, man, demon, animal etc. are its (soul's) various forms.
16. "One whose human form is destroyed becomes God or else turns out something else somewhere. At both the places the soul is constant - the same. The soul remains the same, it does not destroy nor does it become as something else.
17. "The very soul that took the birth suffers the death. In reality the soul is neither created nor destroyed. Creation and destruction are of human and heavenly form.

19. "Thus, it never happens that the existent (entity) undergoes destruction and non-existent (non-entity) comes to existence.
20. "The soul has firmly bound itself with the Jñānāvarāṇśya actions; by undoing, nullifying, them it becomes the Siddha Bhagavan - unique and unprecedented state.
22. "Soul, matter, space and other existents are not the creations of any one, they are themselves naturally existents and themselves are the cause of Loka - the world.
27. "Having the characteristic of life (jīvatva) the knower, ~~non~~ conscious ~~momentary~~ / gūḍy (prabhu), author of actions, and subject to their consequences (bhoktā) i.e. enjoyer of their fruition, the bodyized, in reality -/ ^{asurta} ~~asurta~~ - but in the state of bondage murta - such is the soul.
28. "On being free in every way from the impurity of the karma attaining the higher place in the extremity of the Loka - universe the soul becomes omniscient, omniscient (sarvadarśhī) and attains eternal bliss, happiness which is beyond senses.
29. "The soul becomes omniscient on the strength of its natural manifestation and attains eternal bliss on being free from its own actions (karmas).
34. "As in all the states of a body there exists during the whole life-time the same soul, so also in all the different mundane states there happened to be the same soul.

36. "In reality the realized state or the state of liberation is not a type of creation, it is not created as such; because it is not a result brought into existence by any other substance nor it is the cause of any such thing as its activities are not at all entangled with others.
40. "Consciousness is of two kinds - jnana and darsana. It is eternally same as the soul - it is ever one with it.
41. "Matl, Sruta, Avadhi, Manahparyaya and the Keval are the five kinds of knowledge. Kumati, Kusruta and the Vibhanga are three kinds of ajnana. All of them are different kinds of knowledge - consciousness.
43. "It is not that the soul is conscious because it has contact with the quality like knowledge; from the absolute point of view they are inseparable.
44. "If qualities and the dravya are separate, then one dravya would turn out into infinite ones or the dravya may lose its own identity and may vanish.
45. "Dravya - substance and the quality are inseparable; they have common pradash, not different ones. By the destruction of substance the quality destroys and then by the destruction of the quality the substance destroys. Such is ^{their} there oneness.
48. "Were knowledge and soul absolutely different, then either would have turned out non-conscious. Such is the principle of the omniscient Vitaraga.

51. "Colour, taste, smell and touch - these four characteristics are inseparable from the pudgalic atom. It is from the practical (vyāvahārika) point of view ^{they are} that ~~is~~ stated as different.
52. "In the ^{way the} same ~~the~~ jñāna and the darsana both are inseparable from the soul. From the practical point of view they are said to be different from the soul.
53. "The soul is eternal substantially, but as a series of events it is with the beginning as well as the end, and also it is with the beginning but without end. These distinctions are due to five different states of existence. But existentially the soul substance is eternal.
54. "And thus the destruction of sat i.e. existent and the creation of the non-existent though naturally contradictory are stated as proved a matter of non-contradiction by the omniscient vitarāga god.
60. "The soul functions as the udayadika manifestations on having the instance of dravyakarma and on the instance of the Bhavakarma there manifests the dravyakarma. Neither is the author of the manifestations of the other nor do they manifest without their doer or author.
61. "All are manifesting their own nature, the soul also is the ^{not} author of its manifestations and ~~for~~ the author of pudgal - material karma. These statements of the Vitarāga are worth understanding.

62. "Actions rightly manifest in reality according to their own nature; the soul by its very nature manifests the bhavakarma.
63. "If the actions perform actions and the soul manifests the selfhood, then who will undergo the consequences of the actions i.e. its fruition and to whom it will return the fruits thereof ?
64. "The whole universe is completely dense with the mass of matter, in the form of infinite fine and gross masses.
65. "When the soul manifests its nature i.e. consciousness in the form of Bhavakarma, the atomic matter there by its very nature takes the form of material karma and both of them get entangled with each other in the same space.
66. "Without any other agent or doer there, as the matter takes automatically the massive composite form, so also the matter itself naturally turns out to be the karma.
67. "The mass of matter and the soul both are firmly well composite with each other and on having their season the soul gets fruition thereof in the form of happiness and miseries.
68. "So the soul is the author and enjoyer of the karmabhāva. It (experiences) undergoes the fruition because of its vedak-
svabhāva - conscious nature.
69. "Thus the soul by its own manifestations becomes the author as well as the enjoyer - and such a soul covered with delusion loiter in the mundane world.

70. "By the pacification or destruction of delusion, the soul, having attained the path preached by the Vitarāga on becoming courageous, bold and pure by enlightenment and conduct, goes to the abode of liberation.
73. "The soul on being entirely free from the four-fold bondage, named Prakṛtibandha, Sthitibandha, Anubhāgibandha and Pradeśabandha, takes a transcendent flight. When in bondage or Samsara it goes in any direction other than 'vidiā'.
74. "The puṣṭi i.e. matter is of four kinds: Skandha, Skandhadeśa, Skandhapradeśa and Paramānu. The complete whole, all in all, is the Skandha, its half is 'deśa' and the half thereof is 'pradeśa' and the indivisible simple is 'paramānu'.
76. "The skandha that is by the nature capable of taking the gross and the fine forms of matter by the process of reduction and intaking is known by the nature of the Puṣṭi. It is of six kinds, of which the three worlds are formed.
77. "The ultimate basis of all the 'skandhas' is the paramānu. It is cat, aśat, single, indivisible and 'mūrta'.
81. "The source of one taste, one colour, one smell and two types of touch, the cause of the rise of the 'śabda' i.e. sound and when single in itself countless & 'anśabda' separable and single - though manifesting as the composite form of skandha, should be known as the paramānu.

92. "That which is enjoyed by the senses, and the substances like body, mind and 'karma' all those having form are one and all to be known as the 'paigai dravya' - matter.

99. "The soul and the matter are helping each other in their activities i.e. why they help each other in their interaction, others do not.
It is owing to the matter that the soul turns out active.....

121. "Neither the senses nor the body is the soul, but they are merely the means that the soul has adopted.

128. "The soul that is engrossed undoubtedly in the maanya is having the impure manifestation by which gives rise to the 'karmas' that lead to the good and bad births. (gati).

129. "Due to the birth or form (gati) one is having the body, by the body the senses and by the senses their objects (visaya) which are the causes for the rise of the attachment and hatred.

131. "The good and the bad feelings manifest according to the conscious manifestations of the soul due to ignorance attachment, hatred and the revelation of the mind.

132. "The soul incurs 'punya' by good feelings and the sins by bad feelings inculcated. (S.R. p. 586-595/766)

So now let us recapitulate the main points of this cosmic metaphysics true and simple.

Starting from this practical world of ours we find two kinds of activity -y conscious and non-conscious, and they owe their existence to the conscious and ~~the~~ non-conscious substances - the soul and matter - They are found with activity and movement. For their movement and poise there are two principles or original substances dravyas called as Dharma^{stikāya} and the Adharma^{stikāya} which help them in their movement and poise. This world is a composite whole of the matter and souls, and as such however, great it be it is limited in space. And it owes such limited yet well-compact union to these two principles which are also limited in space. Were they spread together with space, space would have been no space as such and this well-compact dense ^{world} ~~world~~ of matter and souls would have been different from what it is - As with space so also with time - We cannot think of timeless universe. With our concept of activity and change there is preconceived an idea of space and time, and both are felt endless unmade, immediate and eternal Time and space are ever there ^{whether} ~~whether~~ there be world of things or no world at all.

These four i.e. space and Time, Dharma^{stikāya} and the Adharma^{stikāya} are passive, while the soul and the matter are active. The former ones have a passive role in the affairs of the world ^{while} ~~which~~ the latter ones have an active role. The former ones do not interact with one another while the soul and the matter interact and thus both together are the active cause of the world.

The whole of the universe is dense with the mass of matter and infinite souls. The soul with its extendency bhāvakarma or vibhāva while remaining

itself conscious and manifesting its own conscious modifications react on the masses of matter which on its part remaining, non-conscious by nature react and get entangled with soul in the form of dravya karma. Now this soul due to this entanglement of the dravyakarma is prone to ex-tendency which in its turn incurs the bondage in the form of the dravya karma - This leads to the cycle of birth, death and rebirth which the soul undergoes and its being responsible for its actions i.e. karmas, undergoes the fruition thereof.

All the six dravyas - i.e. soul, matter, space, time, the Dharmas-tikāya and the Adharmastikāya manifest their nature and this principle works both as strength and a limit to their powers and capacities. Therein requires no Creator or creature to control or regulate, to create or destroy the world.

The soul is impure because of matter in the form of bondage or karmas. On being pure it attains perfection. With the increase of purity its power of knowledge etc. increases .

Importance of 'Evolutionism' as a thought system :

There are certain trends of thought peculiar to their own age which channel themselves in course of their development into one system of thought that forms the structure and spirit of the age. In this age of science and rationality trends like naturalism, realism, idealism in course of their development have tried to seek their strength and support in the thought of evolution. It is such a thought system occupying a key position in the thought of this age that it lays hold on all aspects of thought of our age.

20

It seems that the theory of evolution if rightly arrived at may serve as a metaphysical solution for problems regarding the universe and man, his duty and destiny, his status and responsibility in the universe. As reason of man by its very nature seeks some order, some system, something progressive in the body of knowledge he acquires, and as also man's will, spirit of freedom, and his ethical sense seek some ideals to realize and some basis of reality for the fair play of his energy and his talents to articulate in some activities and achievements, the concept of evolution may prove highly satisfactory, especially in this era of developing scientific outlook, rather the age of science and technology. So it will be worthwhile to consider the concept of evolution and find out how far the idea of evolution is in conformity with our simple metaphysics stated by Sri Aurobindo.

Urban has finally put his ideas regarding the concept of evolution in his own intelligible way. He writes :

"All intelligible communication whether in their form of description, explanation or interpretation involves essence in the sense of an ordered whole. A term system is in general, used to designate the orderly relation of parts within a significant whole.

* Philosophical knowledge* in the words of Hegel, * is based on the acknowledgement of the content and form of all aspects of reality, the freeing of them from oneness of their forms, and the raising of them to an absolute form or system."

"Philosophic system, thus, should be all-inclusive"¹

"From whatever angle we may take up the task of philosophic interpretation, from the standpoint of fundamental distinctions within being such as mind-matter, life, spirit, from the point of view of philosophic categories or concepts, such as origin and destiny, cause and purpose, development and progress ; or finally, from the point of ultimate values - in every case alike the relative importance of every constituent element is immediately raised.....Every philosophical concept is an abbreviation of system, and this fact is the deepest ground for those eternal internal relations of concepts, categories, and values which we call philosophic system."²

"We may succeed in ordering things according to some principle or scheme of classification, according to some idea or end that is realized in them, or finally according to an ascending series, degrees of meaning or reality, but there is still something left out..... The ordering of things from the point of view of types that are static, or of the end that is progressive or an ascending series is as motionless as the genus and species of logical classification, which simply lie side by side."³

A philosophic system, if it is to be really interpretation^{ve}, must be made to march also."⁴

-
1. The Intelligible World, p. 434.
 2. The Intelligible World, p. 435.
 - 3-4. Ibid p. 436.

"(Thereby) we seek to understand not merely classes and laws, but reality in its individual character, not only as a static order, but as a living moving process."¹

"It is for this reason that evolutionary philosophies seem to be the intelligible philosophies par excellence."²

"No intelligible concept of evolution is possible without the idea of system, no criterion of progress is possible which does not presuppose a scale or system of values. But no such system has intrinsic intelligibility unless it does march, and it does not march ^{if} unless origin and destiny, beginning and end, are brought together in some concept of intelligible movement."³

"There is a certain structure of reality, a certain order of value, that forces ~~it~~ itself on all speculative thinkers, entirely irrespective of their prejudices, realistic or ~~the~~ idealistic, intellectualistic or voluntaristic or what not."⁴

"This structure is above the distinction ^{of} ~~the~~ realism and idealism, of naturalism and spiritualism."⁵

"This structure or order is in part ~~apriori~~ ^{apriori}."⁶

1-3. Ibid p. 436.

4. Ibid p. 440.

5. Ibid pp. 437-38.

6. Ibid p. 440.

"This dominating structure seems to me to be roughly as follows :

"There are certain broad divisions within the series, e.g. Matter, Life, Mind, Spirit. Without recognition of these divisions no intelligible philosophy can be written :

"From the present point of view, it is indifferent what we call them : fundamental categories, or empirical qualities, simple entities or complexes. The significant point is that each has sufficient identity in itself, or sufficient distinction from the others, to make it ^tintegral from the standpoint of intelligible communication : intelligibility depends upon their retension.¹

"Exact definition of none of these terms may be possible. They are strictly speaking indefinable. These words signify fundamental concepts that make other ideas and concepts understandable."²

"Matter itself becomes fully intelligible - reveals its full possibilities, what it really is, only when life supervenes upon it, when it, expresses itself in life.

"Similarly life reveals what it really is only when mind supervenes upon it.

"Life is understandable only when we accept its immediate and indubitable meaning as a centre of values, values realized in the process of growth and survival. It becomes really intelligible only when values become explicit in mind and consciousness.

1-2. Ibid pp. 441-442.

"Mind, too, as intellect, becomes intelligible to us, shows us what it can be and do only when it is guided by mind as spirit."¹

"For all, the essence of reality has been activity, movement - for all, the more immanent this activity, higher the life, the more developed the reality."²

"In a certain sense this structure may be said to be a priori..... in the sense that it is true, no matter what."³

In short, in this structure of reality that we find, some systematic progress is seen, and in that progress we find some significant positive stages, the stages of evolution like matter, life, senses, mind and spirit, which are almost final and universally accepted.

Our metaphysical requirement :

We feel there must be some link among them, there must be some metaphysical principle working under this evolution which is perhaps either not properly perceived or propounded. And if we can perceive it and trace out the line of its working in the system of evolution, we can certainly have a key for solution of some important problems of life and philosophy.

Thus otherwise mere descriptive rendering of evolutionary process and stages as given above by Urban cannot serve the purpose, though it adds a lot in our understanding of facts. Philosophy goes and must go deeper

1. Ibid p. 442.

2-3. Urban : The Intelligible World, p. 443.

and should find out the underlying principle that goes to the making of those facts as stages linked together in the process of evolution. We must know how and why of them all.

Failure of philosophers in the explanation of the process of evolution:

Attempts have been made both by philosophers and scientist philosophers for the explanation of the process of evolution, but they have not been successful to meet the requirements of reason.

Dr. Radhakrishnan in his "Fragments of a Confession" has very precisely taken stock of them all and found them ^{one} and all defective either for want of a linking principle or for want of its adequacy. As naturalist philosophers leave to matter and motion to carry out the cosmic process of evolution it being purely mechanical cannot explain higher stages of life, mind and spirit. Description however detailed cannot serve the want of explanation. Dialectical method fails as it goes to abolish dualism 'by making nature a form of spirit as in Hegel or Spirit a form of nature as in Marx. Bergson's creative evolution carried out by 'elan vital' persisting for duration in novel forms fails by the weak explanation of matter as a lapse or fall of spirit, the principle of reality. Morgan's principle of emergence is merely a descriptive name and no explanatory process. When it is emergent it is hardly an evolution. Neither Alexander's 'space time' matrix nor Whitehead's 'space time matter' can be source of evolution of universes, displaying its distinct manifestations of life and mind.

Now let us turn to Dr. Radhakrishnan himself if he, on the strength of the prominent Advaitin philosophy can provide us with a better explanation of

evolution as world process. He does maintain the world as existent and calls it real. He writes: "Man is neither the slave of circumstances nor the blind sport of the Gods. The impulse to perfection working in the universe has become self-conscious in him. Progress 'happened' in the subhuman world; it is willed in the human."¹ In short: "The human individual has to work his evolution consciously and deliberately,"² as he says.

Really we do feel the impulse and impetus, but 'love of wisdom' within wishes to survey the situation as a whole, and as "Philosophy is an attempt to explain the world to which we belong," we always seek explanation before we set ourselves to the task.

Dr. Radhakrishnan in his 'Fragments of a Confession' attempts explanation not minding if it fails to be final. He writes: "Spirit creates the world and controls its history by a process of perpetual incarnation. Spirit is working in matter, that matter may serve the spirit The world-process can only be conceived as a struggle between twoc antagonistic but independent principles of being and non-being."

Here the dualist will feel like Sisylock as if Daniel really come to judgment, and would say, "right you are, right you are, what is that non-being, please ?"

"What is called non-being is the limiting concept on the object side, the name for the unknown, the hypothetical cause of the object world, that which remains when we abstract from the world all that gives it existence,

1. Kalki, p.42.

2. Fragments of a Confession. Philosophy of S. Radhakrishnan edited by Schilpp.

form and meaning In Indian thought it is called Prakṛiti, the avidyā, the unmanifested, the formless substrata of things. It is potentially all things Prakṛiti is not absolute non-being. It is unformed non-being, while it is powerless to form itself into being without the guidance of Puruṣa, or the self. The existential development is not out of utter nothing or the absolute absence of all being. Nothing is the conceptual opposition of what truly and authentically is. If God creates out of nothing he must be able to relate himself to nothing." ¹ Fine answer ! Something more and enough of it: "The two spirit and nature, puruṣa and prakṛti are not two ultimate principles. They are parts of the world spirit which divided into two - dvaidhā apātayet, for the sake of cosmic development". ² And he warns, "The dualism of puruṣa and prakṛti cannot be ultimate." ³

shelved by great
Ultimate explanation ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ sagi/philosophers:

Then what is ultimate ? "What is before all creation ?" It is "the absolute God." "God is with all creation." "Philosophy is a quest of truth which underlies existence Why is there something rather than nothing ? Why is there this world rather than another ?" Yes, yes; that is what we want to know and here we have his answer: "Being is the foundation of all existence, though it is not itself anything existent Being posits everything, but is not itself posited There can be only one such Being and that is the Divine Spirit. To say that God exists a se, of and by reason of Himself, is to say that God is being itself. This is the concept of Brahman as it is formulated in the Upanishads. God God is absolute as distinct from dependent or conditional being....."

1-2-3. From Fragments of a Confession.

That which is to make all conditions possible cannot itself be subject to conditions Absolute being is absolute freedom.¹ Hence, it is above the question of how and why. Thus all explanations are shelved in the name of one ultimate absolute reality. All efforts of philosophic search lead us to ultimate thing and it turns out thus a biggest cipher for all our problems and remains irresponsive to all queries and enquiries about the how and why of the world on the whole.

But thus the problem of all the problems cannot be left to itself when thought reaches to the highest peak of its search; otherwise all philosophic search turns out futile at the end for want of a final conclusion. The question of ultimate reality, for the finding out of which all the genuine philosophers have come out with all the zealous and daring adventures of thought, experience and action, cannot thus be shelved to the idea of God—the absolute being, another name for excuse for the inability of explanation resulting from prejudice, that man cannot know ways of God. Ultimate reality is not suggested for search by God as such, but by the rational man; and if it is not realized or proved and justified by rational human being it is no more real than a wishful thinking.

If the absolute is to remain absolute in every way i.e. either as an end or goal, as an ideal or achievement, or as the basis or source for the world and its relations with the world cannot be traced ^{out} and we should have no concern at all with it and it would suffice if we deal with realities i.e. the spirit and matter that go to ^{form} ~~from~~ a world as it is.

1. Fragments of a Confession.

However, turning to the final point of our problem of ultimate reality when Radhakrishnan declares: "the two: spirit and nature, purusa and prakrti are not two ultimate principles. They are parts of the world spirit, which divided into two - dvaidhā apātyet, for the sake of cosmic development ... The dualism of purusa and prakrti cannot be ultimate," it would not be unreasonable to consider the form and structure of the world spirit, whom Radhakrishnan identifies as God, Brahman and Being, nor would it be out of place to make enquiry into the process of God's being divided into two, and their possibility as such.

God or the World Spirit not justifiable on monist lines:

Firstly when we take spirit and nature i.e. purusa and prakrti to be the parts of the World Spirit i.e. Brahman or God, God must be taken as a composite being like all other beings composite of two principles one conscious and the other non-conscious - jada i.e. of soul and body, which is material.

By corollary we can deduce that neither the spirit nor the nature/^{can}by itself alone be ultimate source or basis of the world. Hence duality is there ultimately in the very basis and genesis of the composite world of souls and matter. Then such God being a composite being cannot be absolute as the Advaitins profess ^{it} to be. Nor can this composite being can be eternal, as it is subject to decomposition. It is then obvious that no composite being can be called or taken to be ultimate and eternal as it is subject to union and disunion, composition and decomposition, integration and disintegration. On the contrary, the two uniting substances that go to make a composite being can really be called ultimate.

Here, it will be worthwhile to note Rajachandra's reply to Gandhiji regarding God's being a creator of the world.

In reply to Gandhiji's questions: "Is it true that He (God) is the creator of the world?" Srinad writes: "He is not the creator of the world i.e. atom, space, etc. are eternally existing and they are such that they are not possible to be made out of any other thing. However, if at all we take them to be derived from God, then that too does not seem proper, because if we consider God to be sentient (conscious) then how can therefrom atom, space, etc. come into being, because there is no possibility of genesis or outcome of space, atom, etc. from it. Now on the other hand if God is taken as non-conscious then naturally God loses his supremacy - godhood. Nor can therefrom even soul be born. And if we consider God to be matter - soul - composite then there being world, composite of soul and matter, it is a way of being satisfied with make-believe by giving it (the world) merely a name of God. Hence it is far better and proper to call world a world than to remain content by calling the world as God i.e. other name than its own." (S.N. p.426).

God's ways above how and why

Now let us turn to the second point of our problem. Accepting for the time being that the world the composite of purusa and prakrti is created by God, it would be worthwhile to consider how and why he happened to create it. Shankar and Radhakrishnan are too clever to admit that God might have created the world out of any want either internal or external. It involves many metaphysical problems together with ethical ones like being and non-being, potentiality and actuality, real and ideal, progress and end,

evolution and its stages order and aim, freedom will and responsibility which are not so easy of explanation; and solution on so all-embracing aspect of philosophic probe becomes difficult. Hence, their answer had a total negation of rationality on the very grounds of crafty reasoning. They say there must be something over and above the law and order which maintains law and order in the universe. It must surely be an absolute being above all this world of change and progress. The being of all beings must be absolute. And "absolute being is absolutely free" and full with all powers and potency. These idealists are apt to the mania of attributing everything highest and best ^{to} in God. And God being postulated as above reason all the irrational concepts regarding him are rationalised and all important problems are shelved in the name of this absolute almighty - the product of pedantic utopia devoid of all the realistic sense and full of all the idealistic nonsense.

Let us see it at its highest perch with all the jugglery of words and mockery of reason so as to justify the ways of God to man.

Radhakrishnan writes : "God is absolute, as distinct from dependent or conditional being. As the ground of an ordered multiplicity, He is one and not multiple. That which is to make all conditions possible cannot itself be subject to conditions..... Absolute Being is absolute freedom. To the question why should such an order exist at all, the only answer is because the Absolute is both Being and Freedom..... Freedom is the primordial source and condition of all existence. It precedes all determination,"+

+ Fragments of a Confession.

Joad writes :

"He (Radhakrishnan) tells us that 'History of philosophy in India as well as ⁱⁿ Europe has been one long illustration of the inability of the human mind to solve the relation of God ^{to} the world. The great thinkers are those who admit the mystery and comfort themselves by the idea that the human mind is not omniscient.^{t.}'"

So we cannot ask why God creates the world and cannot make him responsible for that, as he enjoys absolute freedom and above all outside control. But he creates the world is a fact. None can deny it. If he having absolute freedom has not ^{to account} /if ~~accounted~~ for his act of creation of the world, it does not cease being his act and it has some metaphysical root and relation with the being of a thing and Shankar^a knows very well that this fact can be ^a basis for arguments against God's creative activity Joad has very clearly brought it out. He writes " But why, asks Shankar^a, should God create assuming, that is ^{to} say that God is perfect ?

"Activity of any kind implies want or need which the activity is designed to allay. A need implies deficiency ~~the~~ in that in respect of which the need is felt; it implies, that is to say, imperfection. A perfect being cannot add anything to his perfection. Furthermore, an infinite being cannot create anything since, as he is infinite, everything which exists or can exist does so already in him. Moreover, he is beyond time and beyond space, conditions which are necessary to the construction of any material thing, which must be in time and in space.

"Either then God is not perfect and creates the world because he feels some need, or he did not create the world in which case he is not infinite, since something, namely, that which he did not create, exists besides and in addition to God.

"Shankar states and recognises these difficulties more clearly, perhaps, than any Western theologians and answers them by the suggestion that God although perfect is unable to contain himself in his perfection. He feels a need to express himself; so great is his joy, so perfect his goodness, that He overflows. God (like an artist) was moved to create the world not out of any deficiency or lack, but out of ~~other~~^{the} very fullness and abundance of his goodness."

Duality necessary even in Monistic System :

But, "the artist does not merely create, he creates in a medium which is other than that which he creates..... Creation is always creation out of something; expression, expression in something We must introduce a principle of objectivity which is other than God, in which, or through interaction with which God expresses himself. The necessity for this principle is in fact realised by Shankar, and it appears in his work under the name of 'Maya' +

So Joad finally concludes : "That the difficulties are incapable of solution on Monist lines is indeed, in the view of ~~many~~^{many}, including the present writer, a plain fact, and it is this fact, which they hold, necessitates the inclusion in the universe of some principle or ~~factor~~^{factor} ~~factor~~"

+ Matter, Life and Value - p. 40-41.

to break up the unity and engender the world of plurality even if plurality be held to be only an appearance." +

So have we come after all to a point where we have to recognise duality, because ^{an} other principle, *Māyā*, along with God is to be adjusted even on monist lines.

Duality or Plurality even in the theories of Evolutions :

Anyhow we find that even Advaitins like Shankar and Radhakrishnan make mention of duality one way or the other. Now let us see precisely how evolutionists too adopted duality. Naturalists, though explain cosmic principle on strictly mechanical lines, do accept outcome of spirit or intelligence in the higher stages of evolution. Greek spoke of *Eous* or *Logos* giving form to *Hyle* the material principle and the world came into existence. Dialectical materialists to accept matter and consciousness, having objective and corresponding subjective dialectic. Either nature is made a form of spirit or spirit a form of nature. Bergson's creative evolution is credited to 'elan vital' which moulds matter to suit its own aims and achievements. Lloyd Morgan accepts matter, life and mind as progressive stages of evolution, they are emergents. Alexander mentions space time matrix giving rise to movement, matter, life, mind and deity. For him God is both at the beginning and at the end of evolution. Regarding Whitehead's universe Joad writes that "it is more like a living organism."

+ Counter Attack from the East.

or rather like plurality of connected organisms in unison of development or still more accurately, like the process which is, or contains, this plurality, than like a work of art.* Thus plurality felt and maintained some way or other.

Failure of the evolutionistic hypotheses :

We have no objection to their ~~a~~ escape or resort to plurality or duality. Whether plurality, duality or singularity of the reality at the basis is altogether a different problem. But what is expected of a system based on either hypothesis, enlightenment, or experience, it must maintain thorough non-contradiction in itself. But here we see that these world hypotheses or totality world-views base their main argument on singularity or on monist lines specially for maintaining order and integration into the system but they insert some other principle in their support and practically make it the world of duality or plurality and in their explanation either they let the ends loose or adopt reduction which as we have seen cannot ~~stand the tests of reason and~~ stand the tests of reason and prove themselves unsatisfactory and useless. All the edifices of hypothesis thus collapse: at least as the basis cracks and split into fragments. Then the hypothesis loses its greatness and cannot stand as a system though it may be of interest to scholars and historians, it merely proves the play of words and meanings. It is really irony of fate ^{that} the philosophy now-a-days is given ^{the} in the main, work of cleansing the field of meaning :

* Guide to Philosophy : Fundamental Principles of White-heads Philosophy.

and its pity that the scholars go with all their ^{will} zeal and on that narrow way as they are perhaps devoid of the sense of totality. Socrates did it because he had had a penetrating and almost all-piercing insight, resulting from the view of totality.

We, indeed had some hopes for final solution of fundamental problems in this new trend of evolutionistic philosophy as it is able to meet some requirements of reason. We want integration of all our knowledge in some orderly way that is in some system of thoughts which can comprise within it truths of sciences like astrology, geology, physics, chemistry, botany, ~~astronomy~~ biology, psychology, sociology, law, logic, ethics, aesthetics and metaphysics etc. The concept of evolution seemed to be far more promising as it is almost all-comprising and at the same time, it lends the idea of progress towards perfection.

Main Causes of their failure :

But the philosophers failed in their hypotheses as they proved to be short of meeting the requirements of reason and could not give satisfactory explanation of its working as a system. Firstly, as they wanted integration, they tried to remove bifurcation at the basis by way of undue reduction of one principle or the other. Secondly, as they could not explain stages of evolution in terms of 'evolving' they sought explanation of it through irrelevant process of 'emergence' and the like. This was so perhaps because philosophy gave way to science and lost its balance and suffered final collapse in the eyes of scientist and lesser philosophers, both of whom 'raised too much dust before their eyes and complained they could not see

beyond.¹ Thirdly, scientists and after them philosophers have given up the law of causation, the main basis of metaphysics.

Consequences of the failure :

And what are the consequences. Philosophy has gone bankrupt and cannot command any faith or conviction. "Even to speak, at this late date of the principles of metaphysics, or of epistemology, or of ethics is tantamount to inciting one's fellow-philosophers to riot. The traditional academic quadrivium of metaphysics, epistemology, logic and ethics has been shaken to its foundations. General metaphysics and epistemology have become at best, ideology, and ideology itself as we have seen is now in increasing disrepute."¹ "Yet as our age drags on toward a conceivable Armageddon, one curiously senses the faltering conviction that without first philosophy our culture is doomed and our lives ^{or} scarcely worth the living."²

Whatever the situation, we cannot leave this crisis to itself, as we are what we are, because we think. Regarding reaching the ultimate reality in our philosophical search, Srinad Rajchandra has proclaimed³ : "Think over it and you shall realize". So now before we try to render a solution of the problems that canx make or mar the system on the whole, let us proceed to understand the difficulties in the way of successful orderly integration for the system of philosophy on evolutionistic lines in the main or from the evolutionistic view-point at least.

1. Henry D. Aiken : Philosophy in the Twentieth Century : Introduction. p. 16.

2. Ibid. p. 17.

We saw that in the structure and working of the universe or the world, at least duality, if not plurality, proved indispensable one way or other explicitly or implicitly. Yet it is also a fact that its maintenance in the systems seemed a difficult job to their ~~past~~ pioneers or professors, and they were obliged to leave the other factor of duality either unexplained or under pretext. Let us ~~a~~ try to understand how it happened so.

Even duality difficult to be maintained. Why ? :

There are causes for opposing or eliminating the duality. It is well stated by Joad in two ways, while considering the philosophy of Whitehead.

Regarding Interaction :

He writes :-

"Matter, as White-head puts it, suffers modification of its external relation of locomotion and mind suffers modification of its contemplated objects." But "how, White-head asks, 'can two such independent substances be brought together?' How can they modify each other? Interaction between two completely different substances separated by a real gulf of otherness is as unconceivable as causal connection between two material substances separated by a gulf of real ~~spacous~~ space."

"Now this problem, White-head insists, is insoluble^{va}, so long as we think of mind and matter as two different substances initially separate from each other, but brought together in some incomprehensible ~~xxx~~ relation within the living organism.

Regarding law of causation:

The notion of causation so conceived in Whitehead's words made 'nonsense of the scientist's scheme'. For us Whitehead shows, unless it can be established that there is some connecting tie or bond linking cause and effect the notion of causation must be abandoned for mere regularity of sequence, which, since it is in no sense necessary regularity, may at any moment cease to operate.

But to introduce a connecting tie or bond is to give up the scientific presupposition that nature consists of distinct configuration of matter separated by space.

"In this scheme each piece of matter just is, and is completely

"Now the belief in induction presupposes that the state of nature at one time justifies the human mind in entertaining a certain expectation in regard to the state of nature at some other time. From one state of things, in fact, the mind is held to be justified in inferring another. But this expectation and the inference which are based upon it are only legitimate, if nature at one time does in fact refer to nature at another. Yet such reference presupposes in its turn, some underlying connection between one state of nature and another, a bridge, as it were, over which the mind can pass as it infers what will be or what was from what is now.

"If, however, science is right in supposing that nature consists of separate pieces of matter extended in space, owing neither tie nor bond to join them together, the belief in induction is not based upon anything that can be observed in nature. The belief in induction is not then justified by anything in the 'scientist's scheme'.¹

1. Guide to Philosophy: Philosophy of Whitehead.

Sankar's epistemological arguments :

There are similar points raised by Sankar and others on the thing - in-itself aspect of the substances like soul and material substances. Jond is conscious of them too. He has noted: "Sankar's philosophy starts from an epistemological dualism which is not markedly different in type from the theories of the modern realists.

"Knowledge, he held, is a relationship between a subject and object, the relationship is that of awareness of the object ^{by} of the subject nor the object of which there is awareness is dependent for its existence upon or reducible to the other.

"Presently, however, Sankar abandons this somewhat naive realism and proceeds to point out that in knowledge not only are subject and object related, but that they are also adapted to each other. If it were not for this adaptation they would never be able to get at each other, in the sense that knowledge of the one by the other implies.

"This adaptation cannot be regarded as a merely fortitious occurrence, it can only be explained on the assumption that both the entities adapted are expressions (or creations) of something more fundamental than either. Since both are expressions of or emanations from this more ultimate something there is kinship between them which proves their apparent twoness to be illusory. Sankar suggests that this ultimate something is spirit, and identifies it with God."

Some basic difficulties noted:

On the survey of the difficulties that the monists and advaitins, the scientists and the evolutionists found in arriving at a system of metaphysics

on evolutionistic lines are highly important, and unless and untill they are removed we cannot ^{ve} ~~and~~ vitalise philosophy. So it will be worthwhile to note those main and basic difficulties and how they have undermined the very basis of philosophy and consequently how the whole structure of philosophy on its four mainholds like metaphysics, religion, epistemology and ethics has collapsed. Now let us note those basic difficulties first.

1. If there are at least two really separate substances that are altogether different from one another they cannot be united since there cannot be anything else that may unite them, or bind them to union.
2. Since they remain separate and do not get united they are in fact the things in themselves. And when each is a thing-in-itself, they cannot be capable to interact.
3. Without their interaction ^{cannot} ~~law~~ of causation be traced out. Without the law of causation among things no link can be had among the phenomena.
4. Without any such link, induction is a make-believe and all the sciences which are mainly based on inference lose their certainty and knowledge expected by experience and that too instant is impossible.

Catastrophes due to these difficulties:

Let us now see how these four difficulties if not removed end into the catastrophe in the field of philosophy at the hands of bad logic.

It is rightly said that by removal of the law of causation metaphysics automatically collapses. If there were no law of causation in the very nature of things then the universe can hardly be an orderly whole and would be without any system as such. No activity can be effective, nor can it be a process.

On the other hand all epistemology is mere a fancy as no source of certainty and criterion can be traced out for knowledge, nor experience can be supported by authority as such. With the collapse of metaphysics and foundation of knowledge how can rules and ideals can exist and when truth of things are shelved, where is ethics to be justified and religion to be observed.

Law of causation proved:

How all this seems a sheer nonsense ! Without the law of causation in the nature of things no system of philosophy can stand even on realist lines. What to talk of philosophy, except the idiot or the crack none would have taken trouble to spell or utter a single syllable. Without despoiled faith and firm conviction in the principle of causation prevailing in the nature and in minds of men we would have gone bankrupt in our social activities and affairs. Bertrand Russell writes in 'the Scientific Outlook': "All inference in regard to the course of nature is causal, and if nature is not subject to causal laws all such inference must fail. We cannot in that case, know anything outside of our personal experience; indeed strictly speaking, we can only know our experience in the present moment, since all memory depends upon causal laws. If we cannot infer the existence of other people, or even our own past, how much less can we infer God, or anything else that the theologians desire."¹

1. Wiener: Basic Problems of Philosophy, p.259.

He further writes sarcastically: "The principle of causality may be true or may be false, but the person who finds the hypothesis of its falsity cheering is failing to realise the implications of his own theory. He usually retains unchallenged all those causal laws, which he finds convenient as, for example, that his food will nourish him and that his bank will honour his cheques so long as his account is in funds, while rejecting all those that he finds inconvenient. This, however, is altogether too naive a procedure."¹

And he rightly warns: "Those who desire caprice in the physical world seem to me to have failed to realise what this would involve."²

So the principle of causality is ever prevailing in this world of change, the *samsara*. Even the great Advaitins like Sankar and after him Dr. Radhakrishnan are obliged to accept on the strength of the causal law the duality of mind and matter at the world level, otherwise they would not have been able to explain the process working and order prevailing in the universe.

They accepted undoubtedly as a working hypothesis the duality of the soul and the matter. They accepted also the law of causation, which forced them to accept, I presume, the duality at the world level i.e. at the semi-final or last but one level of ultimate reality. But on the strength of the law of causation i.e. same cause a same effect, having involved epistemology ^{with} which metaphysics they presumed that, were not the soul and matter akin i.e. ultimately of the one and some substance knowledge of matter would have been available to the soul. Here, they have thoroughly misunderstood not only their distinctive natures but also the nature of

1-2. Ibid, p.259.

knowledge which is transcendent in fact. As we have shown before in details that they have mistaken and have identified knowing with being and doing, which are all distinct characteristics of the soul.

Yet, however, there remains on our part to explain the interaction of the two extremely opposite and distinct realities like soul and the matter.

Interaction established and explained:

It is felt that if the so-called gulf between soul and matter is bridged there remains nothing so objectionable to have us one integrated all-embracing system of philosophy.

We get something reasonable and purely metaphysical in Grimald's philosophy that can serve as a bridge for this so-called gulf between the soul and the matter. He himself puts the problem and then states some solution which he writes in his precise way:

"The non-conscious (non-sentient matter) manifests its material nature and the conscious its sentient manifestations. Neither gives up its own nature and admits the change for the other¹

"In all the three times the non-sentient is ever the non-sentient, and so also the sentient remains the sentient. It is obviously a matter of (everyone's) experience²; what is to be doubted therein ?

But, then, he sets the problem -

"If the non-sentient ever remains the same as the non-sentient and the sentient over a sentient then there can be nothing like bondage and liberation,³ nor can there be any activity and cessation of activity as such.....

His point is clear. If both the ultimate realities remain purely and absolutely the same, then there can be no union and interaction between them. Hence, they are un-united and there can be no interconnection and link that bind them into the union. And as they remain physically or substantially completely apart like watertight compartments there be no interaction nor any activity between them. Consequently there can be nothing to account for the union or for their binding, bondage is not possible at all; and where there is no bondage there is no problem of liberation. Secondly, when there is no interconnection there is no activity between the two nor its cessation remains to be achieved.

"Bondage and liberation are in fact due to their union, which lasts so far there prevails self-ignorance or self-delusion. But even in bondage or union one's nature is not given up. So says the Jin - God This union of the sentient (soul) and the matter is the mine beginningless and endless. None has created it. So says Lord Jin." (S.R.297/266).

Thus Srinad shows mainly two things. Firstly, that union of the sentient (soul) and the non-sentient (matter) is beginning^{less} and endless in the form of the world. Secondly, he does tell that the bondage is due to their union which can be ended by giving up self-ignorance or self-delusion. Since their union is beginningless, it cannot be said that they were separate and distinct things and got united. So we need not take them separate as things in themselves i.e. as absolutely separate, though in their united state they are distinct by nature. As the members of the union they have preserved their individuality, identity.

Again, as we have seen before, Śrīmad writes in his memo-book as follows:

"Universe is beginningless.

Soul is beginningless - anādi

Atoms, the Pudgals are anādi." (S.R.p.800)

"The union of the soul and the

pudgal is anādi." (S.R.p.827)

Now as their union is beginningless it is nonsense to ask the reason thereof, i.e. what is the reason of their union. However, we can ask what is the nature of their union. It is, no doubt, natural as it is beginningless; but at the same time it is not because of their genuine nature or real nature. Then, ^{of} what type it is? Śrīmad has clarified it. He writes: "It (the union) is not by their nature, but is the form of the 'Vibhava' ". (S.R.p.759).

What is Vibhava?

"Vibhava means not the 'opposite' or 'contradictory of nature', but unnatural manifestation. The manifestation of soul purely as the soul is bhava or its own nature. But when it goes beyond its nature and manifests in excessive form it is vibhava - 'unnatural manifestation'. In the same manner it should be understood regarding the matter too." (S.R.p.759).

15

The union is of the two. It is their common manifestation. And that manifestation is their unnatural manifestation i.e. it is of the form of Vibhava on the part of both. Here we have a metaphysical explanation for the composite world of matter and soul, as well as for the composite body of living beings. Body and the world are both the composites of soul and matter. And that composite form of their union is the form of their simultaneous

external manifestation. Had they no ex-natural manifestation they would ^{not} have been united together, nor would they have got united if neither of the two were incapable of external manifestation like Dharmastikāya and Adharmastikāya. Both are united because of their ex-natural manifestations.

We can also deduce another principle from this. Suppose that there were no other principle than either the matter or the soul. Then neither the matter nor the soul would have any ex-natural manifestation. By itself either of the two would have natural manifestation. However, if they would have been capable of ex-manifestation, they would not have really manifested as such because of the want of the other. It is the presence of the other that prompts the ex-natural manifestation of one. Hence, it is due to their union that ex-manifestation of both happens to be.

Here are two points to be noted to understand the principles working in the formation or maintenance of the composite world of these two ultimate realities - the soul and the matter. Both by their very nature have the capacity of ex-manifestation - vibhāva, and they manifest their vibhāva at the instance of the other. Without the occasion of the other, they do not manifest any vibhāva but maintain and manifest their own real nature. Here we have to keep in mind that the soul being sentient having the capacity of willing may or may not manifest the vibhāva though there be an occasion for it at the instance of the matter; while matter being devoid of sentience or consciousness having no capacity of willing i.e. will-power, always remains responsive to the soul's vibhāva. It always manifests the corresponding vibhāva.

It would be worthwhile to understand this interaction between the two in its application in the field of Karma which moulds the matter along with

the dynamic and vital principle, the soul in its infinite manifestation. The basic principle involved is merely stated here in ^{the} words of Śrīmad and its full application in terms of evolution, creation, progress and perfection will be considered later.

Śrīmad writes : " External manifestation of soul - vibhava is the Bhāvakarma (the sentient form of the Karma).

And union (of the soul) with the matter, paṇḍal, is the dravya Karma (the material form of the karma). (S.N. p. 587).

Śrīmad elsewhere writes : "The Bhāva Karma is called by the name of 'Vibhāva'. (S.N. p. 827).

Vibhava shapes by interaction the Saṁsāra the relational reality :

While describing the three-fold activity of the soul Śrīmad explains how the ~~the~~ soul is the author of the 'dravya karma' by manifestation of bhāvakarma in the form of ex-natural tendency which is experienced as the interaction between the soul and the matter come into closer contact. He writes : " from the relational point of view, when (in contact with) convergent with other things, the soul is the author of dravya karma". This dravya karma is the result of the vibhava on the part of both the soul as well as the matter, it is the composite form of the mutual vibhava, the interaction between the two. It is the relational aspect of reality and not the absolute. It is the form of vyāvahāra. Hence, the world or saṁsāra is called the vyāvahārika sat, relational reality and not pāramārthika or ultimate. Saṁsāra also has called this world of duality as the Vyāvahārika sat - the reality

(samsara)

from the aspect of exchange. The world substantially owes its existence to the two realities soul and matter, it won't have been if those two have had no vyavahāra, no exchange, no interaction between them. The word vyavahār means exchange. But with such ultimate things giving and taking cannot be substantial, for if there be substantial give and take between them they would lose their ultimacy, and individuality or identity, consequently they would be no more realities as such. Hence, their exchange is formal and ex-natural vaibhāvika. It takes a composite form by the interaction between the two. The soul and the matter, thus, remaining by nature and substantially the same, i.e. *ātma* sentient and material respectively, take by interaction the common composite form of mundane beings.

Regarding the matter we have already seen that it is named 'paśala' by its very nature of composing and decomposing. The *paramāṇus* are thus capable of union and disunion.

Thus on realizing the world as the beginningless composite whole of the sentient and the non-sentient, mainly of the souls and matter, there remains no problems, now, of uniting, of reaction and of causation, which are fairly solved in previous pages.

World or Samsāra from the evolutionists view-point :

Now let us see the working of the world from the evolutionistic point of view. Before we see it, it would be worthwhile to understand the concept of evolution. 'To evolve' means to progress from potentiality to perfection. It is unfolding of the inner worth to

its utmost. Some terms are rooted in their background without which they do not display their stature in full import of the concept. So is the case with the term evolution.

The non-composite single single thing absolute by itself would not admit of the process of evolution. It has nothing to evolve, nothing to unfold. It is perfect by itself, in the state of ^{its own} as it is. It is absolute. Supposing there were only one 'paramānu' - one and only one itself in the whole of infinite space, how would it have unfolded itself and from what potentiality to which perfection? In our concept it is eternally a ~~param~~ paramānu. It would have been ever and everywhere the same. No space-point would have changed it, nor ^{would} no moment have added to it. It being simple non-composite there is nothing potential, there is nothing inner or outer in its being. It has not to become. It is already what it is and what it can be.

Concept of Evolution :

In order to realize naturally the meaning of evolution we should turn to the world of objects and to the world of itself from whose process in the working we have got this term with its concept. From the smallest seed the Banyan tree, from acorn the oak, from bud the flower, from 'Jiva' the 'Shiva', i.e. from soul the Brahman, there is growth and there is some putting forth. In the process, there was something hidden, something covered, something within limits, something raw, something imperfect which has afterwards at the end have come out as unhidden, as discovered, as unlimited, as refined, as perfect and full-blown. This obviously shows something limiting, something

negative, something hindering. Looking to the world the seers found something in progress like *anas*, *prana*, senses, mind, soul and the scientist found matter, life, senses, mind and spirit; and they caught the idea of something progressing and achieving these various levels and this brought home to their mind the concept of evolution.

There remains now the explanation of the process of evolution to be rendered. The stages of the process of evolution are almost wellknown. They are roughly matter, life, senses, mind and spirit. They are facts almost universally accepted and mainly by almost all the outstanding philosophers. But how they happened to evolve is the matter to be explained and it is the matter main problem.

As we have observed that monists and the *advaitins* tried to explain but as they could not do it on monist lines they allowed dualism at the world *in* level, and finally showing some difficulties in to interaction and the thing-in-itself aspect, and of the law of causation they escaped to monism resorting to the absolute or the *brahman*. Since we have done away with the difficulties, caused by the wrong approach of involving epistemology with metaphysics, mainly, knowing with doing and being, and secondly by their inability to understand or to state properly the essential manifestations of the soul and matter, our course will run smoother and safer, we hope.

What evolves and how ? :

In the universe space provides room to the other four : infinite souls, infinitely infinite matter, single pair of the Dharmāstikāya and the Adharmāstikāya. Time and space have no concern directly between them two, space can do without time, time can do without space. Time requires no space, space requires no time. Space can exist all alone without time or timing. It is eternal - beyond time. No space-point requires time. Nor time requires any space-points as it requires no room. The same is the case with time and the Dharma-Adharma Antikāyas. Soul and Matter need space; they need Dharma-Adharma for movement and poise. Soul and matter maintain their substantial as well as formal existence and as such they maintain constancy and change which give us the sense of time. It seems, time cannot have any individual existence of its own separate from the manifestations of the soul and the matter, and their composites. However, our knowledge being generally motivated on one hand and itself ^{being a} manifestation relative to other manifestations we have a keen sense of time and we feel it with every manifestation of ours, we cannot conceive the world without time - and in a sense the world being the world of change ^{is} time is indispensable to us in every walk of life. All our dealings are wrought within time and with the time sense in the back-ground. The vyavahara between the soul and the matter, and amongst the souls and their composite forms bespeak of time. So the time is one element, one factor of the world, anyhow, and it is in the basis of our intelligible world.

In the universe then the matter and soul by their composite forms play the prominent role or it is ~~in~~ they that make the universe as it turns out in the process of its becoming. So far from the evolutionistic view-point we shall consider the soul and the matter and their composite from the course of time. As we have seen before that that the absolute single simple substance, be it 'paramāṇu' or the pure soul, is above evolutionary process. Evolution, so far they are things in themselves does not touch them. So it remains the matter of their composite forms. Looking to the five well-known things matter, life, senses, mind and spirit or the like we find the two at extremes as single entities and the remaining as composites.

As we have observed that the universe is the mine of the souls and matter, a composite whole. The union of the ~~was~~ soul and the matter is beginningless. It is maintained by their 'vibhavas' their ex-natural manifestation. Whitehead comes nearer to this concept of the 'vibhava' or external ^{NCY} tendering of the two. Joad writes about Whitehead's concept of feeling : "The essential nature of the underlying process of prehension is feeling, or is at least analogous to feeling The sensitivity in virtue of one physical entity takes note of the presence of another by reacting to it is, for Whitehead, not fundamentally different from the way in which sentient beings feel the presence of one another."⁴

⁴ C.E.N. Joad, Guide to Philosophy, p. 582.

His concept of composite reality is also somewhat akin to our idea. He writes : "The doctrine that I am maintaining is that neither physical nature nor life can be understood unless we fusi^{on} them together as essential factors in the composition of really real things whose interconnection and individual characters constitute the universe"⁺ Here if we take life as soul, and physical nature as matter it will be felt that question as to when the union took place is nonsense, but rather we should take the union as granted and then should try to understand them.

The Process of Evolution :

For this composite form of soul and matter, in view of Arinad's approach, we shall give prominence to the spirit or soul and shall proceed in the explanation of the process of evolution. Joud seems to have a somewhat good appreciation of the trend of the process. He writes : " I am thus led to postulate the presence in the universe of a dynamic force or principle of change which enters into association with matter to form living organisms and is known to the biologist as life, to the psychologist as mind and to myself as the stream of consciousness, which constitutes my being." *

This 'dynamic force or principle of change which enters into association with matter to form living organisms' is none but the soul, and

+ Basic Problems of Philosophy (Erikerian), p. 527.

* Philosophical Aspects of Science. pp. 271-272.

which is experienced within us as the stream of conscious^{ness} which constitutes our real being. The soul by its ex-natural manifestation (vibhāva) incurs the bondage in the form of the karma by intaking the fine matter within the space of the body. Brihad writes : "the inoculating of attachment," and hatred is nothing but the soul's ex-natural manifestation - vibhāva. The agent of that manifestation is none but the soul and it being within the body it intakes the paramānu of matter from the space of the body; it need not go outside." "In space within the loka extending to fourteen 'rajju' there ever are the 'puṣṭal paramānu' to the full. In the same ^{way} ~~way~~, the space within the body is also full of the huge a lot of fine matter. Therefrom the soul intakes the fine matter and incurs it as bondage" (S.B. p. 747). With the help of this fine matter in the form of karma the soul enables itself to form the bodies, having senses and the brain etc. The same soul works in the senses and as the mind in the form of consciousness. The soul, thus, forms as it progresses, different types of bodies and manifests the composite form of the beings from those having one sense like the vegetables and stones to beings having five senses and the mind like animals and man.

In these composite manifestations there is clearly seen striking development in the form of living beings both epistemologically and metaphysically. There is obvious progress in the power of knowledge of the soul as it manifests itself as living beings with one^s sense to human beings with five senses and the mind. There is also seen distinct progress in the series of these beings and higher and more refined.
^

Metaphysical principle of Evolution:-

Metaphysical principle of Evolution :

The soul being sentient the increase of its power of knowledge is due to gradual unfolding or evolution of its potential powers. All its potentiality remains covered or undeveloped so far it remains engrossed with matter or i.e. so far it remains impure. Its capacity of knowledge goes on shining out more and more as it becomes increasingly pure. Srīmad gaveṇḍ in short the principle of evolution for the soul and the matter, principle of unfolding of their potential powers. He declares : " As the powers of the paramāṇu go on multiplying with its attainment of advanced forms (paryāya) so also the sentient power of the soul go on increasing with the increase in its purity. Glass, spectacles, telescopes etc. are the evidence of the former and Avadhī, Mahā Karak-paryāya, Kovaljñāna, Labdhī, Riddhī etc. are the proofs for the latter." (S.R. p. 763). Elsewhere he writes : "Where there is highest purity there is the supreme power realized (siddhī)" (S.R. p. 620/632). Thus the principle of progress, unfolding or evolution of the soul's powers is purity of itself. With the increase of its purity it goes on evolving into higher and finer forms of being. It is the principle of spirited evolution. It leads the potential self to perfection. It takes 'Kṛivā' of 'Jeeva'. "The main characteristic or quality of the soul is consciousness 'upayoga' (feeling, awareness or knowledge regarding the thing whatever). The soul having impure and imperfect consciousness the 'Jeeva' from the relational point of view, by its real nature is verily itself the God. But so far it has not

realised its own real nature it is potential God- has not attained its Godhood." (S.R. p. 190).

But then why can it not realise itself as it is ? Obviously because of the impurity of the consciousness caused by the beginningless union with the matter. Śrīmad explains : " There must be some cause by which the consciousness turns out impure. That cause is the matter in the form of karma incurred in by the incessant flow of the ex-natural tendency of the soul. That which ends in viparyāya, external manifestation, cannot odour so without the cause of impure consciousness, and that impure consciousness cannot result without any union or company." (S.R. p. 191). "The soul is unconscious of its natural state due to the union (with the matter)" (S.R. p. 469)

The way of purification :

But in this composite state of the soul and the matter, their union prevails. How can it be ended, while still living with the matter, i.e. what can be done by the soul, so far as the company of the matter prevails and persists ? Śrīmad shows the way of purification precise and simple : " Karma is inert (not at all conscious) by nature. It is experienced that the soul that cherishes to whatever degree its contact with egoistic sense of identification with ^{jada, matter} to that extent, that soul turns out non-conscious i.e. to that extent its consciousness is hampered, rather dulled.....Those souls who do not identify themselves with the co-existence of the Karma and the byproducts at its rise and undergo with equanimity the fruition of the potential karmas, will attain by degrees the series of transcen^{den}tal

stages and shall realize the pure sentient stage. To proclaim so is valid, because it has so happened in the past, happens at present and shall certainly happen so in the times to come." (S.R. p. 183/55). These are not mere proclamations, they are metaphysical principles working throughout the whole of the universe eternally.

Omniscience : the highest state of consciousness :

So now it being a principle that with highest purification the soul attains its supreme state, and evolution being the progress from potentiality to perfection, purification is a process that leads soul to perfection. Then it is obvious that on complete self-purification the soul attains omniscience. Grimald writes in his notebook :

There is the Omniscient (Sarvajna).
Knowledge is the soul's own essential
characteristic.

The soul being single, ~~and~~ non-composite (non-divisible) and perfect substance by itself its cognitive capacity (knowledge) is also perfect.

Attachment and hatred are the obstructions to knowledge.

Attachment and hatred can be completely destroyed." (S.R.p. 825).

And what is the result ? Obviously, the omniscience. Hence, one can confidently say with Joad : "As evolution proceeds and mind develops

in scope and power, new levels of awareness continually emerge, and at these levels, new types of objects begin to be known! * In short, "Minds at different levels of development illuminate different areas of the universe."

Accordingly, we find in the world, as Jainism has stated, various types of beings in the progressive series : ~~are~~ ^{are} ~~naked~~ spread throughout the universe, vegetable-bodied, earth-bodied, fire-bodied, water-bodied gas-bodied, insects, birds and animals having ^{one} two, three, four, five senses, without mind and with mind. * There are demons and Gods. All are pervaded with life and senses. Mind is seen at a higher stage.

Evolution : General and particular :

This shows progress of evolution in general. It works at the individual as well as at the mass level. As there works the free-will of the soul, it is not compulsory that every soul has to pass through every stage in ^{the} series. Nor is it that it always goes on progressing. Srimal has accepted mainly three types of 'Chetana' consciousness :

(1) The consciousness that undergoes mainly fruition of the Karma. - Karmafala Chetanā, which is experienced by the onesensed. (2) The consciousness that is mainly dealing with karma - karma-chetana, which is experienced by ^{the} ~~vikaladriya~~ ^{vikaladriya} and ^{the} ~~panchendriya~~ ^{panchendriya} i.e. beings having two to five senses (3) Jnana chetna, consciousness dealing mainly with the jnana - It experiences the state of the siddha (siddha parvaya).

(S.R. pp. 775-776). The soul attains purification, also when it has

* Philosophical Aspects of Modern Science. p. 262.

+ See Sarvartha Siddhi, 3rd chapter.

karmas are somewhat exhausted with the passing of the time, at the lowest level of beings when it is having only one sense. Becoming lighter and purer it may achieve two senses and may come to five by its natural upward tendency. And if it has got some light by way of coming into contact with highly developed soul like that of the seer then it may have a sudden progress and may reach directly the upper stage like the human form. The souls having karma chetana have greater and greater scope for their progress, with the advance of the sense-attainment. Conscious purification is highly helpful in the soul's evolution than the unconscious, one, as the former is with insight, speedier and aimed at the goal.

As we have already arrived at a knowledge of the linking principle between the stages of evolution, we have no necessity of the hypothesis of emergence. As the things simply evolve according to the law of causation it is nonsense to allow the notion of emergence, to interfere. It was because of the want of proper causal connection that we took it granted as a hypothesis.

Looking to the various kinds of living beings we can find parallel progress in the organic form of the matter. Though physically and chemically it is material to the core but it is in the process highly refined and developed in various forms capable of being all the parts of living beings, and playing higher roles as near to the psychic and nervous activities remaining at the same time sensitive to so intelligent and abstract an element like soul. Indirectly we can also claim that it is because of the development of the human intelligence that

the recent technology has made magic of applied physics and chemistry so that matter has reached now in evolution an epochmaking stage of electronics.

Turning to cosmic structure we cannot say that the whole cosmos is evolving. We have observed before that the union of the matter and souls in the form of the universe is beginningless. Hence it is nonsense to start with astronomical hypothesis applied to the whole cosmos. We cannot apply the same process prevailing concurrently to all the heavenly bodies of the universe. It is mentioned in scriptures that the cycle of evolution and devolution go on running at various parts ⁱⁿ and particular parts there are fairly higher levels of life and beings. But wherever whatever the process the principle of spiritual evolution is the same, as the soul and the matter is same by their respective natures throughout the universe. There may be different kinds of beings in shape and structure elsewhere other than we meet with here on our globe. There can be elsewhere beings that might be living or may be living in lower or higher temperature belts than ours and may be ^{with} different physique.

No doubt as we have the universe as the beginningless union of matter and souls and as we have conceived evolution mainly as spiritual we move from the material to the spiritual. And as such matter in general must have had a wider and greater role to play both in the structure of the universe as well in the primary forms of beings in whatever zone of the universe. The evolutionary process is prevailing; because at the lower levels of beings which are almost material, the spiritual element i.e. soul is in so dulled a state that it can hardly shape or control the physical phenomena of land, water, atmosphere and cosmic energy. It is all left to the order

of nature, as nothing can give up or rule out its nature. Nature of a thing is verily its strength and weakness, its power and its limitation.

Hence, sciences have their special rules to play towards the advancement of knowledge in an orderly manner as the common ^{an} orderly whole by nature in working as well as in its structure. According to Srinada: "In a sense, order is the mover of the running universe." He does not believe, as we have observed previously, in a creator or the controller of the world. There is neither a creator nor a controller of it. Obviously, then, sciences may form a series of themselves starting from astronomy rather cosmology on to metaphysics comprising in the series geology, physics, chemistry, botany, biology, psychology, medicine, history, geography, sociology, law, ethics, economics, aesthetics and also art, literature and philosophy their full scope in order to harness knowledge under the reins of wisdom in making life richer, enlightened, sublime and blissful. It should not be reconstructed merely on the data of facts and figures but should also be vitalized by insight, vision, enlightenment, wisdom and spirituality that keep always in view all souls from lowest to the highest.

Necessity of increasing knowledge: its keys

If we have problems, we should increase knowledge and wisdom. It is not by reading lots of books but finding books in running brooks that one can mind matters. One should not go on piling knowledge data but should increase the capacity that may pierce through the piles and view a process from potentiality to perfection. If we want to take in our cognitive grip the whole of universe we must increase our cognitive capacity. As the weighing so the weighing-machine or the weighing set (vajan-tarān kālān)."

And one can do it by knowing the self through self-purification.

We have observed often before that spiritual evolution is the process of purification that leads potentialities to perfection. Self-purification is the only way to speed up process of evolution, especially at ^ahuman level where evolution is a conscious process. It is not merely for liberation or for the world beyond only but also for a better living here - i.e. for the richer, higher, wiser and happier life that self-purification is to be aimed at and attained. We are composite beings no doubt having body, speech, mind but are every inch a self + soul, one who feels, thinks, speaks and carries on various activities on physical, mental and spiritual levels. Hence our speech, thought and action must move in harmony towards the goal by way of self-purification. Śrīmad has noted for himself his key principle as final wisdom or insight into reality as follows:

"Orderliness of the body,

"Syād-vād-panu of speech.

Un-engrossed tendency of mind

Free-spiritedness of the soul

(This is final wisdom)."

(S.R.p.794)

How can this be explained ? It is the essence of philosophy and religion, the path of purification leading to perfection. It is the sanctifying life of the seer who is born-free, free ever and everywhere.

Some factors and points in the system of evolution

In evolution from spiritual view-point we find mainly two factors at work. One works as a positive force, other as a negative one. Soul works as a positive element, while matter works as a negative element, as a limiting principle. Both of them in the state of their union interact. They act upon each other by way of their ex-natural tendency. This ex-natural tendency of soul manifests itself in the form of self-ignorance, on one hand, and attachment and hatred, on the other; while ex-natural tendency of matter manifests in the form of the dravya karma which bind the soul and limit its talents. As we have formerly concluded that ex-natural tendency of one is due to the presence of the other. It is because of matter in the form of body of the mundane soul that the soul identifies itself with body and behaves as a composite individual and also takes other embodied souls on parallel identification. So out of this ignorance or self-delusion or soul-delusion, he does not understand anyone in its reality or natural state. Again the differences of the mundane beings are mainly due to the embodied states, which are different with various manifestations of matter. So while dealing with other living beings the soul under delusion act and react to these ex-natural manifestations of matter on one hand and ex-natural manifestations of other souls owing to material manifestations. Hence, matter rises in response and react upon the soul concerned. It turns out the karma and bondage. It thus works as a limiting factor.

Now in these concepts of union, interaction, ex-manifestations the concepts of things as distinct individuality is presumed. But it does not mean that they were separate and got united as their union is beginningless.

Let there is one point to be considered. Union of matter and soul is beginningless but union with various atoms is with a beginning and also with the end. When soul gets embodied (in sthula body) it does incur lot of atoms and at the same time in the wear and tear many united atoms depart. As with the birth and living so with the death the process of uniting and disuniting goes on. This shows individuality of the soul and matter. In their disunited state they are things in themselves. For soul the state of liberation is such a state. Thus in their absolute states they are things in themselves, no doubt.

Now are they the things-in-themselves in their related aspects. Yes. Substantially and by nature they are so. Though they are united, though they have their one common composite form they are in a sense things in themselves. Soul is soul, matter is matter. No atom, molecule or electron or proton is at all having any consciousness in the least, though they are keen and responsive to the ex-natural tendency by way of their ex-natural manifestations. Nor soul even in the embodied form of earth or stone, or fire or water is at all devoid of consciousness. It is every in a soul, conscious substance. Interaction takes place because the thing remaining itself can act and react upon the other. Ex-natural manifestations too are on the same basis. Otherwise ^{there} it would have been transformation of one thing into another and things would have lost their individuality. It may happen so with material things that are composite that they vanish, but their matter does not. The atoms, molecules or the electrons that go to form it however fine do not ^{go} undergo utter destruction, do not perish, though they may disappear.

As this aspect of substantial individuality being sacrificed at having a concept of the phenomenon, the concepts of thing in themselves and

and interaction are somewhat misunderstood. Even in material things whatever law may be working, and quantum theory or the like may be applied; but it is certain that concepts and hypothesis cannot change the reality of things. At a particular temperature and at a particular atmospheric pressure things preserve their certain composition. Let their be kinetic dance whatsoever high our clocks are clocks and regular to some extent, the ice is ice and water is water, air gives way, the shed shelter and partition privacy, cabins secrecy. No walls go as airy as atmosphere, and no falls turn out dancing fairies. Pills are pills, bullets are bullets, balls are balls and cannons are the cannons.

Matter has nature of composing and decomposing into various forms, but it does observe some laws. It is 'pud-gal' by nature. But it does not mean that it is all airy go nothing. It is sometimes natural with intelligence that at its height it is fanciful. As there can be religious and philosophical abstractions like 'Brahma Satya Jagan mithya', so also there can be so with physics that the kinetic dance is the only reality and the things of the world may be mithya ! It is because matter maintains certain structural forms as things, and things in their practical use maintain certain kind of thinghood we are able to carry on our activities of science and technology to so great a success in making things like radios, television sets, missiles and satellites which work as things and make some series of events happen by their own activities in their capacity of being one or other type of instrument by which they serve as things for what they are meant.

Things and activities seen in their relations prove effective on universal levels and the cosmos is once material whole, no doubt. Things,

events and activities can be seen from a totality view, from a cosmic view in their relation aspects; yet in the concept of relation are presumed the individual things, their initiatives and roles in certain events and activities. So the idea of things and thinghood cannot be given up. They form the reality of this relative world of ours; and if we say that there are nothing like things it is just negating our own existence which is a self-contradictory statement. Even from the absolute point of view, things are things; because that view-point is applied at every stage of reality. Only from the view-point of ultimate reality we may say with caution that there are no things as such but souls and matter ultimately. It is absolute view-point. Otherwise even ultimate realities can be seen in forms of things - composite things from the relational point of view, as composite things are nothing but various compositive forms of soul and matter or ^{of} matter itself.

Now there is problem of qualities. Once we have clear concept of a thing we can be able to understand the nature of qualities. As for the primary qualities there is no problem ^{but} regarding secondary qualities scientists and some philosophers conclude that they are merely subjective. Thereby they shelve almost the whole of metaphysics and some aspects of epistemology. They ignore empirical world, they ignore the basis of and the content for the axiology and teleology. As the structure and form of things are manifestations of the substance of a thing, so also are qualities the manifestations of the essence of things. Essentially the nature of substance is revealed in secondary qualities. Material aspect of a thing or substance is seen manifest in secondary qualities, while the formal aspect in its primary qualities. Sweetness of sugar makes it differ from salt.

With particular form and structure of a thing there are coexisting other qualities of colour, odour, truth. Science can give formula in terms of maths, but we deal with things on clear concepts, distinctions and discriminations, on cognition and valuation of secondary qualities no less than that of the primary qualities. Science can furnish us the formulas of secondary qualities in terms of mathematics. But they cannot take the form of qualities themselves. They are expressions, symbols of the particular aspect of a thing. Things are not reduced nor can be reduced in mathematical formulas. Otherwise on spelling or speaking the formula it may work as magic on things and the scientist may turn out a jinn into jinnel. As philosopher in their theory speak of ultimate reality and absolute being but in practice they live and find their life worth living in rational reality, & so also some scientists and scientist philosophers in theory speak of existence only, of primary qualities, while actually they in practical life are lively and keen at the secondary qualities of things, they themselves do not turn out non-sentient beings and disapprove the world of senses. Things are what they are because they have on one hand material form on the other they have a formal one, because they maintain their essential thinghood by manifestation of certain qualities on one hand and run on or help run some activities or other. It is called their artha-kriya. Process of evolution is not static, it progresses, it progresses in activities, in qualities. Otherwise what were there to be evolved or developed, what were there to function as 'being' and 'becoming' ?

As matter, life, senses, mind and spirit are universally recognized as the main stages or levels in the process of evolution, and as we have already

considered that spirit in union with matter manifests various forms of beings with life, senses and mind stage by stage achieving higher and higher refinement and development by way of increasing purification, it will be worthwhile to see the process somewhat differently, specially from the view-point of individual soul in evolution. As we have seen that with the increasing purity of the soul, soul in general is believed to develop its cognitive capacity and also is able to have higher forms of being i.e. with increasing senses, with mind and in mind too having various capacities going on increasing in their scope like cognitive capacity developing *śrutajñāna*, *matijñāna*, *avadhijñāna*, *manahaparyaya-jñāna* and the like, so also it can be said regarding individual soul in general that the soul may in union with matter be able to have right from embodied state having one sense in its different shades and degrees to the state of being having five senses and mind, and being with minds having various capacities of cognition step by step, stage by stage, birth by birth. It may in the lapse of infinite time manifest itself in the birth series, all the types of beings serially in the order of development in its process of evolution. So, what is said figuratively of the self that all this is verily the self comes to be true metaphysically as the historical event, in the infinite manifestations of soul's becoming in its evolution. If the soul goes to proclaim in the Upanisadic manner: "Eko aham bahu syāme", verily then it is absolutely right.

So now this soul in its relative aspect goes on progressing by way of purification; and when attains complete purification it attains *kaivalya*, though the embodied above body, and philosophers and the enlightened seers call it realisation of God, or of Self-brahman, sat or being by whatever we name it is the final goal of evolution. It is the ideal realised. It is the potential

perfected. Here potential becomes perfect, it comes out as actual. The ideal remains no more ideal, but becomes real. Progress by purity reaches its culmination in perfection. The soul becomes by complete purification perfect. It realises itself in its purest natural state. Śrīmad has written that "all scriptures are written with a view to bring home the fact that there is no difference nor any distinction between the jeeva and the Jin - between one's own soul and that of the Jin - the Lord." It is the ideal of the path of self-realisation or dharma. In Upanishads and the Vedānta, it ^{is} a well-known fact that and is embodied in the triple statements: "Aham brahmāsmi"; "Tat - tvam - asi"; "so aham."

"Various types of view-points, various types of prazāna, various types of bhāṅgajāla and various types of anyoga - all those are like lakṣaṇa. The aim or the goal thereof all is sat-cit - ānand (the self)." (S.R.p.795/10).

"The sages have expressed only the sat - the ultimate reality, whatever form and name attributed to it. The knowledge of it alone is worth having, the faith therein alone ^{is} worth keeping and that verily is worth experiencing and worth worshipping with supreme love.

"Call that ultimate reality the supreme knowledge, call it supreme love if you like, and call it the sat-cit-ānand, call it soul, or the soul all-in-all, call it one or many, call it if you like all-in-one or one-in-all, but the sat is over the sat and that alone is worth stating by all these ways, and in fact is stated. All are nothing else but that alone.

"Such a supreme reality is called by infinite names such as Puruṣottama, Hari, Siddha, Ivara, Hiranjana, Aksha, Parabrahma, the great soul, the great God, the Bhagavats." (S.R.p.267/209).

Some utterances of sages are significant of this truth:

"Man is turned into God." (Eckhart).

"My being is God, not by simple participation but
by a true transformation of my Being." (St. Catherine of Genoa)¹.

"I am as great as God, He is as small as I am;
He is not above me, nor I below Him." (Angelus Silesius)²

"I am God." (Husayn ibn Mansur)³

"I became God." (R. Tsunashima)⁴

"Thou art the jeeva and thou art the Lord

So saying, Akho clapped as problem solved."

Having realised itself in its pure natural state, the soul becomes completely separated from matter after death and attains the absolute state, where it enjoys the omniscience and bliss achieved in Kaivalya. There reaches the process of soul's evolution its culmination, where two ends matter and soul or spirit stand as altogether separate and absolute, not at all related with each other.

There are some problems regarding the omniscience and will, omniscience and freedom, which face us, when we say self-realisation is achieved by

1. Douglas Clyde Macintosh : "Mysticism" in the basic Problems of Philosophy p.408.

2-3-4. Ibid, p.409

by self-purification and it is the goal, or ideal to be achieved, or when we say at human level evolution is ^aconscious effort, as by effort man changes his hypotheticalities into perfection. When we speak of omniscience, we feel that if future is known our will becomes nothing but merely expression of a destiny or destined which one can predict or ~~predict~~ foresee on the strength of omniscience. And accordingly if it is to ^{happen}~~happen~~, it may or must happen, what is the use of willing and aspiring ?

If we only know omniscience as knowledge, we won't have any such muddle. Knowledge knows the things as they are. It knows fact as a fact, possibility as ^apossibility. It knows probable as probable, destined as destined, cause as cause and result as result. So by omniscience possible does not turn out a destiny; probable seems as probable, possible as possible. And there are also alternatives which lead the process at different ends. Omniscience knows all the 'bhāvas' like will and destiny in their proper relations as they are. Supposing if the omniscient says that a particular person will attain liberation, the omniscient does also know that the person concerned will put in all the necessary efforts by his strong-willed nature and thorough self-sincerity. Because he knows the full strength of the causes - the talents in the person, that are to result in liberation. He knows the whole process wherein will is one factor as possibility and potentiality which transforms it into actuality; otherwise possibility and potentiality would have remained as they were and would not have resulted into actuality.

Scope for sciences and their developments by spiritual approach:

We have already seen that the evolutionary process starts from matter to spirit. Matter itself by its nature of ('pud-gal) uniting and disuniting

may turn out in various forms naturally though they the soul works out the evolution by entering into various raw or untouched matter and by its activities in an embodied states it does interfere and can change physical phenomenon to some extent by its own knowledge. As the process of evolution clasps in it all the stages life, senses, mind and spirit, Sciences, that man has found out and founded, can play their role at various levels of evolution.

But as spirit works at every level or in every field, and it is by the ex-natural manifestation of soul that the forms like life, senses and mind have come into existence it is naturally more helpful if we take spiritual ^{rather than} approach ^a then the materialistic one. We have ^a better grip over the situation by approaching the initiator and active agent in the phenomena, than the non-conscious and the passive one.

If soul's ex-natural tendency is going to incur the matter in the form of karmas and those karmas are in the background in mundane life either in the form of life, senses or mind, then it is better ^{to} of approach the soul and its ex-natural tendency whereby we can know its working in the affairs, facts and phenomena.

Secondly, if we believe sciences to be the achievement of knowledge, it is clear that on increasing ^{our} capacity of knowledge there may be made relative advance in sciences, as avenues of knowledge open with the increase in its capacity e.g. mati, sruta, avadhi, manahparyaya etc. and by a spiritual approach the capacity ^{can} be increased, not only that, if it be right and spiritual it won't turn out harmful to any soul, to any being, it might be

balanced naturally by wisdom and the sense of service and bliss for mankind.

Welfare as a programme as evolution at human level: a conscious effort.

If purification of soul is the principle of evolution, then it is obvious that it is a conscious effort, and as such should be pursued as one programme for the betterment of mankind and other beings. It is because of this fact that religion has ever taken the form of some institution. Even the omniscient seers who have been completely non-attached by their keen wishes of the past establish the system of religion or school of philosophy.

Srinad^{ai} laid great stress on puruṣārtha both by individuals and society. He was highly zealous^a in his early youth. He wrote: "Wait and see how we are going to shape the world?" He wrote on "Importance of society" in his Mokṣasāra, he wrote many poems on social and religious reforms in his boyhood. His view of puruṣārtha and its four kinds throws light on the past how Sri Rṣabhadeo and Bharat established four āśramas - the abodes and sources of right efforts. It is thrilling to know how they poured spirit at all levels of life and how they formed a powerful, intelligent, united and wise society. From raw and rude life of nature it shaped it in the civilized and cultured one and enhanced progress of mankind for ages. Rṣabhadeo is called Adināth, Brahman^{is} and known by such other names because he created the 'aruṣṭi' - i.e. he taught ari, masi and krusi. He taught all languages to 'Brahmi' which is known as 'Saraswati'. She wrote different scripts, some by right, some by left. He taught all fine arts to 'Sundari'. He taught all arts of war and weapons to his son, Bharat, who became first emperor of the world. He taught agriculture to people. Thus he created the civilized and cultured society and spread civilisation throughout the world with the help

of Bharat who ruled all over the world. He ^{therefore,} was called the Prajapati. When he renounced and established system of religion his Canadhara wrote various scriptures known as the Dwadasāngi. The Canadhara is considered the best writer and is popular as Ganapati.

Socrates too insisted that there should be ^a philosopher king as the head of the state; because he has the vision of the good. He (philosopher) is usually not caring to shoulder such responsibility but he should be made to shoulder it. "I (Socrates) said: Until philosophers are kings or kings and princes have the spirit and power of philosophy and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and these commoner natures, who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils - no, nor the human race, as I believe - and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of the day."¹

"Then, I said, the business of us who are the founders of the State will be to compel the best minds to attain that knowledge which we have already shown to be the greatest of all - they must continue ascend until they arrive at the good, but when they have ascended and seen enough we must not allow them to do as they do now."

"What do you mean?"

"I mean that they remain in the upper world; but this must not be allowed; they must be made to descend, Again among the prisoners in the den,² and partake of their labours and honours, whether they are worth having or not."

1. Reginald F. O'Neill: Readings in Epistemology p.4

2. Ibid, p.19.

^{the}
In Gita there is appeal for action with a view to Loka Sangraha:

"Karmasaiva hi samsiddhim

-Ashita Janakadayah

Lokasangrahevapi

Sampashyam kartum arhasi " 1

Even Gautam Buddha and Mahaveer preached to the aspirant four Bhavanas like Maitri, Pranada, Karunya and Madhynatha. Swami Vivekananda and Christ laid greater stress on world brotherhood. Srined writes: "I have not even the slightest sense of difference with any of the souls." And yet it is generally believed how thoughtlessly that religion is not this worldly but other worldly. The same is said about Srined's philosophy. But it is not so. His religion and philosophy are neither for this world nor for the other; or say it was for the both. It is for the soul, for man, who by way of self-purification can lead to perfection. No doubt he has preached renunciation and non-attachment; but his renunciation of a different sort. "To give up soul-identification with the manifestation of other substance is renunciation said by the Tirthankara," according to him. He wants to live as a soul, as the master of body, senses and the mind and not as their slave. He wanted to awake in every man the spirit of the self, of soul; so that he may live his life feeling every inch a soul, so that he may lead a life of thorough self-sincerity.

He had had a keen sense of the uplift of the society. Once he cross-questioned Mahipatram Ruparam Keelkantha. He narrates the incident:

1. Srined Bhagavad Gita, III, 20.

"Mahipatram was telling and writing that the adversity of this Bharatavaras is owing to the Jain religion. Ten years ago, when he happened to meet in Ahmedabad I asked him:

Q: Bhai, does Jainism preach non-violence, faith, unity, compassion, well-fare of all beings, paramartha i.e. 'suumum bonum', well-being of others, justice, morality, healthy and wholesome food and drink, giving ^{up} of bad habits, diligence etc.

Mahipatram replied: Yes.

Q: Bhai, does Jainism prohibit violence, untruth, theft, disunity and differences, cruelty, selfishness, injustice, immorality, cunning, unwholesome food and drink, excessive enjoyment, passion-greed, idleness and lethargy etc.

Mahipatram: Yes.

Q: What leads to adversity of the nation ?

Mahipatram : By the latter i.e. by violence, ... etc.

Q: Then does the country's uplift can be had by the opposites of violence etc. i.e. by non-violence, truth, unity, etc.

Mahipatram: Yes.

Q: Does Jainism preach such enlightenment and practice that can lead country to uplift or to adversity ?

Mahipatram: Bhai, I do confess that Jainism preaches the means whereby the nation can attain uplift. I did not think over it so minutely and so discriminately. We in the childhood learnt at the Christian School where we acquired such impressions. Therefore we said and wrote in such a manner without giving any thought to it.

Mahipatram confessed with straightforwardness. In the search and research of truth straightforwardness is a necessity. To get the essence of truth one must go to the depths with discrimination," (S.R.p.666).

So one while concluding thoughtlessly over such matters should take a hint from the above and understand the hearts of the enlightened. Srīmad writes: "To this world without any refuge the enlightened seer alone is the refuge The mundane world is absolutely full of unhappiness. Even the slightest ease that any being is having verily the grace of the seer. Without some kind of 'punya' one cannot have any ease at all, and that 'punya' is not known without the preachings of the seer; after long time the preached 'punya' is available through tradition so it seems as if it has been attained from scriptures etc. but the source of it all is the seer alone. So we believe it once ^{for} from all that from the slightest ease to the absolute bliss - all samsādhī owe its existence to the seer. Though having such supreme capacity he is without any wish, without any conceit, ego or self-aggrandisement....." (S.R.p.269). It is seer that makes 'Śiva' of 'Jeeva', leads from bondage to eternal bliss and freedom.

Soul the source, its purification a power :

Soul itself is the source of all the good the world over. All kinds of happiness lie within the soul, as nowhere else lies happiness. Soul is itself the enemy and friend of his. It is the soul that in the process of evolution attains by purification higher stages of being and higher type of happiness, greater freedom, greater talents. So purification of the soul proves to be a power in the attainment of freedom, happiness, perfection, omniscience and eternal bliss. Pure soul is the abode of all these.

Brihad writes: "All the great mysteries and mystic powers are at the command of the perfect self. It is^a decided fact and is worth accepting without any doubt therein. Where there is shown out the perfect state of the self there if all the great mysteries do not dwell, then where else shall they find their abode? It is worth considering. There is no possibility of having other abodes as such; and then there shall be their non-existence. But if there is^{no} non-existence of the perfect state of the self, then how can there be a non-existence of the great mysteries? And if at all it is argued that there is possibility of the perfect state of the self, but there seems no possibility of the great mysteries, then it is nothing else but a self-contradiction; because the holder of the contention knows such an extremely inferior mystery to the pure self to be greater; and accepts it so. This is significant of the fact that the speaker is ignorant of the self.

"Nothing is greater than the self. There never happened to be, nor shall be, nor doth exist such a mystery on earth that which is not at hand to the perfect self.....(S.R.p. 354/411).

"The ignorant and the deluded devoid of enlightenment are now-a-days taking of low aims and efforts and say, 'there is no possibility of Keval-jñāna at present', 'there is no liberation' now-a-days. While words of the enlightened are always inspiring and encouraging efforts. The deluded is himself weak and spiritless, so his preaching is low aimed. One should not mind the matters like pañcan kāla - degrading age, bhāvasthiti, physical weakness and short life-time; and should not even hear those who doubt of possible efforts.

"One should not mind the idle talks showing the efforts unnecessary on the pretext of the possible 'agocya kevali' who attained kaivalya naturally without any efforts. On hearing such stories one should not give up right efforts.

" Purusārtha is the best." (S.R.^{p.}703).

"The original nature of the soul is not as you believe it to be; the soul is not solely covered and limited by the karmas. Its purusārtha dharma is absolutely free."

(S.R.p.690)

"If one puts in the right efforts he becomes completely free. If there be karmas of infinite past, but if the soul puts in efforts, karmas won't say that they won't give way. Within half an hour all the infinite karmas can be destroyed." (S.R.p.709)

"Karmas are not destroyed singly one by one. The enlightened ones taking the whole lot of them destroy them all at a time." (S.R.p.708).

"Karmas won't get destroyed without any efforts if one puts in the efforts, they certainly cannot stand, they vanish." (S.R.p.708)

"The soul must be bold at efforts."

"There is no mightiness like that of the self."

Grinād concluded his say, as we saw, saying, "Thou art freedom - liberation, /thou art infinite knowledge, though art absolute, thou art pure, thou art the enlightened, thou art the caitanya-ghana, thou art the self-luminous, thou art the home of happiness - eternal bliss. What more should be said. Think it over and you shall realise."

by thorough thinking

It is left to man to rise to the occasion and to come in form. Man has to be sincere to his own self within. If he is not sincere to it what else will remain sincere to it? And how can he ^{except} anything or anybody remain either sincere to his own self or even sincere to itself or himself. ^{if he} ~~he~~ ignores his own self and practically repudiates ^{it} ~~leaves~~ ^{it} aside, as if not concerned, then he is ignored by all else; such is the law of the nature.

There is clear warning in the Upanisads. Yajñavalkya tells plainly to Kaitreyi:

"brahma taṁ parādāt, yo'nyatrātmano brahma veda; kṣatram taṁ parādāt, yo'nyatrātmanah kṣatram veda; lokas taṁ parādāh, yo'nyatrātmano lokān veda; devās taṁ parādāh, yo'nyatrātmano devān veda; vedās taṁ parādāh, yo'nyatrātmano vedān veda; bhūtāni taṁ parādāh, yo'nyatrātmano bhūtāni veda; sarvaṁ taṁ parādāt, yo'nyatrātmanah sarvaṁ veda; idam brahma, idam kṣatram, ime lokāḥ, ime devāḥ, ime vedāḥ, imāni bhūtāni, idam sarvaṁ, yad ayaṁ ātma."

"Brahmanhood deserts him who knows Brahmanhood in anything else than the Self. Kṣatriyahood deserts him who knows Kṣatriyahood in anything else than the Self. The worlds desert him who knows the worlds in anything else than the Self. The gods desert him who knows the gods in anything else than the Self. The Vedas desert him who knows the Vedas in anything else than the Self. The beings desert him who knows the beings in anything else than the Self. All deserts him who knows all in anything else than the Self. This Brāhmanhood, this Kṣatriyahood, and these worlds, these gods, these Vedas, all these beings, ¹ this all are the Self."

Hence, one should remain thoroughly self-sincere. Self-sincerity is the mother of all morality, it is the essence of all ethics. On turning out true to one's own self, one feels its presence ever in every state and shall realise itself the seer of the situation or the state. Thus will he find himself as absolute. It will give undaunted spirit to face any situation and give him the insight to realise dependence and otherness of the matter. He will, then, try to give up ex-natural tendency and turn out pure. Being pure he will be perfect. Thus self-sincerity serves as the great impetus. Without it all religion and its practices are only show and philosophy is but a pretext in the name of māya. Śrīmad has washed off his hands saying "As the soul wants to remain deluded no remedy can help, and all efforts are futile."

Think and

Man has to realise this once for all that he alone can raise his inner self by thorough self-sincerity, by remaining true to his own self by giving up ex-natural tendency. Purity leads to perfection. Perfection of humanity is divinity.

Gita has made a final appeal to the self-sincerity of man, with a warning:

"Uddharat ātmāna-ātmānaṁ

Na-ātmānaṁ avasādayet /

Ātmāiva hyātmāno bandhur-

Ātmāiva ripur-ātmānah // ¹

Om Śānti, Śānti, Śānti