

“DEV DHARMA “

THE MEANING OF LIFE

S. P. KANAL

Delhi University

The Meaning of Life

Introduction

We are too much engaged and engrossed in our busy routine to find to raise the question: 'What is the meaning of life?'. But there come occasions or situations in life when this question comes to the forefront of our consciousness. If we lose a dear one, say when one loses one's only promising child, or one loses one's partner in life, we ask, what the meaning of life is. Is it another name for suffering or pain? If one faces terrible deprivations and frustrations for years together in grinding labor to build up one's business or profession and when he reaches its zenith, he finds to his dismay that he suffers from cancer, he writhes in agony and asks himself: "Is life meaning striving? Were my tears and toils to end in smoke? Is this suffering of cancer a term in the unending series of suffering? Are life and suffering identical?" If a person has worked for political emancipation of his country from foreign rule, suffered imprisonment and risked life or fought for social and political justice for years and thus earned so much respect and gratitude that wherever he goes, he gets standing ovation from millions, and then comes a time when people turn their face when they see him or he is faced with the fate of Browning's 'The Patriot', he shouts in sorrow, 'what is this chaotic drama of life? Is it a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury, signifying nothing?' Thus the occasion of the loss of a dear one, of incurable disease, of frustration and disgrace, shake one out of the slumber inducted by engagements in meeting the demands of desires, to ask about the meaning of life. No wonder, the answer is pessimistic for it is the only answer which tragedies can give to the question.

There are other situations too, which make one give such pessimistic answer. Some persons come to consider the normal satisfaction of their biological instincts to be sinful through their religious and social culture and thus suppress them. They get mentally diseased. In this state the world loses all its charm for them. The most joyous events leave them cold. They consider life as a meaningless burden, senseless suffering.

As we grow old, our responsibilities in relation to children are over. We are retired from work. Our instincts for enjoyment are deadened. And one or another disease makes our body a permanent home. In this state of old age, life becomes tasteless. One feels one is carrying a load. One

wonders whether life is not a maya, an illusion, or a conspiracy of sufferings.

These reactions to situations involving disease, frustration, old age and death, are emotional and not reflective. They represent moods of the hour. Even if these moods become settled, as it does happen in the life of some persons, they are not worthy of serious consideration. However, they are philosophers, both theistic and non-theistic, who support the view that life is meaningless. They give reasons in support of the conclusion that life is all suffering and therefore, worthless. They challenge anyone to say that life on earth is worth while. Let us study their reasons for such a conclusion about life on earth.

The Pessimistic view.

Atheistic philosophers of pessimism agree that life on earth is empty of significance. We have a number of desires which make us restless and clamor for satisfaction. We strive hard to fulfill them. In spite of our tiresome labor we fail to satisfy many of them. Their frustration rancors in our heart and this rancor grows more painful as their fulfillment becomes impossible. They remain ghosts to disturb our peace of mind.

We do fulfill some of our desires, but we are disappointed to find that their fulfillment has not yielded the satisfaction we expected of them. The distance had lent charm to the idea of their satisfaction, but their actual satisfaction is less satisfactory. For example, as Young-men we thought if we could amass wealth, we would have heaven around us. We suffer deprivation and put in endless toil to get rich. When we get rich, the glow of success declines into dull feeling. Further, we find that when we grow rich, we do not become happier in proportion. On the contrary, some rich persons are so bored with wealth that they commit suicide.

We bring up children with a halo of hopes about them. As time passes, the halo round our hopes disappears and hopes turn into disappointments.

Our pleasures in life are baseless. What gives us satisfaction today, fails to satisfy us later on. The new cinema tunes which we so much enjoy that we wish to hear them again and again in the day, soon lose their charm for us. We feel bored by them. We enthusiastically get a new dress stitched. But after some time we do not care even to look at it. There is no principle on which our pleasures rest. They are arbitrary in character.

Our pleasures are not only without foundation, they are undependable. As Hartmann puts it, pleasures are prostitutes, we cannot

depend on them. They leave us without reason, without notice. We may be happy at this moment and next moment we find the sun of happiness is covered with clouds, and set for ever.

Our pleasures fail to sustain themselves. The more intense the satisfaction, the less is its duration. If we try to sustain our pleasures, they turn into pain. Take a simple example. If we are hungry, we will enjoy if we take two or three pieces of sweet (rasgullas). We feel tempted to maintain this state of satisfaction. We take one or two rasgullas more, only to feel disappointed that these two rasgullas have not yielded the same quantity of pleasures, which the first two rasgullas had given. To compensate for the loss, we try two other rasgullas, only two experience a nauseating feeling. If we are foolish enough to take two more rasgullas, we cannot avoid vomiting. This is, in economics, the law of diminishing returns. What is true for this bodily pleasure is true for all bodily pleasures. They are incapable for sustaining themselves. There is no way to avoid their mortality.

The futility of bodily pleasures becomes still more patent when we know that many a pleasure demands 'ahuti' of pain. If we want to have satisfaction of food we must experience the pain of hunger. We cannot enjoy food on a full stomach. The pangs of hunger alone can give the pleasure of food. However, the pleasures of satisfaction of hunger do not last long. They are soon followed by pangs of hunger. Our pleasures are preceded and followed by pain. However bright be our pleasures, there are hunting shadow of pains to extinguish them. Our pleasures are conspiracies for pains. Just as a flicker of light intensifies the darkness, a flush of pleasure intensifies the gloom of life.

Whenever our pleasures are chance-medley, our pains are companions of life, for degeneration is unavoidable and inevitable in life. Our degradation begins the moment of our conceptions in mother's womb. The date of our conception is the date of our death. When we speak of a child as two years old, we mean he is two years short of life. The process of degeneration is true for all our organs and energies of life. As years pass, the degenerative process ascends to dominate our personality. Our bodily organs and intellectual and emotional fabric decline and decay and we become old. It is said old age is itself a disease. But the suffering of old age is not only physical. In old age, we become strangers in our own home which we have ourselves built. The younger generation we reared with love and service, looks askance on us. They feel us old fossils, whose place is in museums rather than in home. In hundreds of ways, open or subtle, they tell us we are out of place, our world is all over, and gone. We still offer them love. But they do not appreciate it. On the contrary, they feel irritated by the coldness of our kisses, the shakiness of

our embrace. As we step out of home, we find ourselves stranger in outside society. The old friends in business or profession who greeted us and welcomed us, are gone. The new generation has taken their place, who show slight recognition and no concern. The natural world is no more welcome to us. The wet earth and cold water which sent us in ecstasies in our childhood, now produces a shudder in our old age. The flowers no more look enchanting as they did in childhood. The foot is less prompt to meet the morning dew, the heart less bounding to emotions new. Disowned by home and society, we have not even the strength to cry. Overwhelmed by sufferings of physical disability, mental degeneration and, social ostracism, we mutter: 'Is the life is not a vanity, a pointless suffering? We feel that the human loves are frail, human relations brittle, human world is callous, and human life is tragedy.

Whatever little capacity man has for enjoying pleasures of life, is ruined by religion. It dings into man's ears that pleasures of this earth are a snare to trap man into recurrent transmigration. If we pursue worldly pleasure, it warns us, we be born as a fly or a mosquito only to be tortuously killed by D.D.T. Poor man, who seeks shelter in pleasures against pains of life, comes to distrust his pleasures and thus helplessly surrenders himself to pains.

The philosophers like Schopenhauer and E.V. Hartmann, and literary giants like, Tolstoy, and Thomas Hardy, all consider life to be a 'stupid fraud', a luckless chance that man became conscious to be overwhelmed with pointless suffering. They all conclude that it would have been a better world if there had been no life on earth.

'Today or tomorrow', wrote Tolstoy in A Confession, 'sickness or death will come to those I love or to me; nothing will remain but stench and worms. Sooner or later my affairs, whatever they may be, will be forgotten and I shall not exist. Then why go on making any efforts?' Tolstoy linked the fate of man to that of a traveler in the Eastern tale who pursued by an enraged beast, seeks refuge in a dry well. At the bottom of the well he sees a dragon that has opened its jaws to swallow him. To escape the enraged beast above and the dragon below, he holds on to a twig that is going in a crack in the well. As he looks around, he noticed that two mice are gnawing at the stem of the twig. He realizes that very soon the twig will snap and he will fall into his doom, but at the same he sees some drops of honey on the leaves of the other branch and reaches out with his tongue to lick them. "So I, too, clung to the twig of life; knowing that dragon of death was inevitably awaiting me, ready to tear me to pieces..... I tried to lick the honey which formerly consoled me but the honey no longer give me pleasure. I only saw the

inescapable dragon and the mice and I could not tear my gaze from them. And this not a fable but the real unanswerable truth."

Clarence Darrow is one of the most compassionate man who ever lived in America. He holds: 'Life is a ship on the sea tossed by every wave and by every wind; a ship headed for no port and no harbor, without rudder, no compass, no pilot, simply floating for a time, then lost in the wave.'

Schopenhauer says that 'the final judgment' about vanity of life is death. This is the last proof, that life is a false path, that all wishing is perversity and that nothing at all is worth our striving, our efforts and struggles.

Criticism of pessimism.

The philosophies of pessimism are wrong in denying all meaning to life. Their conclusion that life is meaningless is based on the false pre-supposition that life and pain are identical. If life and pain were identical, life would have long disappeared. If in taking each morsel, I were to experience pain of a severe toothache, how many morsels of food I would take and how long I would survive. If sexual intercourse were as severely painful as hand in fire, how would human species survive. The fact is that exercise of the biological functions is pleasurable. I find pleasure in eating food, I eat and live. I enjoy sexual intercourse and become father of children. It may be said by the pessimist that the existence of pleasure is not denied. There are pleasures in life, but the pleasures are mainly to intensify the consciousness of suffering. The separation from pleasure makes pain more acute. The logic of the pessimists can be turned on them. We can say that pain exists to intensify pleasure. The pangs of hunger exist to intensify the pleasure or satisfaction that follows it. The headache is painful. The relief of headache is experienced as pleasurable. This relief from headache gives us the consciousness how our normal healthy existence is pleasurable.

It is a strange oddity in the thinking of the pessimists that they consider death to be a tragedy. They point out that illumination of intellect is achieved through infinite labour, and death snuffs out the light of the intellect. It takes a life-time of arduous discipline to cultivate some virtues, but death turns these diamonds of heart into dust. If some rare person, by chance, enjoys happiness, death puts an end to his happiness. Death takes away from us the dear ones whom we have brought up with love and service.

There is no doubt that the pessimists indulge in double thinking. If intellectual illumination is something worthwhile in itself, then death which extinguishing it becomes a tragedy, not otherwise. If emotional maturity of virtues is good in itself, then and then only death is an evil. If love of dear ones is valuable in itself then death is the most painful event which deprives us of them.

If intellectual illumination, and emotional maturity of compassion and love **PAGE-----7 TOP.**

Religion and science are two of the major disciplines of human creativity. Each one of them has separate origin, attitude, field of operation and method of study.

(1)

Religion originated in fear. The primitive man found himself faced with certain conditions in his environment which threatened his very existence. Storms and lightnings, floods and earthquakes, blew away or washed away his huts or houses, injured or killed his domestic animals and lay waste or turned to ashes his ready harvests. In his state of fright against such ruinous events, he thought, given his undeveloped intellect and ignorance, that events are caused by conscious agents and so there must be agents of the frightful events. He did not perceive these agents in his environments and so he thought of them as invisible. He called these invisible agents God. It is not only the undeveloped intellectual of the ignorant primitive man that thought thus. Even today when there is so much knowledge about events of Nature, the theistic intellect still shares the primitive world view. Some years back there was a famine of water in Maharashtra State due to absence of rains. On this occasion the educated heads of all theistic religions convened a joint large public meeting in which they prayed to God to forgive their sins and give rain. The theistic mentality of the modern man is no superior to the mentality of the primitive man inspite of all the knowledge of events of Nature which modern scientific education has given to it. To think that God can cause rain is not superior pattern of thinking then to think of Indra Deva to be the cause of rain. Monotheism is no superior to polytheism in its anthropological model of thinking. Both are stupid enough to think that natural events are due to some conscious agent or agents.

Though the primitive man thought of some super-human agents of natural agents and gave them the dignified name of gods, yet he gave them his own psychology. He knew he got others to do things for him by all blown adulation, by going into a mood of humility and surrender and by offering gifts. So when he thought of getting a god to protect him from some calamity, he indulged him indiscriminate praise of him and offered him gifts. This is how religion was born. The early man framed prayers eulogizing his gods, singing hymns in praise of them and by going prostrate before their image or symbol and offering gifts to them. Let us refer to our Vedas, the most ancient scriptures of the world. In the mantras the gods are given so much of praise that it makes it difficult to differentiate one god from another and this made it easy for commentators to assert that Vedas consistently hold to monotheism. True. there are monotheistic mantras in Vedas but to interpret that primarily all mantras are monotheistic in character is taking too much liberties with the texts.

The Vedic Aryans pray to God for protection from wild animals (by which they were surrounded in their early period of life) thus: "O God, give us not upto evil creatures as spoils to wolf or she wolf" (R.V.vi. 516). They prayed to god Indra to protect them from local tribes which attacked them: "O Indra, we are surrounded on all sides by Dasyu tribes: O' destroyer of foes! Kill them". (R.V.x. 22.8) They prayed for cattle: " O Agni, may this sacrifice be rich in kine, sheep and horses'. (R.V.iv 2.5) They prayed for rain for their agricultural prosperity. O Varuna, Mitra, pour down in plenty here upon the people, the choice of your celestial rain" (R.V. vii; 64.2) They prayed from freedom disease: "Soma And Rudra, expel the wide spread sickness that had entered in dwellings; keep of Nirriti (misfortune and poverty) so that she may be far away, many prosperous means of substenance be ours (R.V.6.13.2) They prayed for protection of life: "Agni, be thou our guardian and protector, bestow upon us life and vital vigour. Accept, O Mighty one, the gift we offer and with increasing care protect our bodies." (R.V.x. 77:T)

It is clear from these few hymns that the motivation of religion is fear. We love and struggle to live and seek pleasure and avoid death and pain. Whatever threatens our life and pleasure causes fear. Fear is the urge to get rid of circumstances threatening our life and pleasures. No wonder all religions offer techniques of how to live even after death. Immortality of long life is assured by all religions under certain conditions. It is true there ha been progress in thought as to what constitutes true life and lasting pleasure. Biological life is distinguished from spiritual life. Body is distinguished from soul. Body is perishable and its desires and satisfactions are transitory and mixed with pain. So religion has consoled man that his soul is immortal or a more lasting entity. It prescribes elaborate spiritual exercises to ensure an eternal life of bliss for soul or long lasting peaceful

and harmonious life for soul. All religious idealism boils down to obtaining eternal life of bliss or indefinite life of harmony and peace hereafter through successful communion with one's deity.

The origin of science is in the instinct of curiosity just as origin of religion is in the instinct of fear. As the instinct of fear is escape from dangers that threaten life and pleasure, the instinct of curiosity is the urge to know things for themselves. Aristotle said: "Philosophy begins in wonder." Kant said: "The starry heaven above and moral law within make me wonder." Ralph Weldon Emerson says: " Men love to wonder and that is the seed of science."

In a child the instinct of curiosity or wonder is strong. To him the world is a magic box. He wants to open it and see it for the fun of it. If he happens to find a watch, he can not resist the temptation to open it. In his attempt to open it and see it, he mishandles its part, loses some and renders the watch useless. The elders blame him, blow him why he opened it, what he had to get from it, he had nothing to do with time. He was not to be a watch-maker! The child has no answer. His curiosity is his only answer. He was not seeking any advantage in opening it. He was seeking understanding of it. The watch was not thing of utility for him, a thing to keep his engagements. He was not interested in it to take to the profession of a watch-maker or watch manufacturer. His interest was delight in understanding it. A scientist, like the child, finds the world to be bewitching in its fascinating working. He wants to understand it for its own sake. He is drawn to the truth of things for their own sake. We at common sense level, can appreciate a scientist's delight in truth if we take our own example from our daily life from another sphere. We prefer to put on beautiful dress. What has the beauty of dress to do with its utility? We put on clothes to cover our shame and protect our body from dirt and cold. A rough and ready dress does discharge all these functions as well. Then why do we seek beautiful dress? From the point of view of utility there is nothing to choose between the two dresses. Beauty of the dress has no extra utility to rough dress, It is not preferable on the basis of utility. Beauty of the beautiful dress has its own intrinsic attraction. We seek its for its own sake and find complete satisfaction in it without regard of its utility. Sometimes we sacrifice some utility of beauty. We choose to love beauty for its own sake and find in it all justification in seeking it and creating it. A scientist seeks truth for its own sake as we seek a beautiful dress and finds his complete fulfillment in seeking or discovering it. To put it in the words of Russell: "Science in its beginning was due to men who were in love with it. They perceived the beauty of the stars and the sea, of the winds and mountains....Heraclitus and Ionian philosophers from whom came the first impulse to scientific knowledge (in th West) felt the strange beauty of the world almost like a madness in the blood. They

were men of Titanic passionate intellect and from the intensity of their intellectual passion the whole movement of the modern world has sprung." (Scientific Outlook, pp 271-72) To a passionate scientific intellect understanding the universe is the be-all an end-all of his study. He does not seek beyond understanding. He does not seek worldly enrichment or spiritual salvation through knowledge. To him to perceive the universe as a system of law is the highest satisfaction. He would undergo any sacrifice to be beholden to the harmony of the laws in the universe.

There is a world of difference between a religious man seeking knowledge and a pure scientist seeking knowledge. A religious man has some interest other than knowledge in seeking knowledge, whereas a pure scientist is disinterested in seeking knowledge. As religious consciousness developed it sought knowledge of self and the universe. But the knowledge is tied to the objective of salvation or 'moksha'. Knowledge has worth for him as a means or method of salvation. All knowledge outside this objective is waste of life. All that is of worth for religious consciousness is self-knowledge for self-realization.

Scientific knowledge may yield utility. The Greek philosophers felt it a misfortune if a utility was found for a truth. They considered a truth inferior for which utility is found. They distinguished three grades of values or good. Good as a means. Transport is good as a means to reach one's destination. It has no value in itself. Good as an end has value in itself and may also be useful. Education is an end in itself, it illuminates our mind. But it is also a means to help us to get into some profession in life. The highest grade of good is that good which is beyond all utility. The perception of the highest truth is example of the third grade of good. In the western scientific culture, the highest scientist is the theorist who gives understanding of the universe, though his theory may have no utility for mankind. The scientist who seeks knowledge for utility in the form of inventions, ranks second in science.

(2)

The second difference between religion and science is this: Worship and not morality is the soul of religion. If one lacks feeling of worship for a deity he is not a religious person, however magnificent be his nobility of character. Again, the anthropologists tell us the tribal religions had very little to do with morality. This is clear from the fact that whereas religious beliefs of various tribes are so much diverse, their moral practices are comparatively similar. Morality is based among them on practical common sense of the group. Since social life necessitates respect for life, property and sex, the behavior pattern is framed according to the

social and political conditions and the state of knowledge of the group in which these three respects can be practiced.

It is true that as religion developed, morality came to be recognized as essential to religious life. In all developed religions codes of conduct are prescribed. However, even when morality comes to be recognized and prescribed, faith and worship remain indispensable. There is no religion in the world which does not place faith or worship as the primary condition of admission to it. No man will be admitted to a religious society on the basis of his observance of the best ethical life. He must accept faith and worship of the deity of the religion he wishes to join.

Faith and worship expresses itself in rituals. Hindus garland their deity, sing hymns and arti. A Christian goes on his knees and offers praise and prayer to his lord. A Muslim says prayer five times a day, and each time he indulges in the praise of his God. Even though certain religions like Buddhism and Confucianism avoided worship to start with, worship has entrenched itself in their religions. However, rituals are not indispensable to worship. Their religious sects, which do not observe rituals in their worships.

In science there is no place for faith or worship. When a scientist enters his laboratory, he does not go with a garland in hand to offer to the photo of Newton or Einstein, though their intellect is higher than the sky. No scientist goes on his knees before the photo of Newton or Einstein, but the same scientist does go on his knees when he goes to his church. A scientist does not go to his laboratory to seek acceptance of what other scientists have said in a particular field. He goes to check the truth of what has been said. His attitude is not one of acceptance but critical examination of the theories in the field. It is best to sum up what Karl Popper says about scientific attitude. "On the pre-scientific level we hate the very idea that we may be mistaken. So we cling dogmatically to our conjectures as long as possible. On the scientific level, we systematically search for our mistakes, for our errors. This is a great thing. We are consciously critical in order to detect our errors. This is the ethical method of error elimination. It is the method of science".

(3)

The third difference between religion and science relates to their field of operation. **Religion deals with values, science deals with facts.**

Every developed religion lays down commandments. The commandments of Moses is a case in point. In our Vedas we have Vidhi and Nisedha. In Koran the whole social life is prescribed. At a higher stage

there is call for purity of soul from passions like greed, sex, anger, undue attachments, ego-love and cruelty and for cultivation of gratitude, compassion, love, reverence, disinterested service. Some of the noble sayings of Dhammapada (the path of virtue) and the Sermon on the Mount are supreme texts of moral virtues. Religion offers spiritual exercises for elimination of ugly passions and development of beautiful virtues. The doctrines of heaven and moksha, and salvation dominate all developed religions and these are primarily value concepts.

Science is concerned to know what is what. It studies events, discover laws of them and seeks higher and higher laws. For example Kepler formulated three laws for explanation of the movements of heavenly bodies. These were laws of the lowest order of generality. Newton's genius was to take these three laws and Galelio's law of falling bodies and subsume them under the higher general law of gravitation. Einstein's law of gravitation is more general than Newton's law of gravitation for it covers in its explanation not only matter but also light and every form of energy.

Physicals sciences study inanimate existences and events like earthquakes, volcanoes, hurricane, floods, lightning and epidemics and no where find need to evoke value concepts to explain this. But religious do give value interpretation. Religious persons, like Gandhiji said when Bihar earthquake took place in 1934 that it was caused by God as a punishment to Hindus for ill-treating untouchables. Ahmedya leaders thought it was a warning to Muslims for non-recognition of their founder as Masiha. In 1960 when an unusually alarming comet appeared in England, an eminent Scottish divine declared that the comets are "prodigies of great judgment on these lands for our sins, for never was the Lord more provoked by a people." At personal level when we get some incurable illness like cancer, we ask ourselves as to what sins we have committed to suffer unbearable pain. We seek value explanation for the physical event of cancer. No medical researcher goes out to find out what sins lead to cancer. His researchers are concerned with changes in the body caused by habits in food, drinks and environments. The scientist lifts all physical events of earthquakes, floods, diseases from the morass of value concepts.

The religious outlook is ego-centric. It makes man to look on the universe from his superiority. How much man has tickled his vanity by his make-belief that the infinite God thought it worthwhile to create man, and to provide him with the universe for his needs and enjoyments and looks after him day and night; or in how much megalomania man has indulged in, in hypnotizing himself into the belief that he and Brahman are one. Thus the universe has no meaning apart from him and whenever an unusual event happens in it, it is a warning from God to man to beware of his misconduct.

Science studies the universe without its relation to man and treats man as any other object of the universe, giving him no privileged position. It removes man from the centre of the stage of the universe and refuses to impute human and divine values to the universe. It remains value neutral to get at the factual aspect of things. The astronomical facts of planets, even those of our planet, are explained by science without bringing in value concepts. It finds that the evolution is not known to have occurred in hundreds and million of other planets. It interprets in cold logic the evolution on our planet as well as other possible destruction of our planet in future, when it collides with some other planet. It speaks of the evolution of the conditions which has made life possible on earth and speaks with the same unconcern about the probable effects of the second law of thermo-dynamics by which heat is so distributing itself that no life will be possible. Science studies the universe with complete unconcern for human personality and values. Science tells itself not to let 'ego, come between its understanding and the universe.

The emphasize the point for the purpose of clarification let us take Darwin's theory of evolution. Darwin explained the origin of man by 'chance variation' and 'Natural selection' both value void concepts. He excludes any purpose in the rise and disappearance of species. We can understand the difference of approach to evolution between science and religion if we compare the scientific theory of evolution of Darwin with the religious theory of evolution of the Christian mystic Teilhard de Chardin and the Absolutist theory of evolution by the Indian mystic, Sri Aurobindo. Religion puts meaning and values on the facts of the process of evolution, while science ignore them as irrelevant and obstructive in the understanding of evolution.

Even when science deals with value activities of man an his institutions, it excludes value perspective. Take sociology. It deals with rituals, customs, conventions and moral codes of different tribes and communities, as they are practiced without evaluating them. It does not compare the conduct pattern of different societies in terms of good or bad. It just says what they are. Psychology studies human motivation and behavior in factual terms. For example, it tells us how habits are formed and how habits can be broken. But it says nothing about what are good habits and what are bad habits and how to judge them. If a patient asks a doctor if he should live or die, he will tell him his science is not concerned with this question. It deals with the conditions in which health can be maintained and improved and the conditions in which body deteriorates and how diseases can be cured. There is a factual aspect of things and events and science hold that understanding is adversely affected by bringing in values.

(4)

The fourth difference between religion and science is in their methodology of study. Religion explores the inner experience and science studies the public fact. The method of religion has been to dive deep in the recesses of mind and find the secret of universe and self through meditation. Swami Vivekanad, a modern religious thinker of exceptional brilliance, thus defines the method of religion: "Religion deals with the truths of the **metaphysical** world, just as chemistry and other natural sciences deal with the truths of the physical world. The book one must read to study chemistry is the book of Nature. The book from which to learn religion is your **own mind and heart.**" How to study our mind and heart to know the truths of religious metaphysical world? Says Swamiji, "Experience is the only source of knowledge. There is always, however, a small group of men who teach religion from experience. They are called mystics." Our Upanishads which are considered highest repository of metaphysical truths, are fruits of concentration on inner experiences which are not public facts.

Science has throughout its career of over three centuries used the method of external **observation and experiment.** Science started as Astronomy and gradually took to the study of physics, chemistry, biology. All these fields of study offered public facts which any one could observe under certain conditions. We know how a telescope and or a microscope can help any normal person to see facts when he is directed how to set the instrument. When science came to the study of the mind of man, it at first look to introspective method which gave contradictory reports. So it gave it up and followed methods of external observation. It defined psychology, not as the science of the mind, but as the science of behavior. Behavior is an observable object. Psychology observes behavior under experimental and field methods to understand human personality.

(5)

Let us sum up the difference between religion and science. Religion has its birth in the instinct of fear. Fear is the urge to avoid and escape from those conditions which threaten one's life and happiness at biological and spiritual levels. All religions prescribe techniques for self-protection and self-satisfaction here and hereafter. Science is born of the instinct of curiosity, i.e. the urge to investigate and know things for their own sake. It finds complete fulfillment in the in the discovery of truth for itself with complete unconcern about its advantages to oneself or to mankind, here and hereafter.

Religion involves worship of some power superior to man to get benefits here and hereafter and at all levels of life. Deity need not be genius of excellence, it can as well be an evil genius. Worship can take the form of rituals, meditations, 'dhyān', mystic experience. In science there is no place for personality cult. A scientist goes to his laboratory, not to accept but to check the theories of great scientists. The scientist's attitude is not one of acceptance and submission but of critical appreciation of the truth of theories.

Religion is primarily concerned with values. It gives us, say, ten commandments of Moses, noble sayings of Buddha in Dhammpada for the conduct of daily life and method of attaining 'Nirvana', or 'eternal life of bliss.' Science is primarily concerned with facts, to know things as they are in their objective character without admixture of subjective involvement.

Religion primarily studies inner experience, i.e. 'know thyself', science studies public facts, i.e. 'know the universe'.

It is clear that the two disciplines can not be made identical. Science can not become religion for it will lose its objective spirit of critical study of the universe. Religion cannot become science for it loses its feelings of reverence and worship of super-human excellence. However, **religion can be science-grounded in the way of its method of study, just as it can be revelation (Sruti)- grounded or mystic grounded.**

(6)

The question we face is what is the relation between Religion and Science. When there are two objects or attitudes, the relation between them can be conflict, co-existence, co-operation or mergence. We have seen that it cannot be of mergence for both lose their distinctive characteristics. Whether the relation between Religion and Science can be one of conflict, co-existence, co-operation depends on the kind of religion in question.

We can distinguish four types of religions. Theistic, non-theistic, Humanistic and Evolutionary Naturalistic. Theism as religion is revealed religion. The religious scriptures are word of God, infallible in charter. Under non-theistic religions we include Jainism and classic Yoga. Jainism rejects God as the creator and ruler of the universe. It holds that the universe is eternal, and consists of living and non-living things. The events in the universe and human life are governed by the law of Karma. However, it holds that human soul in its moksha state is disembodied, infinite in power, and knowledge and bliss. So, though Jainism denies God it does not deny the supernatural world of disembodied souls.

Humanism is a product of scientific culture culture. As regards facts, it holds that whatever science discovers about the universe and man is alone worthy of acceptance. As regards values it holds that each person is an end in himself and therefore right conduct is to respect the rights of others in conduct. **Evolutionary Naturalism of Dev Dharma** holds that the scientific method is also true method of investigation even in the field of religion. Good is what is conducive to the health of the human personality and society. Evil is what damages the health of the human personality and society. Just as the medical sciences discover the laws of the health and disease of the body by the scientific method, Religion is to discover the laws of health and disease of the soul by the scientific method.

(7)

We take revealed religions first. Bible, Koran and Vedas are revealed books of Christianity, Islam and Hinduism respectively. Modern science had its birth in the West where Christianity was and still is the religion of the people. To start with, there was no conflict between the theistic religion of Christianity and science. In fact the theistic religion of Christianity provided psychological motivation for the rise of science. The theistic view that God made the universe and rules it by invariable laws encouraged scientists to the study of Nature. However, the progress in the scientific study brought scriptural texts and science into open and severe conflict.

Science first took to the study of Astronomy. It discovered that it is the earth which goes round the sun. In the Bible, the word of God is that it is the sun which goes round the earth. Since the word of God is infallible, it was blasphemous for science to challenge it. A Jesuit Father maintained that "the opinion of the earth's motion is of all heresies the most abominable, the most pernicious, the most scandalous. Immovability of earth is thrice sacred; argument against the immortality of soul, the existence of God and the incarnation should be tolerated sooner than an argument to prove that the earth moves." Galileo was summoned to Rome to appear before the Inquisition. The Inquisition punished him in spite of the fact that Galileo was compelled to declare his view to be false. It said: "We condemn you to the formal prison of this Holy office for a period determinable at our pleasure; and by way of salutary penance, we order you during the next three years to recite, once a week, the seven penitential psalms." Galileo remained till the last day of his life under house confinement, debarred from seeing his relatives and friends who scientifically confirmed his view that the earth goes round the sun.

Science took to the study of Geology. Its views conflicted with that of the Bible. It discovered how it has taken millions of years for the earth to come to the stage on which life has become possible. It is given in the

Bible that God made the world in six days. There was again conflict between religion and science. The church had now lost its political power. But the condemnation of the scientists was no less severe.

Science took to Biology. Bible had the view that God had made man in his own image. Darwin presented the scientific view that man has evolved from a species of apes. He storm of protest against it continued for years on end. There was no abuse which was not hurled against Darwin and his supporters like Huxley.

At every step religion opposed and delayed the growth of scientific knowledge.

It is true that the conflict of religion and science has ceased in the 20th. Century. This is due to two reasons; Christianity has accepted that the cosmological view given in the Bible were primitive and need to be discarded. Again science has progressed in knowledge far beyond the dream of spiritual beliefs. Even if the cosmology of theistic religion were true, it would be suitable for kindergarten children only.

(8)

However, today religion claims that there is harmony between religion and science. The latest discoveries of science support religious doctrines. The fact is that " the statements of the scientists have, as a rule, been somewhat tentative and indefinite but the theologians have seized upon them and extended them, while the news papers in turn have reported the sensational accounts of theologies, so that the general readers had derived the impression that the physics confirms practically the whole book of genesis."

There are four fundamental concepts in science: Space and Time, Matter and Force. It interprets all phenomena within the frame-work of these concepts In using these conceptual tools it is led to sharpen, refine and re-shape them. It has given up some old sample clock model presentations of the universe and replaced it by new, complex ones. But it does not go outside these concepts however much it makes them subtle and complex. Hence all attempts to seek support in the refinement of these concepts and models in science for metaphysics of God and soul, is like trying to save oneself from drowning by catching at a straw. Though a drowning man catches at a straw, it does not save him.

In the eighteenth century Newton thought that space and time are absolute and infinite in character. With his law of gravitation he was able to explain the motion of the whole solar system. Though the law of

gravitation continued to explain different motion of the heavenly bodies, it did not touch the natural laws. New branches of physics dealing with sound, heat, light and electricity grew to vast proportions but no property of matter was discovered which could be connected with gravitation. It was only through Einstein's theory of relativity that gravitation was fitted with the general theory of physics. Einstein's theory of relativity revolutionized the whole concept of space and time. Einstein proposed that instead of considering space and time as separate entities, they be considered as one entity, space-time with observer thrown in. Religious apologetics interpreted this change to mean that Einstein's concepts of space-time made room for transcendental reality by denying the absoluteness of space and time. This interpretation is wrong. The relativity of space and time does not involve denial of the reality of the world of space and time.

There is another development in physics which the apologetics read as supporting the view that the universe is idealistic in character. The atom has been split into electrons and protons and there is further development in this direction. Atom is no more a hard indivisible entity. It is a complex of electronic charges and protons. True, atom is no more regarded as simple indivisible entity, but it is reckless to interpret this to mean that atom is physical centre of activity. Here is what is disciple of Sri Aurobindo, Sri Ompoorna Swatantra says: " The latest researches have revealed that matter is nothing but asleep form of spiritual and spirit the awakened matter, these are two extreme ends of the vast range of manifestation of consciousness. It has blasted the age-old myth of matter being absolutely devoid of consciousness." This is not the view science holds. It must be divine revelation like we have in religious scriptures. It is a pity that religious-minded scientists (not science) are less cautious and precise when they speculate outside their laboratories and it is still greater pity that religious apologetics unacquainted with scientific investigations make wide assertions on scientists' cautious statements.

Whatever be the refined analysis of atom as 'wave' it does not cease to be under the law of physics. If it is under the law of physics, it is physical; and to attribute consciousness to it is speaking beyond the text of physics.

In reply the apologetics point out that single atom is no more under the old laws of mechanics.

True. The old laws of mechanics which could predict with precision the movement of big bodies are not found applicable to behavior of single atom. A single atom shows capriciousness in its hop from one state to another and it is not determinable which of the possible hops it will take

on a given occasion. This is known as quantum phenomenon. Even the scientist Sir Arthur Eddington who should know better, draws the conclusion that atom has free will and free will is characteristics of psychic activity. Einstein differ from this view of atom. He says 'God does not play dice', which means in literal language that all events are determined by cause and effect or all events an subject to laws. If today we find that the behavior of atom is not subject to the laws of old physics, "it is rash to jump," says Russell, " to the conclusion, as some physicists have done, that it is not subject to laws of all. To prove that a given set of phenomena is not subject to law is essentially and theoretically impossible. All that can be affirmed is that law, if any, has not been discovered. Given further developments of techniques of measurement and space-time concepts, the laws regulating the behavior of individual atom may be discovered. It is very rash to erect a theological superstructure upon a piece of ignorance, which may be temporary."

Sir Hermann Bondi of the Combridge University and Noble Prize winner in physics, asked theistic apologists as to what would be their position if receive discovers the law of the behavior of single atom. Have the apologists the capacity apologetics to reject their scriptural view when science propounds a new view opposed to the scriptural view. The history of religion has not shown the capacity to move out of their scriptural encirclement. How can then, conflict between science and religion be avoided!

Again, theistic religions are varied in their doctrines. We ask which theistic view is supported by ever-developing views of science on space-time, mass-energy.

There can be no way to avoid conflict in the approach of theistic religion and science. Einstein says: " the main source of the present day conflicts between the spheres of religion and of science lies in this concept of a personal God. It is the aim of science to establish general rules which determine the reciprocal connection of objects and events in time and space. The more a man is imbued with the ordered regularity of all events, the firmer becomes his conviction that there is no room left by the side of this ordered regularity for cause of a different nature. For him neither the rule of human nor the rule of divine will exists as an independent cause of natural events."

(9)

Let us take mystic religion based on mystic experience in contrast to Prophetic religion based on revelation. Sri Ramakrishna, Sri Raman and Sri Aurobindo are three modern founders of mystic religion.

It is claimed by mystic religion that when sense experience is held as evidence for the belief in the reality of the external world there is no reason why the evidence of mystic experience should not be accepted as evidence for the reality of the transcendental world. If experience is the way to truth, we must accept the sensory world which is given and guaranteed by sense experience and transcendental world given and guaranteed by mystic experience. The mystic religion pleads for co-existence between science and religion, each to limit itself to its own world. The mystic claims that what it says about the transcendental world should not be questioned and denied on the basis of the criteria of sense experience. The transcendental world has entirely different character from the sensory world and the categories of interpretation and the criteria of truth applicable to sensory world are not relevant to it.

Let us examine the claims of mystic experience to be deliverer of knowledge about the transcendental world and its claim for co-existence.

How to define mystic experience? It is an experience which is allied to the experience which comes to some rare individuals who tell us how in a rare moment their whole outlook on life underwent an emotive change. Such a person had been reared under the certain views and values of life and then, some event in his life, says the death of a dear one, one's prolonged illness in bed, reading of a poem or hearing of a musical symphony had lifted up the veil and made him beholden to new light on the universe and life. Such experiences are spontaneous, not a result of discursive thinking. It has the character of being received rather than acquired. Though the experience is transitory, it leaves an impression for the whole life. William James holds that **mystic experience is characterized by noetic quality, passivity, transiency and ineffability.**

We may thus define mystic experience in the words of Prof. R.W. Hepburn: "Mysticism refers to experience which reveals something about the (a) totality of things; (b) something of immense human importance for all times and places: and (c) something upon which one's ultimate wellbeing or salvation wholly depends."

Such experiences are not restricted to religious field. It may relate to art and literature. We will limit ourselves to mystic experiences in the religious field. They are varied in content. There are the non-theistic mystic experiences of Jain and classical Yoga mystics. They interpret their mystic experience as monadistic, i.e. revelatory of their own individual state of moksha without a relation to the transcendental reality of God, distinct from their experience. Buddha's mystic experience was revelatory of the Four Noble Truths and the eight-fold path which made him the Buddha, the enlightened, the 'Light of Asia'. We have monotheistic experience of

the Christian mystics, like Saint Teresa and Absolutist mystic experience of the Vedantists. Besides these classic mystic experience, there are numerous mystic experiences of all colors and hues. Given the diversity of mystic experience it is false to define a mystic experience as “the feeling of unity of the self with God (Otto Pflieger) or “an attitude of mind in which all relations are swallowed up in the soul o God (Edward Caird). No mystic experience can be defined in terms of the content of the specific mystic experiences for it amounts to denial of all the mystic experiences of different contents altogether and ultimately of all mystic experiences.

In spite of diversity of mystic experiences, it is still claimed by some mystics, like Dr. Dean Inge that there is unanimity among them. He says: “ I know nothing remarkable than the unanimity of the mystics, ancient, medieval, modern, Protestant, Catholic and even Buddhist or Mohammedan, though the Christian mystics are the most trustworthy”. To say that the Christian mystics are the most trustworthy is to give up the case for remarkable unanimity. William James tells about the actual state of difference in mystic experiences in his book, *The varieties of Religious Experience*. He says: “The classic Religious mysticism, it now must be confessed, is only privileged case. It is an extract. It is carved out from a much longer and if we take the larger mass as seriously as religious mysticism has historically taken itself, we find that the supposed unanimity disappears. To begin with, even religious mysticism itself, the kind that accumulates traditions and makes schools, is much less unanimous than I have allowed. It has been both ascetic and antinomiously self-indulgent within the Christian Church.”

When mystic experiences give different beliefs about the transcendental world, how to discriminate a true belief from a false one? Are there any checkpoints to help in separating the illusory mystic experience from a veridical mystic experience?

No experience about what exists, can claim to be its own truth. If each experience is its own truth, there can be no illusory experience. The distinction between perception and illusion will disappear. Unfortunately each mystic considers his own mystic experience to be self-validating. If it is so, how can one's own experience be regarded as more trustworthy than that of another. One school of mystics considers the other schools of mystics as mistaken on most points and rejects their views as false. But no school of mystics can challenge the views of the mystics of another school as mistaken on the basis of experience for all the experiences of mystics are claimed by them to be mystics experiences.

It is on grounds other than experience on which one school can reject beliefs of the others as untrustworthy. We ask the mystic for the criteria to judge between his own mystic experience and the mystic experiences of another whose reporting he has challenged, since all mystics desire that we should not apply to mystic experiences the same criteria which we apply to two different reportings about sensory experiences. No criterion has been offered for judging the truth of differing mystic experiences. If there is no criterion to judge true mystic experiences from the illusory ones, the statement of mystic experiences fall outside the truth and falsehood, like statement of a fiction. They give no objective knowledge. These experiences may well be treated as emotional rather than cognitive in character.

To escape this damaging criticism mystics do try to specify the conditions, under which one can have veridical mystic experience of the transcendental reality of God. They claim that when a man of science wishes others to believe what he has observed, he arranges the external conditions of observation, i.e. asks the observer to see through a telescope or a microscope. Similarly, we demand from a candidate for mystic experience who wishes to check what we tell him about the transcendental world, to be morally pure, detached from the affairs of the world, to be ascetic in life and acquire the ability to concentrate on a single point and to undergo yogic exercises.

However, there is wonderful difference between the scientist and the mystic in their attitude to the results of such experiments. If a scientist arranges an experiment and majority of normal persons failed to find verification of what he has asserted, then the scientist takes back his assertion about the start of things. But this is not the attitude of a mystic. If some mystics satisfy all the conditions of perfect detachment and concentration and they report the failure of contact with personal God, the theistic mystic, unlike a scientist, will not regard it as disconfirming the view that there is God. If the belief in personal God is not disconfirmed even when a group of mystics with character of purity and detachment like the Buddhist and Jain monks fail to report it in their mystic experience, it is also not confirmed by the mystic experience of Christian mystics. If among mystics of the same inner purity and concentration, some report contact with God, and others deny it, it means that the reports about God's existence are unreliable. One can not have the advantage of confirmation without running the risk of disconfirmation. James has well observed: "The fact is that the mystic feeling of enlargement, union and emancipation has no specific content whatever of its own. It is capable of forming matrimonial alliances with material furnished by the most diverse philosophies and theologies, provided only they can find a place in their framework for its peculiar emotional mood.

We have no right, therefore, to involve its prestige as distinctively in favor of any special belief, such as that of absolute idealism, or absolute monotheistic identity, or of the absolute goodness of the world."

A mystic experience does not divulge the same unanimous statements about its world of reality as a perceptual experience does. It therefore cannot claim co-equal status with perceptual experience in the matter of giving knowledge of reality. The mystic experience is as Acharya Ramanuj points out, imagination killed by perception. Mystic experience is predominantly emotional experience which takes its content from the theological tradition of its group. No wonder the mystic experiences of the primitive man to the modern man show bewildering verities of thoughtful patterns, non of which can claim authority of truth for no mystic does or can offer any criteria of truth outside his experience. A mystic experience is highly emotional like the emotional state of a man under drink and reporting in both cases are unacceptable as cognitive experiences. As Russell points it: "From a scientific point of view, we can make no distinction between the man who eats little and sees heaven and the man who drinks much and sees snakes. Each is in as abnormal physical conditional and has abnormal perceptions. Normal perceptions, since they have to be useful in the struggle for life, must have some correspondence in fact, but in abnormal perceptions there is no reason to expect such correspondence, and their testimony cannot outweigh that of normal perception."

We have further reasons of treating mystic experiences as emotional. The mystic reports of the contents of his experience bristle with contradictions and paradox. Some mystics tells us: " God neither exists nor does not exist. He is above the category of existence and non-existence."; " Mystic enlightenment," says another mystic, "is an absolute emptiness which is absolute fullness." Still others say; " The more sublime divine light, the darker it is to understanding." Such incompatible predications about the transcendental reality and knowledge support the view that mystics statement are expression of ecstatic experience of non-cognitive character, i. e. those statements lie outside the sphere of truth and falsehood. The mystic can answer to our puzzle about paradoxical statements of mystic experience by saying that it is due to the fact that the mystic has to express himself in the language of sensory experience. There is no puzzle to the mystic himself. We make two comments; Language is a social product. Mystics of different countries do claim to have unanimity about their experiences. If this is so, it should have led to the invention of mystic language other then the language relating to sensory world and it could have developed its own criteria to differentiate a false mystic experience from a veridical mystic experience. Since both these things are

absent, the best way is to treat mystic experiences as transitory emotional excitements.

(10)

The mystic religion claims that it is not a conflict with science, since each deals with different world. However, there is conflict in the condition of obtaining knowledge. The mystic belongs to this world. He is body-soul unit here and now. As body-soul unit he is also under the conditions of acquiring knowledge operative in the present state of his being in the natural world. Now, knowledge is possible to us in daily life, through contact of the physical stimuli, may it be of light or a sound, with visual and auditory centers of brain via sense organs. I see red colour of the red ink because light waves traveled from the red ink, strike my eyes which convey the impression to the visual centers and I see red. There is no cognitive experience in mind about what exists without ultimate involvement of contact of a physical stimulus with the brain. In what way is the brain of the mystic affected by the supernatural with which he is in contact, for it violates the condition of being in contact with objects of knowledge, since the object of knowledge in this case is not physical. Either mystic experience is not cognitive or there is a miracle, a clash between the scientific and the mystic ways of knowing.

Mysticism claims that the conflict between science and mysticism concerning knowledge is apparent that real. It is forgotten that there is difference between mind and soul. Mind and soul belong to different realms of being. The conditions of knowledge by mind do involve the operation of the physical and the psychological conditions. Some philosophers like Plato, Aristotle and Descartes consider that 'active reason' or 'self' has capacity of thinking apart from the necessity of intervention of stimulation of brain and so there can be contact with the supernatural.

Mysticism cannot claim that it does not clash with science when it holds (like Jainism) that soul is other than mind and is eternal and intrinsically transcendental entity outside the jurisdiction of natural law. This view of soul is opposed to the history of evolution. Evolution holds that life originated in certain chemical conditions, passed through unicellular organisms to multi-cellular organisms in plants and animal leading on to human life-force called 'soul'. Soul is not eternal. It has a date of birth on this planet. It is in ceaseless change like life-forces in other existents. A thing under change can cease to be. Soul is not intrinsically eternal or immortal.. Again soul as we know it, is embodied. We have no evidence of dis-embodied souls. So the doctrine of (1) eternal and (2) disembodied soul which can establish contact with supernatural being on

which mystic knowledge of the supernatural is grounded and defended, is false to facts and clashes with science.

(11)

Let us now pass on to the relation of humanism to science. Humanism as a religion is in complete co-operation with science. It leaves to science the understanding of the world of facts. It holds that science alone can give us the understanding of Nature in its factual aspect. Humanism limits itself to the task of values. So there is no question of conflict between humanism and science, for science leaves values out in its understanding of the universe and human life. In the sphere of values, humanism holds that each human being is an end in itself. One should treat oneself and others as ends in themselves. All evil arises from considering oneself and others as mere means. Slavery is evil, for slavery treats human beings as things for purchase and sale. Women have been considered as things for sale and purchase. Prostitution is evil for both involved in prostitution consider each other as things for satisfaction. When a businessman adulterates things, he is treating his fellow human beings as means for profit. All exploitation, economic, social and sexual, treats fellow human beings as means or things for one's gratification.

It is always wrong to ask about a human being as to what he is good for. It is a question for things and not persons. It is moral perversion to approach human being as mere things of utility. But we do so. It is regrettably said, "matlab ke hain rishte naate, matlab kee hai dunia saaree." i. e. why is relation of selfishness regrettable? It is because every human being wishes to be accepted, respected and even loved as a person. He does not like to be treated as a thing of utility and resents it when some one uses him as a thing. We call such relation 'matlab' i. e. selfishness for this reason. As soon as the selfish purpose is over, the relation gets discarded as an ice cream cup is discarded to a dust bin when it has no more ice-cream left in it for consumption.

However, it is not selfishness that distorts one's relation to others. It is attitude of utility with which we approach others. If I am keen to collect blood donors for poor patients, I may look upon prospective donors as just as donors and if I don't maintain the same attitude of respect for a person whether he donates blood or does not donate it, I am building my relation with donors as a thing of utility even though my end in view is good. Once a blood donor regrettably said to me that I visit him about the time the blood donation camp is to be held. When we remember or contact a person at time when he can do something for us or for our cause, we are utilizing him as a thing of utility. He also resents this attitude. An altruistic ideal can prevent us as passion do, in failing to

keep intact the primacy of treating others as persons. So the above saying is better expressed thus "Jhutha hain sab rishtey naate, jhoothi hai yeh duniya saree." It means that we human beings live jhutha life or unauthentic life. The authentic life is based on accepting and respecting each other for what we are and as we are, with all our foibles, as persons without qualifications.

Unfortunately we internalize this social ethos of utility aggravated by machine age and lose respect for ourselves as persons of intrinsic value when we fail in or retire from our role of utility in our profession. Our too much engagements with gadgets and machines make us unconsciously an automation whose entire value is measured and exhausted by utility. It is self perversion to identify one's life with utility and feel small or lost when it ceases to yield utility. Utility is an aspect of life, it does not cover all values of life like our capacity for love and laughter, appreciation of beauty in Nature and arts, friendship of innocence and leisure, which repel utility but give authenticity to life.

This humanistic ethics is unexceptionable. But it is incomplete for it does not provide the highest project for love. Human love, in one of its aspects, strives for perfect object to love. We know how love turns an ordinary girl into an object of perfect beauty, though she would not even qualify for entry in a beauty competition. Some rare persons, therefore, create a perfect God of their imagination and love it. They are called mystics. Humanism is deficient in this aspect.

Again, humanism in spite of the intrinsically beautiful ethical ideal of training each human being as a person, does not face the problem of how to control our passions which lead us to treat ourselves and others as means or things of exploitation. Our greeds, lusts and vanities make us treat others and ourselves as mere things of exploitation. How to control these passions of life? Is man sufficient unto himself to solve his problem of mutual relationships on basis of love and justice? It is found that human psychology is incapable to help itself to treat other as end in themselves. In fact the chief problem of religion is to help man to love, to be just and serviceable to fellow men and other living creatures. Humanism as religion fails here. Without a deity, a super human being, though not supernatural deity, is required to illumine and cure man of his exploitative motives and to create feelings of love and disinterested service for day-to-day conduct. Without a worshipful deity, Humanism is reduced to Ethical code.

We now consider "Evolutionary Naturalism of Dev Dharma" as the last alternative. What is the relation between Dev Dharma and Science? Dev Dharma holds that scientific method is the only method for human knowledge in all the fields including religion. Religion deals with man's origin, his redemption from evil life and his destiny of moksha (salvation) and settvic life. According to Dev Dharma all these problems can be dealt with by use of the scientific method. Human personality, both its body and soul, is biological in origin and under the natural laws of life and death. Human personality has no privileged status in Nature. It is one among others objects of Nature, subject to its laws, discoverable only by the scientific method. Understandably, there is no conflict between the religion of Dev Dharma and Science, on method for knowledge, for it does not ask for the 'privileged status' for soul capable of supernatural communication.

Dev Dharma holds that body is not an outer covering of soul which soul can dispense with like an old coat and take to a different new coat. There is inseparable relation between body and soul. Just as a living body can not exist without a soul, so a soul cannot exist without a living body. Both body and soul have inseparable relation here and hereafter. There is no world of disembodied souls outside the world of Nature.

This intimate relation of soul and body, helps to explain how our behavior is product of the joint participation of body and soul. Both body and soul play their part in our thinking and doing. Physiology and psychology for example, tell us how the secretions of glands influence our thinking and behavior. Body and soul are both responsible for good and evil thoughts and good and evil actions. When I think some anti-social sex thoughts or do an anti-social sex act, it is not only my mind which is to be blamed for it, my body is co-responsible for its excessive secretion of sex gland. In my religious exercises to control the sex urge towards anti-social behavior, science can render great help. There are experiments to show how the anti-social behavior of persons under detention in jail improve with change of diet.

If science can help religion in developing better conduct, religion can help science in its pursuits. The primary object of science is to discover truth in a disinterested spirit. However, some scientific truths have helped to develop techniques to get control and power over environment. All inventions are techniques to manipulate environment -- physical and social—for one's use. Technology is admissible objective in science only if it does not side-track its real objective to illumine the world to human understanding. To put it in the words of Russell: " Step by step, as science has developed, the impulse to love (to understand the universe) which gave it birth has been increasingly thwarted while the impulse to

power, which was first a mere camp follower, has gradually usurp command in virtue of its unforeseen success." Today Governments and big firms are investing huge funds for technological improvements. Our Prime Ministers one after another repeat at every Annual Session of Indian Science Congress that the scientists should devote themselves to rural technology relegating fundamental research in science to secondary place.

It is not realized that knowledge as power is detrimental to love for truth, just as position as power is suicidal to right conduct. Politics of power leads to dictatorship even in democratic frame work, and science as power leads to nuclear weapons of destruction and devastation. Ecological imbalance created by industrialization is threatening human life more than atom bomb. Power must be unmindful of right and wrong to be powerful. The character of power is to get things done and it finds principles of higher conduct obstructive in it and so it blacks out consideration of higher conduct. Science can be cured from its lust for manipulating environments by religion. Religion is concerned with values. It can help science to cultivate vision and strength to the pursuit of truth and nothing but truth. **Dev Dharma has this capacity.** It specializes in presenting truth and goodness in most captivating vision and it can give strength to the scientist to follow truth as its chief objective and give second place to technology within the field of benign goods.

There is a second help of religion to scientists. A scientist in his laboratory is superb, he is perfectly objective and impartial, and shows infinite patience in the study of the phenomena and is anxious to check and re-check his results. But he is a failure in his personal relationship. Such a master intellect like Newton, was found to be jealous and vindictive in inter-personal relationship. This is the second task of religion to help the scientist in his social relations to be cured of evil passion and to cultivate altruistic attitude of love, understanding and disinterestedness in person to person and person to social relationships. Dev Dharma in is humanistic in the sense that it denies all supernatural beings like God. Its religion is not of mystic trances or God intoxication. It is centered in giving Moksha or freedom from evil passions and developing fine sentiments of love and service in relation to others—human beings, animals, plants and inanimate objects.

We have said that Dev Dharma is in complete harmony with the spirit of science and is anxious to develop the relation of mutual service. Let us explain:

A religion is the autobiography of the life and the thoughts of its founder. It has the character of the life and the spirit of the

founder. It is outpouring of the life of the founder in word and action. The founder of Dev Dharma explicitly states: Deasya Dharmah se Dev Dharma, i. e. whatever is the religious life of Devatma (Founder) is Dev Dharma. So Dev Dharma is not the name of the society (Dev Samaj) which owes allegiance to him.

Now what is the religious life of the Devatma? The religious life of Devatma is characterized by:

- (a) Complete love of truth;
- (b) Complete hatred for untruth;
- (c) Complete love of goodness; and
- (d) Complete hatred for evil.

Life which evolved under these four -- fold love and hatred is called Dev Jiwan.

Devatma's love of truth helped him to give up all traditional methods like revelation, mystic experience, intuition and to stay committed to the scientific method in his naturalistic re-construction in philosophy of religion. He writes: "The scientific methods of investigation which were imperative for researches into their domains (Vishwa Tattva and Moksha Tattva) gradually acquired sovereign sway over my heart. The love of experimental interrogation had so completely possessed me and had become such an integral part of my mind that it was absolutely impossible for any unverified belief to stay there." No other religious leader has given this exclusive importance to the scientific method as the only true method of discovery of truth in the field of religion.

His opus magnum entitled Dev Shastra is religious scripture of its own kind. Its conclusions are not revealed. They are arrived at through the scientific method. They are not infallible. In his scriptures Dev Shastra he has said: "If any of the teachings of Devatma also fails to prove true on being tested by any one of these four criteria (logical consistency and verification are two of them), it does not deserve to be accepted as true." There is not only permission in Dev Dharma to reject any belief which is not verified, but there is strength in Dev Dharma to actually reject it. For Devatma has in him complete hatred for untruth. His total personality repels untruth. Therefore he has in him unbounded strength to through out any belief found unverified by scientific tests.

There is a further characteristic of Dev Dharma as a reflection of the life of the founder. The established religions go to science to get some support for their engrained fixed beliefs. They love their beliefs, wish to stay to them and therefore seek science, due to its prestige, to get bulwark for their tottering beliefs. This is love for one's beliefs, not love for truth.

Devatma had developed in his life love to seek truth unconditionally. Dev Dharma would go to science not so much for support for the beliefs it holds, but for getting its beliefs checked or re-checked to discover any element of untruth in it. A ruthless subjection of all beliefs to the scrutiny of reason and scientific method was his life characteristic. He writes in his autobiography, 'Mujh Mein Dev Jiwan Ka Vikas': "I became anxious that I should examine and criticize whatever beliefs I had acquired from others or assimilated from tradition and whatever was true in that I should know and accept it and whatever was false, I should know it and never accept nor teach it to others as true. In pursuance of this anxiety, I used to pray in all sincerity that whatever is true I should have the capacity to know it as such and whatever is false I should have the capacity to know it and to reject it. Let everyone of my beliefs be true. Let non of my beliefs be false." This was not only his 'prayer.' It was motivating force of his life. After years of God worship and devotion to his service, he, though the leader of a theistic society, gave up his beliefs when he applied the scientific method to it. He had to lose some disciples and incur the hostility of the entire theistic religious communities.

Again, he had to throw over board his entire work of several years and re-start new research. He first published his new philosophy of religion in 1905 under the title of Dev Shastra. But he continued to re-examine it and published the second draft in 1910. His last researches of philosophy of religion took shape in 1928, a few months before his death. A religious leader who holds his conclusions to be fallible and repeatedly and continuously reviews them will be anxious to get them checked and re-checked for all times. He would not like untruth to be perpetuated with his 'Dev Jiwan' (Divine Life).

Besides his complete love of truth and hatred of untruth, which made him to use the scientific method in the field of religion, his love of goodness and hatred for evil helped him to see good and evil as conditions of soul as health and illness are conditions of body. Good and evil in the soul have as much natural origin as health and disease have. His love of goodness made him see good in all its attractiveness and made him developed it and his hatred of evil made him see evil in all its horrid ugliness and shun it. So Dev Dharma has in it the light to show to the scientist his deviation from the path of discovery of the truth for itself as ugly and can give him the power to shun it. It has in it the light to show to the scientist the ugliness of anti-social behavior and to give him freedom from it. It can show him the social virtues in all their beauty and help him to adorn his life with them.

There can be no two opinions that there can be co-operation, and mutual give and take between religion and science if religion has the characteristics of Dev Dharma.

भगवान देवात्मा की इश्वर पूजा करने की विधि

