

The Concept of Man

S. P. Kanal

Delhi University

The Concept of Man

Introduction:

Why does or should man study himself? There are manifold reasons which have motivated him to explore his nature. There is inborn curiosity in man to understand his world and his being in the world. A child, as soon as he is able to speak in sentences, pesters his elders with questions concerning his environments. The world is a magic box of wonderful delight for him and he wants to revel in understanding it. No wonder his mother complains that from the time her child has picked up language, he bothers her with questions of no consequence to him. True, the child has no biological or social problems of utility in seeking answers to his questions. He is interested in satisfying his sense of curiosity. Knowledge is itself pleasurable to him without regard to its utility.

The child does not ask questions only about his environments, he asks questions about himself. He asks his parents as to where from does he come. The parents in general give a fanciful answer to leave the impression in the child that sex is a forbidden subject.

When feeling of curiosity matures in a person, it takes the form of the love of knowledge about the universe and himself. Aristotle well puts it when he says: 'Philosophy begins in wonder'. Kant says the same thing in his statement: The starry heaven above

and the moral law within make me wonder. Man is possessed of an insatiable urge to understand his environments and himself, for itself. Knowledge is not a biological necessity. If the insects of the animal world do biologically survive inspite of man's persistent destruction of them if apes and monkeys do survive in the absence of philosophy and science, why could not man as an animal, survive without science and philosophy. Knowledge is a cultural necessity, a necessity born of man being gifted with understanding which seeks satisfaction in knowledge. Knowledge has intrinsic value for human under standing, it is its satisfaction and fulfilment. The Greek philosophers were so dominated in their pursuit of know ledge for its own sake, that they considered inferior any knowledge for which utility came to be found. It still remains the cultural pattern of the West inherited from the Greeks, that the scientist who seeks understanding of the universe for its own sake, is superior to the scientist who seeks utility of his knowledge.

The desire to know for itself is one motivation in man. There is a second motivation, to meet his biological problem of survival and the psychological problem of suffering. Man tries to improve his ways of production for survival. At agricultural mode of production, he has discovered what crops can be grown in different seasons, how he should prepare the land for various crops, how much water is needed for specific crops, how to improve seeds. Such knowledge is of biological use to man to satisfy his hunger. Man has developed medical science to meet the challenge of illness in him and to improve his health and happiness. However, it is mere reductionism to assimilate man's

urge to know for itself into an urge for biological survival, i.e. intrinsic value of knowledge to its utility.

There has been an additional reason for man to understand himself. Man does not only feel an urge to understand himself for the pleasure of it or to meet the challenges of physical and social survival and suffering in him but also to understand the universe. It is a pre-supposition with him that he epitomizes in himself the secrets of the universe. As Mencius says: "Universe is within man". Man is the conscious reflection of the unconscious cosmos. Man is the voice of the dumb universe. He is the highest expression of it. In him lies the full understanding of the universe. The understanding of an apple, e.g., is not in its seed but in its state of maturity. Man is the measure of everything, the whole universe.

It is best to close this section with a quotation from Aristotle : "In our view knowledge is a thing of beauty and value, and one sort is more so than another either because it is exact or because it is knowledge of better and more wonderful object. On both these grounds we may reasonably place the investigation of the soul among the highest. It seems too that knowledge of it contributes greatly towards truth as a whole, but specially that about nature."

In this context when Devatma is the highest fruit of evolution, understanding him fully illumines our true understanding of the planet.

(2)

Perspectives of the Study of Man

In the past Man studies himself from innumerable perspectives. Almost all sciences offer perspectives of man. Perspective of astronomical science, man is an absolutely insignificant creature, an accident of no consequence. Biology studies man in the Perspective of evolution of species. Sociology understands man the nexus of rituals, customs, conventions and laws. Economics interprets man in the most crucial context of production and distribution, The various branches of psychology explore man in varied aspects. Social psychology discovers social inter-connections of man in group life. Abnormal psychology deciphers the inner structure of man's psychological functions. General psychology describes the physiological basis of man, measures his various abilities and aptitudes. Educational psychology concentrates on the processes of learning in man. Industrial psychology illumines the processes involved in vocations of man. Medical psychology analyses interaction of psychosomatic factors in the make-up of man.

It is not only sciences that study man. Literature offers the deepest study of man in concrete context of interaction between man and woman, between man and Nature. It offers the most penetrating existential insights of man. Modern philosophy is more and more turning towards literature in its interpretation of man. It finds that scientific studies are too abstract to catch the truth of concrete individual man who is the true unit of reality. The average man is a fiction, the particular man is alone real. Literature is the nearest approach to the understanding of particular men and women in their specific life situations,

Religion and philosophy, too, study man in his meta physical and

valuational aspects. It is in philoso-religious perspective that we will study man. Let us not forget that philoso-religious perspective is one of the innumerable perspectives on man. No single study or perspective can exhaust the bewildering complexity of human life.

(3)

Problems in the Study of Man

We will raise the following questions on man:

1. Is man simple or complex in his constitution ? If he is simple, what is it made up of? If it is complex, what are its parts? When it is constituted of two or more parts, what is the relation of them? Is he the sum total of them? Is the relation causal? Is the relation logical? Are the constituents, parts or aspects of one unitary whole ?
2. What is the nature of man ?
3. What is the relation of man to society ?
4. What is the relation of man to sub-human orders of existences- the animal world, the plant world and the inanimate world?
5. What is the relation of man to his deity ?
6. What is the ideal of man ?

(4)

Materialistic Concept of Man

Man in his studies is first outward directed and then turns to

himself. He is first drawn to study his environments before he comes to the study of himself. The physical studies precede humanistic studies.

The western philosophy started with Greeks. They were fascinated and struck by the diversity and multiplicity of the universe. They tried to seek the source of this infinite multiplicity and diversity. Thales holds that water is the essence of the things in the world. Anaximenes attributes the diversity of things to condensation and rarefaction of air. Parmenides holds that body or earth is the only truth of the universe. Heraclitus found fire to be the source of the bewildering world of change and becoming. Empedocles and some Indian thinkers hold that water, air, earth and fire are the primary stuffs of the universe and their combinations explain the infinite diversity of things. In the present context, these answers appear childish. Even though childish, they are of immense significance. These thinkers were on the right track. They sought the explanation of the universe within the universe. They laid the foundation of naturalism, In pursuing this path of inquiry, they reached the conclusion that the universe consists of atoms moving according to mathematical laws. This is the fundamental understanding of modern experimental physics, too.

The philosophers came to the study of man through the understanding they had developed in interpreting the universe. Man is a part of the universe, What is the essence of the universe is the essence of man. If air is the essence of the universe, then some thinkers like Diogenes, thought air or breath to be the essence of man. Man lives so long he breathes. In ordinary

language, which reflects man's understanding, when we say, 'he breathed his last', we mean he is dead. God is also supposed to hold the same view. In the Book of Genesis, Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. The word 'soul' in its root meaning means breath. Some thinkers, like Hippo maintain that the principle of soul is water, because the seed of all creatures is wet. If essence of the universe is fire, the essence of man is heat. So long the body keeps warm, it lives. In ordinary language, when we say, 'His hands and feet have gone cold or his body is getting cold' we mean he is dying or is dead. Fire is the principle of life.

Both these interpretations of the principle of life of man as breath or fire, were empirical and verifiable, based on the belief that the principle of life is that in whose absence man ceases to exist,

When philosophers came to think of the universe as consisting of atoms, man was thought of as made of atoms.

Democritus holds the view that what is called soul is made of fine or subtle atoms and body consists of gross atoms. It is clear that these philosophers hold man to be a physical existence. Its principle of life is simple, say air, fire, atoms,

The modern science repeats the history of the ancient Greek philosophy. Science started its study with the universe and later on came to the study of man. Science was born as astronomy. This science was followed by physics, chemistry, biology, sociology, and then psychology. Whereas the scientific study of physics is three hundred years old, the study of scientific

psychology is hardly one hundred year old.

A study is scientific if it uses scientific method in the field of its exploration. Scientific method studies entities and events which are publically observable. When an astronomer sees a heavenly body with his telescope, another astronomer can also see the same heavenly body with his telescope. In matter of fact, any one can see the same heavenly body with the help of his telescope. In a physics laboratory, a number of students can see the same experiment being done. When psychology took to scientific method in its studies, it modified its definition. Psychology is not the study of soul. 'Soul' is a metaphysical term riddled with too many equivocal and unverifiable meanings to be scientifically useful, But psychology is not even a study of mind or consciousness, Mind or consciousness is private to a person. It is not a publically observable phenomenon. What we can publically observe of a man is his behaviour. We can observe how he does things, how he behaves in relation to others. So scientific psychology is defined as the science of human behaviour.

Psychologists in the understanding of the methods of learning in animals found no need to refer to consciousness or ideas in animals in explaining their methods of learning. They could explain them without recourse mental words like consciousness or ideas. The methods of learning in man are the same as the methods of learning in animals. There is, therefore, no need to interpret human behaviour in mental words. The well-known behaviourist psychologist. Watson declared that the mental words like consciousness, ideas, feelings, emotions, desires, and will are as mythical as words like god or goddess. They must be

banished from the study of man. Human behaviour can be explained in reflexes or bodily mechanisms.

The modern school of philosophy is Linguistic Analysis which dominates the field. According to its great exponents like Wittgenstein and Ryle, mental words can be translated in physical language. Understanding is a mental word. We say: 'He understands addition'. What does it mean? He can correctly perform the operations of addition. The correctness of the operations is judged by an objective standard. The word 'understands' does not mean anything beyond or other than the correct operation. To think that behind the correct operation of addition there is understanding, a mental phenomenon, is as redundant as to think that there is understanding in a computer at the counter which adds up the price of one's purchases, Ryle sums up this philosophic standpoint of logical behaviourism in his book, *The Concept of Mind*: "It has been argued from a number of directions that when we speak of a person's mind, we are not speaking of a second theatre of special status incidents but of a certain way in which some of the incidents of life are ordered. His (man's) life is not a double series of events taking place in different kinds of stuff: it is one concatenation of events.... So the question about the relation between a person and his mind, like those about the relation between a person's body and his mind, is an improper question. Consciousness and Introspection cannot be what they are officially described as being, their supposed objects are myths." It is obvious that modern science and philosophy, through the perspective of the universe and scientific method, interpret man to have simple

single unitary bodily existence.

(5)

Idealistic Concept of Man

In course of time philosophy came to study man direct Instead of through the universe. Man became the centre of the study for philosophy. Man was no more viewed through the spectacles of the universe. He came to study himself with his own spectacles. In Greek Philosophy humanistic studies were initiated by Sophists, high-lighted by Socrates, and developed by Plato and Aristotle. Socrates is known for his epigram "know thyself. He holds the view that the most important and valuable study for man is man himself. Philosophy should concentrate on the study of man.

Socrates draws distinction between body and soul. There is a difference between a carpenter and his tools. A carpenter is the user of tools. I am distinct from the car I drive. I am the user of the car. As I use the car to cover distances, I use my feet to go from one place to another. So I am distinct from my body. I am soul which cannot be reduced to body. The soul in me is knower of truth. It can know what is good or virtues like justice, temperance, courage, piety. I am soul for which body is an instrument and dispensable instrument. Socrates identifies himself with his soul just as the earlier thinkers had identified man with one or another material stuff. Socrates was condemned by the court of Athens to death for teaching new ethics to the youth. On the last day when he was to be given a cup of poison, his friends came to meet him and found Socrates happy. Socrates had developed complete vairagya from his body. He was

as happy as a bridegroom is to meet his beloved, his beloved being truth. He said, he would be free from the limitations which body imposed on his explorations in knowledge. While in body he had to earn for his body, to take rest and sleep, and to attend to his sick body. After death, in the embodied state, he would be able to pursue knowledge all the time. One of his disciples asked him how they should bury him, "However you please !" Socrates humorously put it, "if you catch me and I do not give you a slip." And he laughed and then he turned quietly and said, "I cannot persuade Crito, my friends, that 'I am' this Socrates who is conversing and arranging every bit of what is being said. He thinks that I am the thing which he will be seeing as a corpse a short time after and he asks how to bury me".

Socrates holds that the essence of soul is reason. And just as our bodies are composed of the same matter which is found throughout the universe, so must our reason be part of universal cosmic reason. Thus Socrates looks at the universe through his spectacle of man and gives it idealistic interpretation, and rejects the naturalistic interpretation of it.

(6)

We find the same course of development in Indian Philosophy. Vedas are our first religious and philosophic texts. The gods in Vedas represent natural objects like sun, rain, air etc. They are embodied beings, come in chariots with bows and arrows. They make demands for eatables, ask for some drink. The worshippers pray for physical benefits, rain for the crops, progeny for their family and victory in wars. The whole view of man is 'this worldly'

in its metaphysics and ethics. When we pass on to Upanisads the whole outlook of the Indian thinkers is dramatically changed. The physical universe recedes back beyond the horizon and when visible, it is dyed in human colours. The whole thinking and reflection is concentrated on man himself, his inner life. The universe shrinks to the campus of individual consciousness. Man is the universe, He becomes central and focal to the study of the philosophers. The questions raised concern the essence of man, his future destiny and the realization of it. In two of the Upanisads, Taittiriya and Chandogya, the question is raised as to what is 'I'. In Chandogya Upanisad, Prajapati instructs Indra among gods and Virocana among the demons about the essence of man. He says, "Look at yourself in a pan of water. Anything that you do not understand of the self, tell me".

Then the two looked in a pan of water.

Then the two said to Prajapati: We see everything here, Sir, a self corresponding exactly, even to the hair and finger nails.

Then Prajapati said to the two: Make yourself well ornamented, well-dressed, adorned and look in a pan of water.

Then the two made themselves well-ornamented, well dressed, adorned and looked in a pan of water. Then Prajapati said to the two: What do you see?

Then the two said: Just as we are here, Sir, well ornamented, well-dressed, adorned-so there, Sir, well-ornamented, well-dressed, adorned. That is the self'. Said he. Prajapati expected his students to think over whether self or I could be identified with body. In

Taittiriya Upanisad, too, this identification is rejected. This 'I' disappears at death, though the body may remain intact for a short time. What disappears at death is life and this vital principle is prana or breath. But can we identify 'I' with breath? In sleep there is breath, but I am not there, for I hear nothing. If some one calls me, I do not respond. So 'I' cannot be identified with prana or breath. Am I the mind, which responds to sounds, smells, tastes? Can I be identified with consciousness or mind? No, consciousness is possessed by the insane, too. He thinks and talks so incoherently. I am rational in thought in daily life and philosophic pursuits. Can 'I' be identified with reason. Reason operates at the level of dualism of subject and object. The knowing subject is distinct from the object known. This distance or separation of subject and object leaves the knowledge in a state of incompleteness. But when I raise the question 'what am I', the knowing subject and the object known, is the same. So deeper than reason is the state in which 'I' is identified with 'I', a state of bliss. All the other levels of existence in us, annamaya, pranamaya, manamaya, vijnanamaya do not constitute the self or 'I'. 'I' or atma is consciousness bliss, or Anand and the other levels of existences are supported by it.

It is clear how both the western and the eastern philosophies, in the direct study of man, are led to hold that 'I' is soul; the essence of man is soul which is diametrically different from vital and consciousness level of existence which are found in the plant and the animal worlds, too.

Two Views of Man

Both the views of man, of naturalism and idealism, hold man to be constituted by single stuff, that of living body, or self-consciousness, " 'I am body", says the naturalist. "I am soul or self-consciousness", says the idealist. Both are extreme views,

There are other views which take a middle course, but practically retain their main thesis. Naturalists hold that there is soul or consciousness in us. But it is a by-product of bodily activities. In Plato's dialogue 'Phaedo', this view is stated thus: We know that music which is invisible, simple and divine, is produced by playing on a musical instrument, say, lyre. In the same way what we call soul or consciousness is result of the harmonious activities of the body. Just as music ceases when the musical instrument is no longer being played, human consciousness ceases when the body ceases to function. I cease to exist when my body ceases to function. What is primary in me, defines me, is not body but bodily activity. The idealists hold that soul is an independent reality and its presence is responsible for the functioning of the body. At the death of the body soul does not cease to exist.

We see that even when man is regarded as a complex of two stuffs, man is identified with one of them and the fact of the existence of the other is demoted to being a by product or dependent existence.

How is it that philosophers came to such one-sided view of the make-up of man? The concept of evolution was not available to them. Even when the concept of evolution came to be accepted by them, they could not yet see the true relation of body and soul

due to a limited interpretation of the causal principle.

Let me illustrate. The concept of evolution gained currency and prestige in the philosophic world in the nineteenth century. Every philosopher had to encounter it in his philosophic reconstruction. Sri Aurobindo in our country gives an evolutionary interpretation to his Brahmanvada. He accepts the facts of evolution, the gradual unfoldment of life, that of plants and animals and man. He holds that human consciousness at present is limited to rational level. Man has yet to scale other heights of evolution. But he holds that what is known as matter is in fact Brahman gone unconscious. Why did not Sri Aurobindo accept that evolution is development from inanimate or material world? What stood in the way of this great intellect?

The same position we find with the naturalists. They hold that life has evolved. But life is just chemistry. It is nothing but chemistry. Consciousness is nothing but bodily behaviour. Why do the naturalists not accept the rise of new levels of existences from matter?

Both the idealists and the naturalists hold to a limited view of causation as numerical total. A sum total cannot be more than the sum of its numbers. 2 plus 2 cannot make more than four. The effect cannot be greater than the cause, for to hold so is to believe that part of the effect has no cause, which is absurd. The reality of the cause must be equal to or greater than the reality of the effect. If this interpretation of the causal principle is true, there cannot be evolution from the inanimate world to life and consciousness, If the inanimate world is the cause of life, then life

must be implicitly or potentially present in matter, otherwise the effect will be greater than the cause which is violation of the principle of causation. If self-conscious man has gradually come from matter, the self-consciousness must be implicitly present in matter. So matter is Brahman gone unconscious, for matter is showing evolution of higher and higher consciousnesses.

The average man does not feel any hesitation to accept that God has created man, for God's reality is far greater than the reality of man. But he feels great resistance to believe that man has come through gradual evolution of the inanimate world. It is clear that what explains the resistance to believe the evolution of the higher from the lower is the view of causation.

The naturalists, too, do not accept life as in itself a novelty irreducible to chemical elements, for it is to admit effect to have greater reality than the cause. Thus the concept of evolution gets bogged down in the concept of causal principle.

The causal relation is in fact not only additive but emergent, too. When we mix water and sugar, we get sweet water and when we drink it, we get both the taste of sugar and water. The effect is just the sum total of the causal factors. But take the case of water. If we unite oxygen and hydrogen through an electric spark, we get water. Water has properties which are neither in oxygen nor in hydrogen. If we inhale oxygen from an oxygen jar and then inhale hydrogen from a hydrogen jar, our thirst is not quenched. There are properties which are produced through synthesis of elements. Synthesis of elements gives rise to a unified whole with properties of its own which the elements as such do not possess.

Water is not implicit or potentially present either in oxygen or in hydrogen. It is futile to seek in elements what is not due to them but to the fact of their peculiar synthesis, Synthesis is an additional factor in the situation. Hence the effect does not exceed the cause. The cause is not limited to elements but includes in their production the unique factor of synthesis. So what is the result of the presence of this factor of synthesis cannot be attributed to elements and we cannot say that water is implicitly present in oxygen or hydrogen. Water is nowhere present implicitly or explicitly before the peculiar synthesis. Water is an emergent evolute of the synthesis of oxygen and hydrogen. In the present day development of bio-chemistry, the chemists are able to produce living cells through peculiar combination of chemical elements. But life is not implicit or potentially present in chemical elements. What are the characteristics of the whole need not be the characteristics of the elements or parts which constitute it. Let us take the instance of Taj Mahal. It is a marvel of beautiful architecture. The grandeur of beauty which is experienced by an aesthete cannot be attributed to the pieces of marble. It is not implicit in them, though Taj Mahal cannot exist without marble pieces. No piece of marble can claim for itself what belongs to the whole which we refer to as Taj Mahal. The small value of the marble remains the same before it became part of the Taj Mahal or will remain the same when it ceases to be part of Taj Mahal. In an artistic whole, the value of the whole is emergent bearing no mathematical relation to summation of the value of the parts, which make it. All artistic wholes in all fields, say, painting, music, dance, show the emergence of values, which

belong to the whole only and no summation of the values of the parts can account for it. We can now understand that there are situations in which the effect is additive in character and it can be attributed to the elements which go to make it and there are other situations in which the effect is emergent in character and it cannot be attributed entirely to elements but to the peculiar synthesis of the elements. We can see how an idealist like Sri Aurobindo, and naturalists, like Holbach went astray. Sri Aurobindo thought of matter as Brahman gone unconscious for he took causal relation to be only additive. If he had thought that causal relation can be emergent too, he would have felt no need to endow matter with implicit or potential consciousness and call it unconscious Brahman. In the same way, if a naturalist like Holbach had taken the view that causal relation can be emergent too, he would not have thought of life as 'nothing but' chemistry and chemistry being 'nothing but' physics.

(8)

Evolutionary Interpretation of Man :

Let us understand evolution as a case of emergent causation and understand the relation of body and soul. It is true life as emergent from chemical elements has properties of its own, irreducible to the laws of chemistry, but it is not separable from its chemistry. It is true that consciousness has developed in the life of animals, and its laws of functioning are different from the laws of biology, yet it cannot function without a living body, or chemistry or physics. Consciousness is inseparable from a living body. Hence there can be no consciousness without the living

body, as there can be no living body without chemistry. The emergent, however different in its functions and behaviour, cannot dispense with the constituents whose peculiar synthesis has given rise to it. The thought of disembodied consciousness or soul is against the facts of evolution. Again, the denial of different functions to soul is against the fact of the emergence of new qualities. Soul and body are inter-dependent. One has no existence without the other.

The naturalists are right when they assert that soul or consciousness cannot exist without a living body. A soul is blind without eyes. deaf without ears, dumb without tongue, unconscious without brain, It cannot function without body and a functionless entity is non-existent. The idealists are right that soul is the support of the living body. There can be no living body without a soul.

(9)

Deva Dharma holds the view that man is constituted by soul and body and is a complex whole and not a simple single stuff.

To say that man is constituted by soul and body does not say anything clear and distinct. The word 'and' is equivocal in meaning. So many philosophies speak of soul and body and mean very different things. It shows how this word 'and' is unsuitable to pin point any specific view on the nature of relation between body and soul.

'And' sometime indicates only additive relation. Some philosophies hold that soul can leave the body, roam about and

then return to its body. Here, though it is held that man consists of body and soul yet the two have independent existence in man. There are others who hold to a one-sided causal relation between body and soul. They hold that body cannot live without the presence of soul but soul can live in disembodied state and that is the state of Moksha. There are still other thinkers who hold that man consists of body and soul and body and soul have causal relation while they are together. Nyaya and Vaisheshika schools hold that soul acquires consciousness, feelings of pain and pleasure, desire, love and hate while it is in body, but when it is separated from body, it sheds all these characteristics and returns to its original unconscious state.

Deva Dharma holds a different view about the relation of body and soul. It holds to an evolutionary interpretation of soul and its relation to body. Soul is an evolute from inanimate forces. The human life-force or soul as a species is an evolute from the life-forces of a species of mammals. It is biological in origin. Every individual soul is product of coalescence of sperm and ovum in mother's womb. It has a date of birth. Since it is product of natural conditions, it is subject to growth, development and decay. It stays alive or dies under certain physical and psychological conditions. Man consists of soul and body. The relation between them is of mutual dependence. What has dependent existence is an aspect of a unitary whole, Living body and soul have no independent existence but depend on each other for survival. Therefore, body and soul are two aspects of a unitary whole, which is man.

It is less ambiguous to say 'I am body-soul,' than to say 'I am body

and soul, for the reasons already given of the equivocal meaning of the word 'and'. Body and soul are two aspects of man with their own characteristics and functions. In the terminology of modern psychology man is psycho-physical organism.

The inseparable relation of body or soul can be further strengthened when it is shown that the relation of body and soul is not only causal, but logical too, so that the two are inseparable not only in the actual world but in all possible worlds, Descartes holds that there is causal relation between soul and body but there is no logical inseparability between the two and so soul can exist independent of body and be immortal. Says Descartes: "I saw that I could conceive that I had no body and there was no world, no place where I might be, and yet that I could not for all that conceive that I was not.

"I am a substance whose whole essence is to think and for its existence there is no need of any place nor it depends on any material thing, so that this means that is to say, the soul by which I am what I am, is distinct from body and even if the body were not, the soul would not cease to be what it is". Descartes wrongly assumes that mental words like 'thinking' or 'seeing,' obtain their meaning by reference to his logically private experiences. But can we attach any meaning, say, to the word 'to see' without reference to the behaviour of the perceiver and the physical characteristics of the object perceived. A word has meaning in its use. Our ordinary talk about 'seeing' would cease to be intelligible if it was cut off from such experiences as 'I can not see, it is too far off. Do not look around'. The meaning of 'seeing' can be maintained only because it has threads of connection with other non-

psychological concepts. Break these threads and the concept of 'seeing' collapses. Let us illustrate, Suppose a hysteria patient claims to have magnetic sensation. If there is no magnet in the environments, a psychologist would not say: 'We may take that the patient has peculiar sensation, though misnamed about its cause. On the contrary, the patient's report of magnetic sensation will be written off as subjective belief and no case of seeing. All mental experiences have meaning only in relation to their connections with the objective material and social world. Further, as Aristotle points out, all abstract knowledge or thought of universal truths, have their bases in sensory experiences. Hence, if the essence of soul is thinking, it is possible in an embodied entity. In fact the individualization of consciousness to make 'I think' actual, is possible through embodied existence and physical world.

Thus relation between body and soul is not only causal but logical also. Just as there can be no colour without figure and there can be no figure without colour, so there can be no living body without life-force or soul and no soul with out body. Soul-body are two aspects of human life.

(10)

Nature of Man

We now pass on to our second question: What is the nature of man? Here, we limit our study of man to his affective conative nature which is of concern to good conduct and human ideal. We leave out of account man's cognitive equipment of sensations, perceptions, ideas, memory, imagination, and thinking.

Plato holds that human soul has three parts: appetites, spirited part and reason. Reason is both cognitive and conative. Reason discriminates for us what is temperance or intemperance, what is courage or cowardice, what is piety or impiety. It can tell us what is good or bad and what is the highest good or the ideal. Reason is not only cognitive but it is conative, too. It has the power to organize appetites and spirited part to ideal form. When reason regulates our appetites, we acquire the virtue of temperance. When it regulates our spirited part, we acquire the virtue of courage, When reason contemplates truth and goodness, it develops wisdom. When each lower part stands in subordination to the higher and there is harmony, each part enjoying its due satisfaction, we are moral or just. This is Plato's secular interpretation of the ethical ideal of man. Aristotle primarily holds to the same position. Human nature is different from the nature of animals in that man is rational. His virtue consists in the full exercise of his rationality. Human reason has two aspects, theoretical and practical. So there are excellences of theoretical reason called intellectual virtues, like scientific knowledge, technological knowledge, practical wisdom, intuitive reason, and philosophic wisdom. There are excellences of practical reason which consist in finding a 'mean' between extremes of emotions and appetites. Courage is a mean between cowardice and foolhardy rushing into danger. Temperance is a 'mean' between too much indulgence in bodily pleasures and too little indulgence in bodily pleasures. Aristotle, like Plato holds that reason can persuade passions to be orderly in satisfactions.

The Chinese philosophers Confucius and Mencius hold that man

is by nature good. According to Mencius, the feeling of commiseration is the beginning of love, the feeling of shame and dislike is the beginning of righteousness; the feeling of defence and complacency is the beginning of propriety; and the feeling of right and wrong is the beginning of wisdom. "Men have these beginnings", says Mencius, "just as they have their four limbs. Therefore, love, righteousness, propriety and wisdom are not drilled into us from without. We are originally provided with them."

Mencius went further. Goodness is not only inherent in man's nature but man does not require any learning to practise it or any thought to know it. He does live goodness intuitively. In his own words: "The ability possessed by man without the necessity of thought is native knowledge. Children carried in the arms all know to love their parents. As they grow, they all know to respect their brothers. To have filial affection for parents is love and to respect elders is righteousness. These feelings are universal in the world, that is all."

Mencius reasons thus: "All things of the same kind are similar to one another. So why should it be different for man. The sage and I are of the same kind. Men's mouths like the same relishes, their ears like the same sounds and their eyes like the same beauty. Can it be that only their minds do not like the same things? What is this that their minds all like? I say, the principle of reason and righteousness.

The Christian philosophers like Augustine, hold the opposite view to this. Addressing God, Augustine says: "Thou didst set me face to face with myself, that I might behold how foul I was, how

crooked and sordid, bespotted and ulcerous". "All alike," says St. Paul, "are under the control of sin."

All these views of human nature miss the whole truth, for the perspective of evolution is not available to them. Man has inherited aggressiveness from the animal world. He has inherited cunningness from the animal world. He has inherited self-centredness from the animal world, Man has inherited animal aggressiveness, cunningness, selfishness etc., the cardinal characteristics of the law of the jungle. So it is wishful thinking to hold that man by original nature is wholly good. Mencius ignores man's animal heredity, the evolutionary background of his origin. Further, this view fails to explain the evil conduct of man. According to Mencius evil in man is deviation of man from his original nature. But why does man deviate from his original goodness, unless something in him or in his environments, influences him to ignore his real nature. If something in him or in his environment deviates a man, it means his nature is susceptible to evil. If we admit that man is susceptible to evil, he is not wholly good.

The Christian view that man is originally evil, ignores the facts of evolution too. Man is not an animal, sensual, self-centred and lustful. He is an evolved animal. As a species he possesses higher senses of cleanliness, orderliness and higher feelings of compassion, helpfulness, justice and altruism. He has in him urge for knowledge, fine arts and social justice. So all pleasures are not sinful. There are innocent pleasures in man. There are altruistic loves in man which are worthy of admiration. Thus both evil and good tendencies are present in man. evolution. This is the view of

Plato and other rationalists hold that reason gives us knowledge of the good and is also power to practise good. The evolutionalists hold that animals as well as men are guided by instincts. The instincts or the biological urges move us to action. Our bodily organs, like eyes, ears, hands, feet are instruments to serve the biological and social urges.. In the course of evolution, intellect is another organ which has developed in man. Man's intellect is as much an instrument for the satisfactions of his urges or passions as are his eyes, hands and feet. To put it in the words of Hume: Reason is the slave of passions. Reason is not motive of human action but is an instrument to serve action. As Aristotle puts it: "Thought moves nothing".

Again, the rationalists' view, like that of Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, that reason gives us knowledge of values, goodness or badness, is partially true. The knowledge of values needs the co-operation of altruistic feelings, too. It is feeling of compassion which shows us the ugliness of cruelty and the beauty of the service of the helpless. It is feeling of justice that reveals to us the hatefulness of exploitation of the helpless and the beauty of respect of the rights of others. It is both reason and altruistic feelings or sublime feelings of truth and goodness that can build the science of right and serviceable conduct.

Deva Dharma takes an evolutionary view of human nature and hence avoids one-sidedness of the first three views. It holds that man has come from animals and has inherited animal instincts. It rejects the view that animals are guided by instincts and man is

guided by reason. Both animals and man as a species of animals, are guided by instincts. Instincts become conscious in man and are called desires or feelings. Deva Dharma takes a voluntaristic interpretation of man. Man is guided in his action and thought by instincts, desires, and feelings.

However, man is an evolved animal. So he has in him, as a species, higher senses and higher feelings. Deva Dharma rejects the view that whatever is superior in man is merely a matter of social conditioning. As a species, man is born with feelings of compassion, justice or love for knowledge in one or another field. He has very rich equipment of pursuit of knowledge, beauty and virtues absent in the animal world.

Man's animal equipment and human equipment, both his lower passions and higher urges are under the principle of pleasure and pain. His psychology is limited to pleasure principle. When he develops love for the pleasures derived from his bodily appetites or ego, he develops low loves and low hates which issue into evil thoughts and evil actions. When man develops love for some other-regarding feelings like compassion, mercy, helpfulness, disinterested service, he serves the betterment of society and thereby elevates himself.

(11)

Man in Relation to Society

We pass now to the third question. The picture of man is not complete without relating him to his environments. He is an abstraction, a skeleton, without the flesh and marrow of his

connections with his environments. Environments are of three kinds: social, natural and divine. Man is conceived in the womb of society in the form of his mother. His first world of which he becomes conscious is his mother and father, brothers and sisters who look after his needs, talk to him even when he cannot talk, fondle him and smother him with kisses. He grows into a human being in the human culture of his family, his school, and his neighbourhood. His thoughts, emotions, and actions are dyed in the colours of his social ethos.

But how to define his relation to society? There is the view that man by nature is not social. His sociability arises out of his needs which can be satisfied by others. He needs food, he needs the farmer who grows food. He needs clothes, he needs the weaver who weaves clothes, He wants protection, he contracts with a strong person protect his life and property. This is how kingship rises. The society or the other men are not wanted in themselves but for the services they provide. They are means to his ends of satisfaction. Man by nature is selfish and self-centred, wanting to use every one to his satisfactions. According to this view the individual is the end and the society is a means to it. At the lower level, the individual identifies his good with material possessions and hence exploits the society for gaining more and more possessions. This is stupid selfishness. Even at this lower level of material aim of life there are prudent persons who realize that it is in their personal interest to make a fair return to the labour and serve the interests of the customers. However, even when their business is service, their service is a means to their larger gains. This is a case of wise selfishness.

At a higher level also the thesis remains the same, that is, the individual is primary and the society is secondary in character. Higher religions and philosophers teach that the ideal is moksha of the individual and society is a means to it. It is attainable by Nishkama Karma or disinterested discharge of duties of Varna-ashram no less that of humanity. There are other thinkers who accept that moksha of the individual is the ideal and Nishkama Karma towards society is means towards it. But society is one of the means. Bhakti Marg or Jnana Marg are two other ways of moksha. There can be different means for the attainment of moksha.

There are two objections to this view. It is not true that sociability is based on needs only. My relation with every one is not business relation. A mother's relation with her permanently invalid child is not a business relation but relation of love. Love is a relation of accepting the other for whatever he is and be dedicated to it to the point of sacrifice. A wife's relation to her sick and ailing husband is not one of selfishness but of service with love. She weeps to see him in pain. She is sleepless out of worry for him. This is not because he is a bread earner. She is herself a bread earner. Friendship is sociability for the sake of sociability. The social contract theory of sociability is historically false. Modern social psychology tells us that mutuality between human beings is as inborn as hunger and sex. The social contract theory is based on individualistic psychology which is not true.

This view does not represent highest ethics. To render disinterested service to society with good of one's ownself as focal, is a case of spiritual self-centredness, though far superior

to selfishness in the field of material goods. Altruistic love is service in which others are the focal points.

There is an opposite view to this individualistic standpoint. It holds that society is an organism. The status of the individual is like that of a part of a living organism. Just as an eye or a hand ceases to have function and craves to exist when they are taken out of the living organism, in the same way an individual has no meaning and significance, no life possible without society. His purpose of life is to serve the purpose of society. He must live as an organ of society to serve its interests. The individual is to have no interests other than the interests of the society. He is not to determine what is good or bad. It is the society that determines this for him.

This Hegelian view is the main support of dictatorship. It is wrong analogy to reduce relation of individual and society to bodily organism. An individual is a self-conscious person with a life of his own, too. He is modifier of society, he is not just an organ of society. He is able to see society other than himself, reject some of its customs, conventions and laws, call upon it to reform its basis and structure. He is endowed with powers to change it. The individual's right to challenge the social ethos is inalienable. He cannot sell his soul to society and be reduced to an organ of society. Dictatorship is the worst form of society for it denies the individual the right to criticize powers in authority. It treats the individual as a means, a car for it to drive according to its fanciful ideas. Both these views are extreme and one-sided. Neither the society is means to the individual nor is individual a means to society. Both are ends in themselves. Both the individual and the

society have rights. The individual is to respect the rights of the society as the society is to respect the rights of the individual. The individual has duties towards society as the society has duties towards the individual. The individual is to do disinterested service of society as society has to do impartial service of the individual. Deva Dharma holds that individual stands in nexus of social relationships. His higher good is not different from the good of society. There is no conflict between the higher goods of the individual, and the society. Man's higher good is to serve the good of the society diversified in doing good to parents, brothers and sisters, partner in life, one's 'biradri', community, country and mankind. The service in diversified relationships consists in respect for rights of all individuals and groups, gratitude for the service received from them and disinterested service of the less-favoured by inheritance and environments.

(12)

Man's Relation to Infra-human Worlds

In relation to infra-human worlds of animals, plants and inanimate existences, popularly called Nature, most philosophies consider them below moral relations with man. The theists hold that God has made the three worlds of animals, plants and inanimate beings for man's use, entertainment and enjoyment. They have no rights and hence man has no obligation to them except to exploit them for his satisfactions. They exist to serve man. Jainism and Buddhism, both atheist religions, do preach compassion to the animal world and compassion does break through even in the

theistic religions in the form of consideration and kindness to the animal world.

However, no philosophy can truly depict the relation of man to the three worlds unless it has an evolutionary perspective, It is evolution that roots man in the earth and the other physical environments. Man has in course of time evolved from the inanimate world. The inanimate world is part and parcel of us. Every breath declares our dependence on the physical world. We are always physical in our make up. There is no definition of us without the physical body. We share with plants the powers of nutrition and reproduction. We depend for our food on the plant world every day and many times a day. We share with animals the power of locomotion and sensation. We share so many emotions and feelings of love and friendship with them. They are our remote ancestors, yet ancestors all the same. In a situation of loneliness, their companionship helps us to keep our sanity. We still depend on their services. Half the human world is fed on their milk. They still serve our fields, and conveyance. We register in our being all the three worlds. The beings of the three worlds are not means but fellow beings with us.

Deva Dharma accepts the evolution of man from the inanimate world. It holds that each of the three worlds have rights which we are to respect. We do not have right to kick even a stone, or break a stone or tear a leaf unless required by the exigencies of the situation. The animals are fellow citizens. They have right to life, freedom and happiness. Even a snake is not to be killed on his way out. The Founder of Deva Dharma, Devatma, has given detailed instructions of our duties of respect, gratitude, service

and reparation to each one of these three worlds. He illumines us with the truth that wishing and doing service to the existences of these three worlds elevates our soul as wishing and doing service to human beings elevates our soul. Devatma holds that every existence, not only human beings has a claim to exist and we must respect it unless it threatens our existence.

(13)

Man's Relation to the Divine

The final relation which man bears is to some existence who can deliver him to his destiny. It has been instinctive feeling of man to hold that besides and not necessarily beyond the four orders of existences, there is some existence who has a distinct unique character of its own. Such an existence may yet be denizen of the earth. Lord Krishna, Rama and Christ are considered to be of sublime uniqueness standing in isolated grandeur from the four worlds of man, animals, plants and inanimate objects. So the sublime existence need not be beyond and outside the human and natural world.

In early times man thought that gods or goddesses could confer on him what he thought none other could do for him. He sought in his gods his safety and providence of the goods of life and his idea of safety and goods of life was physical. As man's thoughts and feelings matured, he thought of his God as embodiment of virtues. Higher religions conceive God as love, as compassion, as parma dayalu, as mangalamaya, as deliverer from evil. In Bhagvad Gita, Lord Krishna says that when evil comes to dominate society, he takes human form to rescue or free it from evil. In Christianity,

it is believed that when God saw man's suffering due to his sinful life, he felt compassion and sacrificed his only son for the deliverance of man, These beliefs are myths but mythology reflects the psychology of myth-makers. Mythical belief of God as love, compassion and concern for human welfare is nothing but concrete symbolism of Sattvic feelings of love, compassion and altruism. The superior section of humanity in worshipping God as love, compassion and altruism, has worshipped its own sattvic feelings in an attempt to make them dominate in his life.

Man in worshipping God as love and compassion has alienated his sattvic tendencies and turned them into idol of worship. He has attributed all his good to him and all evil to himself. He has attributed even his own goodness to him and felt grateful to him for it and felt inferior to him.

Deva Dharma has an evolutionary perspective on worshipful being. As Prof. S. Alexander has shown 'deity' represents the next higher stage of evolution. Evolution has thrown up men of love and compassion who have reduced suffering and evil of fellow men. Their life represents the next stage of development of society from its earlier level of primitive existence.

But a Sattvic Jivan or life of altruistic loves is not sufficient to deliver man from his evil and help him to his destiny. Battvio prem or altruistic loves, however, beautiful, have limitations. A sattvic love is love for some good. The altruistic feeling of knowledge helps the altruist to devote and dedicate himself to discovery of truth in some field of knowledge. But this altruist may show indifference to his Hay ban potion for animals diasayder arepdy of

money: He may be unhelpful to his colleagues. Another altruist may be a philanthropist who opens orphanages but he may be sexually lax. He may be exploiter of labour. Thus an altruistic life does not cover the whole of the life. It is an excellence along side of certain evil feelings.

Secondly, since an altruistic love allows some passions to co-exist with it, it is not pure in its operation. In an altruist, his evil passions get their satisfactions, even in his altruistic thoughts and actions. A teacher may be devoted to children in a school. But his passion for aggressiveness or cruelty may find expression in this service through undue discipline of children. He may fail to realize that what he justifies as discipline and argues for it, is infact defence of his feeling of cruelty in him. When Shah Jahan asked his son Aurangzeb to send some children whom he could teach, Aurangzab taunted him that his desire to rule still dominated him. Modern psychology reveals how teachers and missionaries have unworthy motives in their welfare service.

Thirdly, even an altruistic love in its own field also lacks light and power to restrain its deviation into untruth and evil. A man with altruistic love for Harijans, becomes partial to them, cxaggerates the wrongs committed by society to them, takes to untruthful means to get advantages for them. He may ignore the claims of justice or merit in his enthusiasm for service of Harijans in the fields of education, and service. There is an element of untruth and evil even in our best altruistic love,

Thus altruistic psychology is not free from co-existence of passions and deviation into untruth and evil. Evolution in its

ceaseless progress to new levels of existence has thrown up the true worshipful being. He is endowed with love of truth and goodness and higher hatred for all forms of untruth and evil. His psychology repels untruth and evil and embraces truth and goodness. There is no disposition in him to evil and untruth and there is dynamic life of truth and goodness in him. This is the definition of Devatma, and evolution has fashioned this all-truth-loving and all-goodness loving being, Devatma, for worship of mankind. His life is light and power not only for the common men but for the highest altruistic persons also. It is not only bodily and ego loves that deviate a common man into untruth, but our altruistic loves also deviate us into untruth and evil, though their form may be subtle. In Devatma, humanity finds his higher sublime environments which can give man freedom from his low loves and low hates and evolve higher loves and higher hates in him. Man's relation to Devatma is one of deliverer and evolver.

Devatma satisfies another need of man. From psychological point of view, man's greatest need is to be wanted and needed. Even when man feels wanted and needed in society, he does not feel secure for being wanted and needed. He fears he may no more be wanted and needed in course of time. At one time a person is wanted and needed by his children. Nothing gives mother greater satisfaction than to feel how the child wants her and needs her. Nothing gives greater satisfaction to a man than to be wanted and needed by his society. But gradually children no more want and need them. Society no more wants the retired persons. It considers it a problem as to how to look after them. How can our need of being wanted and needed be satisfied ?

When we see Bhagwan Devatma's photo and especially read his addresses on his birthdays, we see him and hear him tell us 'I want you. I need you. I wait for you to join me in the task of evolution of the four orders of existences. Come to me and I will fill your life with zest and meaning beyond your imagination. I need the humblest and the ablest to share in the evolutionary task of establishing the reign of truth and goodness. What can be greater than being wanted and needed by Bhagwan Devatma!

(14)

It will satisfy us more deeply if we understand the basis of Devatma's wanting us, his interest in us. The basis of Devatma's concern with us rests on his philosophy of the universe and function or ideal of man in it. This takes us to our last questions.

What is the function or ideal of man in the universe is defined by one's understanding of the universe. There are different interpretations of the universe. One of the most pervasive interpretation is idealistic. It is held that the highest reality in the universe is the being which is eternal, unchanging and perfect in all excellences. Plato thought of this reality as the form of the Good. Aristotle named it as God. Indian Upanisadic view of this highest reality is Brahman, Sat-Chit-Anand. The other part of the universe is the world of changing and becoming, imperfect in all aspects of its existence. Whereas our soul is akin to the eternal Absolute God or Brahman, our body is part of the changing world of becoming. The soul in us is immortal and the body of ours is perishing. The passions of the body engage us and engross us, clouding the vision of our soul and we fail to discriminate

between the eternal good of the soul and the temporary pleasures of our body. The ideal for man is to realize that his soul is akin to the Absolute, God or Brahman and he should dedicate himself to the contemplation of God or Brahman and subordinate or reduce or eliminate the desires of the flesh and the world. Greek philosophy's ideal man is wise man. Plato interpreted soul as rational. Through exercise of reason, the soul is illumined with truth that the real is the Good and in the light of truths thus vouchsafed one should subordinate his spirited part and appetites of soul with virtues of courage and temperance and perform his duties as king, as soldier, as businessman and as manual labourer. He alone should be king who is philosopher illumined with knowledge of the highest reality of Good. As reason in man is to organise his spirited part and passions, the king is to organize the role and function of soldiers, businessmen and manual labour.

Aristotle interprets highest reality as God. God is without body and without society. So he does not have the virtues of temperance courage or justice. He is a thought thinking on himself. But man is composite of body and soul.

So he must develop moral virtues of temperance, courage, justice. But intellectual virtues make us akin to God. The intellectual virtues of contemplation and love of the highest reality or God is the ideal for man.

Both for Plato and Aristotle the ideal life is life of contemplation of the eternal timeless reality of Good or God, and practice of moral virtues is subordinate and inferior and is ultimately

eliminated after death. The same is true of upanisadic thought. Brahman is the highest reality. Our soul is also eternal and changeless. Our mind or empirical consciousness is result of presence of soul with body. Our mind is subtle matter and ever changing. It is due to mind's contact with things of the world that we have passions and desires, love and hate in us which toss us with restlessness of pleasure and pain. The ideal is discrimination (Vivek) between soul as transcendental reality and the body and mind as empirical and perishing in character. The process of this discrimination is contemplation (Jnan marga) Niskam Karma (Karma marg), love (Bhakti marg).

In all these philosophies man is not made to feel that he is a contributor to the universe. He is not depicted as needed by the universe for its future. The perfect reality exists and all that man is to do is to bask in it. Plato defines the philosopher or the ideal man as one who is spectator of all times i.e. of eternal perfect reality of good or God. He has no active role to play in the processes of the universe. Therefore none of the idealistic philosophies are satisfactory, for the best ideal for man is one which gives him no constructive and creator role in the universe. If God is in heaven and every thing is well with the world, I am not wanted to do anything in the refurnishing of the world. If Brahman is the highest reality, Sat-chit-Anand, I am only to lose myself in it. I am not called upon to participate in making it better.

Only an evolutionary philosophy, like Deva Dharma, can enlighten a man to see that he is wanted by the universe in which he lives. According to evolutionary philosophy, the universe is one and only reality, and it is in the making, not made-in complete, im-perfect.

There is the conflict between the forces of evolution and the forces of devolution. The ideal for man is to reduce the operations of the forces of devolution and to increase the forces of evolution and thus to contribute to building a better universe. The medical and biological researchers for instance, do discover ways by which diseases can be eliminated. Such researchers feel being wanted by the social world. The scientists of seismology help to reduce the destructiveness of earthquakes by giving us information in time to evacuate the places and save human life and property. All scientific researches which reduce or eliminate destructive processes from operation make this planet a better place to live in. All social researches which help to reduce inequalities in economic, social and political life are changing the social life to a better ideal state. Deva Dharma gives the best assurance of being wanted by enlightening man that the universe needs every one of us to participate in the evolution of the universe in its progress towards life of pure love understanding, and service for the four orders of Nature, the inanimate, the plant, the animal and the human worlds. The universe admits of progress towards ideals of value and human beings are the custodians of this progress for we can understand the processes in the universe, divert them to higher values and thus feel wanted by the universe. Nothing can satisfy the feeling of being wanted in us than to see and feel that though one is just a speck in the unlimited universe, he is gifted with intelligence and altruistic feelings to make the unlimited universe more valuable in beauty, goodness and knowledge. As a mother feels intensely wanted because of the contribution she makes in the life of her child, a man with

evolutionary vision and altruistic feelings feels intensely wanted by the universe for lending its processes to goodness and beauty and knowledge. If we have altruistic feelings, we feel intensely wanted by the discarded, desolate and lost humanity, by the orphans who are starved of love, by the uneducated lost in darkness of ignorance, by moral delinquents ruined by evil character.

In this satisfaction of being wanted through participation in bettering the world, man gets both light and life through Devatma. Devatma himself is in the process of evolution, he is ever-growing in his love of truth and goodness. He is ever-progressing. He is therefore the highest inspiration, encouragement for us to participate in the service of the four orders of existences. His wanting us is on behalf of the evolutionary process of which he is the highest spokesman. He calls to us to join him in the evolutionary process of the planet. Hence his feeling and concern for us is the feeling and concern of the evolutionary process. He makes us fit for the call of being wanted by the evolutionary process in the universe by giving us the light to see the tagliness of devolutionary forces-low loves and low hates and the strength to shed them; to see the beauty of altruistic forces and to cultivate them and thus get freedom from devolutionary forces and cultivate evolutionary forces in us. Devatma gives us the highest feeling of being wanted by making us march under his flag to participate in the evolution of Nature. Human ideal is one of creative contribution to the building of the universe to the ideal values of beauty, truth and goodness.