# FIRST PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

MICHELAN CAMBABUR

IQBAL ACADEMY PARISTAN 116-McLEOD ROAD, LAHORE



## FIRST PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

An analysis of the natural and perfect development of the human personality as distinguished from the various forms of its unnatural and imperfect development.

MUHAMMAD RAFIUDDIN



IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN

#### All rights reserved

 1st Edition
 ...
 1961

 2nd Edition
 ...
 1983

 Copies Printed
 ...
 1000

Price



#### Publisher

Prof. Muhammad Munawwar
Director
Iqbal Academy Pakistan
116 • McLeod Road, Lahore

Printed at

Zarreen Art Press 61 - Railway Road, Lahore

### CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	i
CHAPTER I	
THE CONFUSION OF MODERN EDUCATIONISTS	1
CHAPTER II	
THE URGE FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH	51
CHAPTER III	
THE MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE URGE FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH	89
CHAPTER IV	
THE NATURE OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS	175
CHAPTER V	
THE CONDITIONS OF PERFECT EDUCATIONAL GROWTH	228

The educator is a builder

And what he builds is the human soul.

O educator! The sage Qaani has uttered

A beautiful maxim for you—

Do not raise a wall before the Sun

If you want the courtyard of the house to be full of light!

-IQBAL

#### INTRODUCTION

Man is so made that he must have a philosophy to precede every action that he performs and the greater the clearness and correctness of his philosophy the greater is the fruitfulness of his action. Thus, whenever an intelligent person decides to do anything, however un-important it may seem to others, he has in his mind a clear answer to the following questions:—

- (a) What is it exactly that I want to achieve as a result of my activity?
- (b) Why do I want to achiev it?
- (c) How best can I achieve it?

This is true of such simple activities of an individual as making a telephone call, mixing tea for himself or writing a letter, which have a bearing on his own private life only, and this is true also of those complex activities of his in which he seeks the help and cooperation of a large number of other individuals and which have a bearing on the life of a whole community. One of these latter activities is the activity of the educator. The educator who takes upon himself the task of educating a community must have in his mind similarly a clear and correct answer to the following questions:—

- (a) What is it exactly that I want to achieve as a result of my educational activity?
- (b) Why do I want to achieve it?
- (c) How best can I achieve it?

In other words, the activity of an educator will not be directed intelligently and fruitfully unless he starts with a clear and correct philosophy of education.

But the philosophy of a complicated activity like education will not be as simple as the philosophy of making a telephone

call, mixing tea or writing a letter. When the educator will make a sincere effort to find out a clear and correct answer to the above three questions he will be faced with other questions like the following;—

What is the aim of education that an educator must have in view? If the aim of education is to produce a particular type of individual, what is that type? What is it that makes one type of individual different from another type. What is it that makes one type of individual preferable to another type? What is the criterion for distinguishing between good and bad types of individuals? What is the best type of individual which an educator can possibly produce? How can such an individual be recognised? What is the quality of his knowledge, skills, habits, attitudes, likes and dislikes, views and opinions, beliefs and ideas, ends and purposes, motives and standards, hopes and aspirations? What steps must be taken by an educator to produce such an individual?

Education makes human beings different from what they are without education. But does this difference come about as a result of the alteration or formation of the human individual from without or as a result of his natural growth or development from within? In other words, is education based on natural endowments or does it depend upon artificial equipments? Is it a process of helping natural inclinations or that of overcoming them and substituting in their place habits and attitudes acquired under external pressure. If education is based on natural endowments and is intended to help natural inclinations, how do they make education possible, and how can the educator help them? If education is a process of natural growth from within what is entity in the human individual which grows as a result of his education. What are the properties and the qualities and characteristics of this entity? What are the conditions of its full growth? How does the process of educational growth take place? Is there a natural direction or a natural end or destination of this growth? If so, is there any danger of this growth becoming misdirected towards wrong ends. What are the causes and conditions which misdirect the educational growth of an individual? Does the misdirection of educational growth make a difference to the perfect educational growth of an individual? Does it make any difference to his knowledge, skills, habits, attitudes, likes and dislikes, beliefs and opinions, ends and purposes, hopes and aspirations? If so, what is the nature of this difference and how does it arise? What conditions are favourable to the perfect educational growth of an individual? How can we create such conditions?

Why do systems of education differ from nation to nation? Are all these systems of education equally educative? If not, why some educational systems are less educative than others? How can we remove their defects and make them perfectly educative. How can we create a perfectly educative system or an ideal system of education? What is the value and importance of the various methods of education known at present? What should be the role of the text-book, the teacher, the games, the general atmosphere of the school and the conditions of the society that prevail outside the school, in a perfectly educative system of education? What subjects and skills must be taught to an individual at the various stages of his educational development and why?

What is the relation of education to ordinary experience? If educational growth is the result of experience, what is the nature of experience itself and why and how experience results in educational growth? How should the answer to this question influence an educator's choice of social environment and the material and methods of instruction for his pupils? Is there any reason for an educator to choose one experience rather than another for his pupil? In case it is right to believe that the quality of education depends upon the quality of experience, what is the criterion for the educational worth of an experience?

What is the relation of education to character? What are the laws of human nature governing the development of character? Why does the character of one individual or one nation differ from that of another? What are the marks of a perfect character? What can the educator do to assure that his pupils come to have a perfect character? And so on.

An educator who does not answer these questions and does not make sure that his answer to these questions is as correct as it can be, before he starts his educational endeavour, ignores the very first principles of education and as such can never hope to succeed in his endeavour. Spending more on the education of a community, adding to the number of its schools and colleges, extending the number of years which its learners must spend on education, increasing the number of subjects and text-books in each class and similar measures aiming at the extension and intensification of education-which seem to be in favour with the educators all the world over at present-cannot compensate an educator for his ignorance of these principles. A motorist who sets out on a journey must know his destination and the road that leads to it before he sets out. If he doubles or trebles his speed while he happens to be travelling on a wrong road, he will not come any nearer to his destination, but will rather recede farther away from it all the more quickly.

Unfortunately, some of these questions have not been attempted at all by any modern philosopher of education so far, for example, those relating to the fundamental causes of differences in the educational systems of the various countries and nations and the qualities and features of an ideal system or a perfect system of education. There are some other questions in the above list which have been, no doubt, attempted by many philosophers of education, but (as I have endeavoured to show in this book) the answers to which are intellectually unsatisfactory, inconsistent and incoherent, for example, those relating to the aims of education. That modern philosophers of education are in a state of perplexity as regards the aim of education, is generally admitted. Thus T.V. Jaffrays writes in his book; An inquiry into the aims of education: (Pitman, London, 1950)

"The most serious weakness of modern education is the uncertainty about its aims".

There are still other questions in this list which have been

correctly answered by all modern philosophers of education without exception but the full implications of the answers to which have been neither worked out nor kept in view by any of them while formulating their theories. Such is, for example, the question whether education is a process of the alteration of the human individual or a process of his growth. While all of them agree that education is a process of growth, all of them have, unfortunately, overlooked this simple fact that no growth, whether biological or psychological, is possible without an innate urge for growth in the organism. Indeed, while they have laid stress on the fact that education is growth, they have completely ignored the urge that is the cause of this growth. As a consequence, they have failed to make this urge the object of their study and thereby to know its qualities and characteristics, the purpose, the manner and the direction of its expression in nature, its history and role in evolution, the manner in which it is related to the intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic ideas and activities of men, broadly understood, and the conditions under which it can be thwarted or misdirected or under which its maximum expression and satisfaction can be assured. The result has been that the development of educational philosophy has been seriously hampered and misdirected throughout the world, so much so, that today it is not able to answer, clearly and definitely, even the most fundamental of all questions that can be asked about education, namely, "What is the aim of education"? The systems of education built on the foundations of this half-grown philosophy of education have, naturally, failed to provide for the constant, all-round growth of the personalities of our young boys and girls, thus making delinquency a serious world-wide problem which grows in magnitude almost everyday.

In this book I have made an effort to answer all the above questions as satisfactorily as it may be possible and I have found that the most satisfactory of all possible answers that can be given to them are those that can be intellectually derived from the fact, already accepted by the modern educationists, that education is a process of growth. This fact (which thus secures an overwhelming evidence in favour of its being a fundamental educational truth) is, therefore, the central idea of this book

and all its other ideas are the implications or the conclusions of this one idea. One of the most obvious as well as the most important of these implications or conclusions is that man has an urge for educational growth and whether or not an individual has been able to grow educationally to the fullest extent depends on the fact whether or not he has been able to express and satisfy this urge to the fullest extent. Consequently, an effort has been made to study at length the qualities and characteristics of this urge and to analyze, in their light, as completely as it may be possible, the psychological pro-cess involved in the growth of the human personality. The most prominent qualities of this urge are, that it takes the form of the love of an ideal, that it can be satisfied perfectly and permanently by the love of an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection alone and that it is an independent urge of human nature which is neither a product nor a servant of the animal instincts or the basic economic needs of man but which, on the other hand, rules and controls his animal instincts and basic economic needs for its own expression and satisfaction.

The modern educator has already come to the conclusion that the nature of the human individual is the only dependable guide to a knowledge of the best and the most accurate methods of education. Thus Sir James Ross writes:—

"It is little exaggeration to assert that all the recent advance in educational method, that indeed the very ideal of sound method based on the facts of child nature, has come from naturalism. When ways and means of education are considered it seems the only sound standpoint to discover the nature of the child and to start with him as he is"

This conclusion evidently implies that education is wholly a natural process. But a process cannot be separated from its end or aim towards which it necessarily moves. A natural process must have a natural end and that natural end (in so far as it is the true natural end of the process) must be only one and not many, although it may have a number of ends as its component parts or elements. This conclusion enables us, there-

fore, to arrive at the further conclusion that the nature of the human individual must be also the only dependable guide to a knowledge of the best and the most occurate end or aim of education and that in order to achieve that end or aim of education we must start with the human individual as he is and not as a particular individual or community desires him to be. As such, there must be something in the nature of the human individual, some natural quality of human consciousness, which determines the end or aim of education considered as a natural process, as a process of natural growth from within. I have endeavoured to show in this book that such a quality of human consciousness does really exist and that it is man's urge to love an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection—an urge which ultimately dominates and controls all his desires and activities. Since this view comes into conflict with the psychological theories of McDougall, Freud, Adler and Marx, all of which are very popular at present in one intellectual circle of the world or another, it has been found necessary to justify it by showing in detail the fundamental weaknesses and inconsistencies of these theories.

The educationist who agrees with the view that education is a process of natural growth from within has, ef course, to agree totally with its conclusions, provided there is reason enough to believe that they have been worked out correctly. As regards the conclusions of this view worked out here, it may be mentioned that they take the form of a family or system of inter-related facts every one of which derives rational support and strength from every other and from all others taken together. This means that if we accept any one of these facts we have to accept all others and it becomes a proof of their validity that they are consistent with, and explain the ultimate rational basis of, not only the established and accepted fact of education as a process of growth but also the established and accepted methods of education—methods which the modern educators have tried and found entirely satisfactory.

The book has not been written with an eye to the needs and aspirations of any particular nation, religion, country or ideology. It is intended to be a dispassionate and disinterested study

of the growth of human personality as it must take place and does take place under the laws of human nature. Human nature is the same everywhere. A human individual who desires to grow educationally in the right direction or to the fullest extent, has, therefore, the same educational needs and requirements and must be educated in the same manner, no matter whether he belongs to America, Russia or England or any other country or whether he is a Christian, a Hindu or a Muslim or-the follower of any other religion.

Mohammad Rafinds:

#### CHAPTER I

#### THE CONFUSION OF MODERN EDUCATIONISTS

A correct theory of education, as indeed of any human activity, can be founded only on a correct theory of the nature of man. Unfortunately the modern intellectuals are, on their own confession, very backward in their knowledge of human nature. Skinner, an eminent psychologist writes, in his book Science and Human Behaviour:

"Science has evolved unevenly. By seizing upon the easier problems first, it has extended our control of inanimate nature without preparing for the social problems that follow.......There is no point in furthering a science of nature unless it includes a sizable science of human nature because only in that case the results will be wisely used".

Alexis Carrol, a Nobel Prize-winner, writes in his book Man, the Unknown:

"The making of humanity requires the development of institutions wherein body and mind can be formed according to natural laws and not to the prejudices of the various schools of education. In truth our civilization has created certain conditions of existence which render life impossible. The anxiety and the woes of the inhabitants of the modern city arise from the political, economic and social institutions, but above all from their own weaknesses........The only possible remedy for this evil is a much more profound knowledge of ourselves".

McDougall, another eminent psychologist, writes in his World Chaos:

"Our ignorance of the nature of man has prevented and still prevents the development of all the social sciences. Such sciences are the crying need of our time; for lack of them our civilization is threatened gravely with decay and perhaps complete collapse".

"We talk of Psychology, of Economics and of Political Science, of Jurisprudence, of Sociology and of many other supposed sciences; but the simple truth is that all these fine names simply mark great gaps in our knowledge—they vaguely indicate regions of vast wilderness hardly yet explored—regions which must be reduced to order if our civilization is to endure".

"My thesis is that in order to restore the balance of our civilization we need to have far more knowledge (systematically ordered or scientific knowledge) of human nature and of the life of society than we yet have"

"Here then is the only road to remedy the parlous and ever more dangerous state of our civilization. We must actively develop our social sciences into real sciences of human nature and its activities.....The task of finding a basis and providing a methodology for the social sciences is far more pressing today than it has ever been".

"What, then, in practical terms is the remedy? I can give my answer, most concisely, by suggesting what I would do if I were a dictator.....I would, by every means, seek to divert all our most powerful intellects from the physical sciences to research in the human and social sciences".

(World Chaos by McDougall, pages 9, 59, 112, 115)

The ignorance of the present-day intellectual world about human nature which these writers deplore so much is reflected plainly in the educational theories of the modern educationists. We know that a truth is always consistent with itself and with all other truths. It is only a truth that can defend and justify another truth, and every truth is defended and justified by all other truths. A philosophy that is worth its name is a family or system of truths defending each other. All truths which are outside this family have an affinity for it and the family has an affinity for them,

because they belong to it. When a new truth is discovered, it is welcomed and absorbed by the family because it has a natural place in it. On the other hand when a falsehood enters it, it is repelled by all the truths there and as such cannot hold its own. If we make an effort to defend a falsehood—which is, of course, always found mixed with something of truth—by a system of truths, truths refuse to be harnessed into our service and the coherence or harmony of the system breaks down at many a point, giving rise to logical discrepancies and contradictions. A true philosophy of education can be only that which is internally coherent and externally relevant to all the established facts of existence. If it does not satisfy this condition we cannot be sure about the validity of any part of it. As Brubacher writes in his book Modern Philosophies of Education:

"It is chiefly in the light of some total harmony that the strength of any individual stand can be assured. If any stand contradicts others, then, one must be on his guard against weakness somewhere".

There is hardly any philosophy of education at present which answers completely to this description of a true philosophy of education. The modern educationists are vague and confused and the philosophies of education produced by them are full of serious intellectual loopholes and discrepancies. Anyone who makes a critical examination of these philosophies will be able to realize how true this statement is. Let us examine as an illustration the educational philosophies of Sir Percy Nunn, Dr. John Dewey and Sir James Ross who are among the most eminent and influential of the modern educationists.

#### EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF PERCY NUNN

Sir Percy Nunn begins by criticising the views of those educationists who say that the aim of education is "to form character" or "to prepare for a complete living" or "to produce a sound mind in a sound body". He rightly points out that though each of these statements of the aim of education is correct in itself it is vague and capable of a number of interpretations. He writes:-

"All of them seem satisfactory until pursuing the matter further we ask what kind of character it is desirable to form, what activities complete living includes and what are the marks of a healthy mind. We then find that the success of these attempts to state a universal aim for education is largely illusory being due chiefly to the fact that every one within wide limits interprets them just as he pleases. For A's idea of a fine character turns out to be either ridiculous or frankly offensive to B; what C regards as a complete living would be a spiritual death for D; while the mens sana in corpore sano that E reveres, F loathes as the soul of a prig housed in the body of a barbarian".

The writer then endeavours to raise himself above such definitions of the aim of education by telling us that "a scheme of education" should aim at "fostering the highest degrees of individual excellence of which those submitted to it are capable". But his statement, though no doubt as correct in itself as any of the statements quoted above, is yet as much vague and capable of a variety of interpretations as any of them. For the writer does not tell us.

- 1. What is the meaning of individual excellence? How can it be distinguished from its antithesis?
- 2. What is the highest degree of individual excellence of which a person is capable?
- 3. How can one know whether one is or is not on the road towards the achievement of that degree of individual excellence?

The criticism that the writer has levelled against the definition of the aim of education given by others applies equally to his own definition. Is it not a fact that men's views of individual excellence differ as much as do their views about a "formed character", a "complete living" or a "sound mind in a sound body". Dis-

cussing further the aim of education he writes:-

"Every scheme of education necessarily touches life at every point. Hence any educational aims which are concrete enough to give definite guidance are correlative to ideals of life. For instance if the "Greek view of life" cannot be reconciled with that of the puritan reformers, it is idle to look for harmony between the conceptions of education that sprang from them".

This means that Sir Percy Nunn realises

- (a) That the aim of education has to be the ideal of life itself.
- (b) That unless our aim of education is concrete enough it will not be able to provide us with any definite guidance.
- (c) That the ideals of life and hence the aims and conceptions of education may vary.
- (d) That every conception of education is the product of some ideal of life and every ideal of life has its own conception of education.
- (e) That our aim or conception of education will not be correct unless our ideal of life is correct.

One could, therefore, expect that he would suggest a "concrete" ideal of life giving "definite guidance" to the educator and pointing out the direction in which alone "the highest individual excellence" could be fostered. But, unfortunately, that is not the case. He believes that while education should aim at fostering individual excellence it should have nothing to do with any particular or "concrete" ideal of life and should leave the individual free to have any ideal of life he prefers. Thus he writes;—

<sup>&</sup>quot;......There can be no universal aim of education if that aim is to include the assertion of any particular ideal of life, for there are as many ideals as there are persons".

Sir Percy Nunn is here contradicting himself. For has he not alluded above to two distinct ideals of life—the Greek and the Puritan—taking each to be common to a large number of persons? It is true that every one of a group of persons loving the same ideal e.g. Communism, Democracy, Christianity, God, English Nationalism, etc., will strive after the common ideal of the group in his own way prescribed by his own special limitations and capacities, but it does not amount to saying that everyone of them has a different ideal. Everyone of a hundred poets may write a sonnet on the same theme, e.g., the love of England. There is no doubt that each of these sonnets will be different from every other, but it does not mean that the theme of each will also be different from that of every other.

Secondly, one may enquire of the writer whether individual excellence can grow to the fullest extent equally in a person who follows the Greek ideal of life and another person who believes in the Puritan ideal of life. If it can, how is it that their ideas of duty and morality continue to differ radically from each other, in spite of their education. If it cannot, what factors interfere with its growth in one case more than in the other and what is the ideal which can assure the growth of individual excellence to the fullest extent? Sir Percy Nunn writes;—

"Freedom is in truth the condition, if not the source of all the higher goods. Apart from it duty has no meaning, self-sacrifice no value, authority no sanction".

But he does not tell us what are the conditions of the freedom that he advocates? Is this freedom to be used for a purpose or is it to be absolute freedom amounting to anarchism and leading to the disintegration of the prevalent social and cultural order. If it is not absolute freedom and has to work in a given framework of life, what is that framework? Can there be any definite framework of life without an ideal to create and sustain it. Sir Percy gives a hint that freedom cannot be absolute and that one must be free in order to do one's duty, to be able to make self-sacrifice and to obey authority. But can we have an idea of duty, can we prepare ourselves for any self-sacrifice and can we submit to any authority, without having an ideal of life?

He is opposed to the assertion of a particular ideal of life, i.e., to the adaptation of the scheme of education to it, because of his conviction that this amounts to interfering with the freedom of the individual and therefore with the growth of his personal excellence. Thus he writes:—

"We shall stand throughout on the position that nothing good enters into the human world except in and through the free activities of individual men and women and that educational practice must be shaped to accord with that truth."

But one may ask "Is it possible to keep an educational system free from the assertion of every ideal?" The evident answer to this question is that it is not possible. Some ideal is being always taught to the learner directly or indirectly. Even in the absence of a particular ideal purposely chosen by the educator as the basis of his educational system, he can be sure that the growth of his pupil's individuality has not been free from the influence of all ideals. For the atmosphere of the school is strongly charged with the influence of one particular ideal and that is the ideal of the nation and the state. It may be, for example, British Nationalism, French Nationalism, Americanism, National Socialism, Fascism, or Communism. The influence of the national ideal fills the atmosphere of the school because it is the ideal of those who lay down the broad educational policy, those who work out its details, those who actually devise the educational scheme, those who put it into practice, those who manage and control the educational institutions, those who write the text-books and those who teach them. Hence it has an unfailing and deep, though gradual and imperceptible, effect on the whole attitude of the learner towards life and its values. It continues to assert itself in the form of a refined and disguised compulsion or imposition on the learner. That is why the pupils who submit to a scheme of education which is the product of a particular national ideal develop a strong love of that ideal, in exclusion to that of all the other ideals, as a result of their education. This is only natural. For, as Sir Percy Nunn himself admits :-

"Every man tends to draw his ideal of life from the in-

#### FIRST PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

spiration of others".

It follows that unless the educator is able to make use of a machinery of education which is created and worked by individuals who have no ideal of life, he cannot claim that his educational scheme is free from the dominating influence of a particular ideal or that he has given his pupils the freedom to choose any ideal they like. But where can he get an educational machinery of this kind? Wherever there is a community or society of individuals organised as a state, there must be some ideal of life to organise it as such and its educational system must be a product of that ideal and must provide for the assertion of that ideal over those who submit to it. But, evidently, if the pupils must come to love some ideal of life in any case, as a result of their education, it becomes the duty of the educator to see that that ideal is totally good and its inculcation is deliberate and scientifically planned. If, as Sir Percy Nunn believes, it is a fact that

"Every man tends to draw his ideal from the inspiration of others."

is it not the duty of the educator to see who those others are and what their ideal is?

Prof. Nunn's statement that no particular ideal should be allowed to assert itself in the scheme of education implies that all ideals are equally conducive to the development of personality and to the growth of the highest degrees of individual excellence. This position cannot be defended and fortunately Professor Nunn realises its weakness. Thus he writes:—

"Our doctrine as stated crudely above may seem to permit no discrimination between good and bad ideals of lifebetween forms of individuality that ought to be encouraged and forms that ought to be suppressed."

Accordingly he poses a question:

"Is the schoolmaster, it may be asked, to foster with impar-

tial sympathy, the making of any character regardless of its moral worth?"

Then he goes on to answer this question himself:

"In the moral sphere the main duty of parents and teachers is to see that the little world in which the child grows up is as rich as may be in those elements that go to the fashioning of the better types of individuality and that other elements are excluded."

If the parents and teachers must impose on the child their own judgements of what are the good or the bad types of personality and what elements must be included in or excluded from the life of the child, what becomes of Sir Percy Nunn's great principle of the free growth of individuality? Is it not the assertion of a particular ideal of life in the matter of education? And then Sir Percy Nunn does not tell us what he means by "better types of individuality," what are the "elements" in "the child's little world" that really go towards their fashioning, what are "other elements" which must be excluded from this little world and how they can be excluded? Does he mean to say that parents and teachers are enough to judge what are the "better types of individuality"? Does he hope that the judgement of all parents and all teachers will be the same?

One could have argued in favour of Sir Percy Nunn's emphatic pronouncement quoted earlier that he will "stand throughout on the position that nothing good enters into the human world except in and through the free activities of individual men and women", by saying that since men and women are good by nature they must, if they are left to themselves, seek the good and must ultimately find it so that no interference is necessary. But Prof. Nunn endeavours to refute this argument himself forgetting completely that he is only emphasising the contradiction of his own position on which he is pledged to stand throughout. Thus he writes:—

"While then the un-perverted impulses of childhood may have a biological bias towards the good, it is too much to expect them to solve unaided the problems of life which have baffled some of the best intentioned minds and most highly gifted races of mankind. Beings, the deepest need of whose nature is creative expansion, must, therefore, on the whole, seek the good and cannot be satisfied unless they find it. But the tragic history of human consciousness and the sad story of what man has made of man show how doubtful is the search and how often it ends in disaster."

If the writer believes that the individual stands in need of external help in the matter of moral education and that the educator must provide that help, does it not mean that interference with the free activities of individual men and women is basically essential for education. For, what use is education without morals? Should not then the writer modify his original stand and say that "nothing good enters into the human world except through the external help of an educator." Moreover, one must know in what direction that external help will be given. Duty has a different meaning for different persons. Morality is a relative term and acquires its meaning from the ideal that it serves. It has a different meaning for persons of different ideals and ideologies. What kind of morality should we teach the child? We cannot trust the ideology and the morality of the teacher to be always satisfactory. Whatever direction the external aid for moral education may take, to employ that aid will certainly amount to the assertion of a particular ideal in education.

#### Again he writes:-

"If it is lawful to dream of a world in which the good of all would be much more nearly the good of each than it is at present, it is lawful to do whatever may help to make the dream reality.....Individuality develops only in a special atmosphere where it can feed on common interests and common activities."

This means that, according to Professor Nunn, not only parents and teachers but also the society or more precisely, the state, has the right to curb the freedom of the individual. And what for this freedom has to be curbed? To enable a particular ideal of life followed alike by the parents, the teachers and the society as a whole to assert itself. Sir Percy Nunn clarifies this view further in his article on education contributed by him to "Encyclopaedia Brittanica". In fact in this article he goes so far as to say that the whole process of education is nothing but a process of the inculcation of the ideals of a society in its rising generation. Thus he writes:—

"Many definitions have been given of the word 'education' but underlying them all is the conception that it denotes an attempt on the part of the adult members of a human society to shape the development of the coming generation in accordance with its own ideals of life".

"It is the function of the school......to bring to bear upon the pupil the spiritual forces which are typical of the national ethos and to train him to take his part in conserving and developing the life of the community."

Again he writes in the same article:-

"An education may be good or bad and.....its goodness or badness will be relative to the virtue, wisdom and intelligence of the educator."

If we interpret this passage in the light of his views contained in the two earlier passages, it means that the education of a nation will be good if its ideal or national 'ethos' is good and it will be bad if the case is the reverse of it, and that the best of all varieties of education is possible only in a society which is based on the best of all ideals.

It passes one's comprehension how such views of the writer can be reconciled with his radical opposition to the assertion of any particular ideal of life in education.

Thus we see that Professor Nunn's statement of the aim of education is extremely vague and confused.

### EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF JOHN DEWEY

Similar is the case with Dr. Dewey. He rightly believes that education is a social process by which a social community is able to continue its existence. What is the exact nature of a social community and of the process by which it maintains itself? A few quotations from his book "Democracy and Education" will give the reader an idea of his answer, (which amounts to a gist of his general theory of education) to this important question. He writes:—

- A. "Men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common. What they must have in common in order to form a community or society are aims, beliefs, aspirations, knowledge—a common understanding—like-mindedness as the sociologists say. Such things cannot be passed physically from one to another like bricks......The communication which insures participation in a common understanding is one which secures similar emotional and intellectual dispositions—like ways of responding to expectations and requirements".
- B. "The parts of a machine work with a maximum of cooperativeness for a common result, but they do not form a community. If, however, they were cognizant of the common end and all interested in it so that they regulated their specific activity in view of it, it, then they would form a community. But this would involve communication..... concensus demands communication".
- C. "A community or social group sustains itself through continuous self-renewal.....and this renewal takes place by means of the educational growth of the immature members of the group. By various agencies, unintentional and designed, a society transforms un-initiated and seemingly

alien beings into robust trustees of its own resources and ideals. Education is thus a *fostering*, a *nurturing* and a *cultivating* process. All of these words mean that it implies attention to the conditions of growth......We are concerned with the general features of the way in which a social group brings up its immature members into its own social form".

- D. "Since what is required is a transformation of the quality of experience till it partakes in the interests, purposes or ideas current in the social group, the problem is evidently not one of the mere physical forming".
- E. "Society exists through a process of transmission quite as much as biological life. The transmission occurs by means of communication of habits of doings, thinking and feeling from the older to the younger. Without this communication of ideals, hopes, expectations, standards, opinions from those members of society who are passing out of the group to those who are coming into it social life could not survive".
- F. "Life' covers customs, institutions, beliefs, victories and defeats, recreations and occupations".
- G. "What nutrition and reproduction are to physiological life, education is to social life".

But what is the method by which the beliefs and ideals of the elders are transmitted to the new generation of a community. Dewey says;—

H. "Beliefs and aspirations cannot be physically extracted and inserted. How then are they communicated......Our problem is to discover the method by which the young assimilate the point of view of the old or the older bring the young into likemindedness with themselves. The answer in general formulation is: By means of the action of environment on calling out certain responses. The required beliefs cannot be hammered in; the needed

attitudes cannot be plastered on. But the particular medium in which an individual exists leads him to see and feel one thing rather than another; it leads him to have certain plans in order that he may act successfully with others; it strengthens some beliefs and weakens others as a condition of winning the approval of others. The things with which a man varies are his genuine environment".

How does the social medium or environment actually nurture its immature members? He writes:—

- I. "A being whose activities are associated with others has a social environment. What he does and what he can do depend upon the expectations, demands, approvals and condemnations of others".
- "To get happiness or to avoid the pain of failure he has to Τ. act in a way agreeable to others.....In this case his original impulse is modified ..... A tribe let us say is war-like. The successes for which it strives, the achievements upon which it sets store are connected with fighting and victory. The presence of this medium incites bellicose exhibitions in a boy, first in games and then in fact, when he is strong enough. As he fights he wins approval and advancement; as he refrains, he is disliked, ridiculed, shut out from favourable recognition. It is not surprising that his original belligerent tendencies and emotions are strengthened... and his ideas turn to things connected with war. Only in this way can he become fully a recognised member of his group. Thus his mental habitudes are gradually assimilated to those of the group. As soon as he is possessed by the emotional attitude of the group, he will be alert to recognize the special ends at which it aims and the means employed to secure success. His beliefs and ideas in other words, will take a form similar to those of others in the group. He will also achieve pretty much the same stock of knowledge since that knowledge is an ingredient of his habitual pursuits".

The writer clarifies this point further:-

- K. "In accord with the interests and occupations of the group, certain things become objects of high esteem: others of aversion. Association does not create impulses of affection and dislike, but it furnishes the objects to which they attach themselves. The way our group or class does things tends to determine the proper objects of attention and thus to prescribe the directions and limits of observation and memory. What is strange or foreign (that is to say outside the activities of the group) tends to be morally forbidden and intellectually suspect ..... The main texture of disposition is formed independently of schooling, by such influences. What conscious, deliberate teaching can do is at most to free the capacities thus formed for further exercise, to purge them of some of their grossness, and to furnish objects which make their activity more productive of meaning".
- L. "The deeper standards of judgements of value are.framed by the situations into which a person habitually enters. We rarely recognize the extent in which our conscious estimates of what is worth while, and what is not are due to standards of which we are not conscious at all. But in general it may be said that the things we take for granted without inquiry or reflection are just the things which determine our conscious thinking and decide our conclusions. And these habitudes which lie below the level of reflection are just those which have been formed in the constant give and take of relationship with others".

The unconscious influence of the society in moulding the beliefs and dispositions of the young becomes conscious and deliberate in the form of the school:—

M. "The only way in which adults consciously control the kind of education which the immature get is by controlling the environment in which they act and hence think and feel. We never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment. Whether we permit chance environments to do the workor whether we design environments for the purpose makes a great difference. And any

This clearly means that the quality of education in a society will depend upon the quality of the "social ideal" or of the "mode of social life" of that society. Dr. Dewey writes:—

- N. "The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind. Since education is a social process and there are many kinds of societies, a criterion for educational criticism and construction implies a particular social ideal".
- O. "To say that education is a social function, securing direction and development in the immature through their participation in the life of the group to which they belong is to say in effect that education will vary with the quality of life which prevails in the group".
- P. "Any education given by a group tends to socialize its members, the quality and value of the socialization depends upon the habits and aims of the group. Hence once more the need of a measure for the worth of any given mode of social life".
- Q. "One of the fundamental problems of education in and for a democratic society is set by the conflict of a nationalistic and a wider social aim.....Is it possible for an educational system to be conducted by a national state and yet the full social ends of the educative process not be restricted, constrained and corrupted?"

(Italies my own)

The salient points in Dewey's general theory of education outlined by these quotations may be given as follows:—

- (1) Education is a social process by which a social group brings up its immature members into its own social form.
- (2) What creates and sustains a social group or community as such—what holds together a large number of individuals as a social group—is the likemindedness of its members i.e. the similarity of their belief and ideas, interests, occupations, hopes, expectations, habits and attitudes, aims and aspirations, standards and opinions.
- (3) All the beliefs and ideas of a community depend upon its idea of what is worthy of approval, admiration and attachment and what is unworthy of it and deserves, on the other hand, disapproval, aversion and condemnation, what is morally good and intellectually sound and what is "morally forbidden and intellectually suspect". In other words it turns upon an idea which the community as a whole considers to be really good, beautiful and true.
- (4) All members of a community "are cognizant of their common end" feel interested in it and regulate their specific activity in view of it. It is the ruling force of their activity.
- (5) Every community sets up a social or psychological environment which becomes the medium for the conscious or unconscious, designed or un-intentional transmission of its "beliefs and ideals", ...its habits of a doing, thinking or feeling" and its "stock of knowledge" from generation to generation. This process of transmission is the process of education and its result is that every generation comes to have the beliefs and ideals and the aims and aspirations of its predecessor.
- (6) Acquiring the beliefs and ideals of the elders (which is the end of the process of education according to Dewey) is a social necessity for the young and the immature of a community. Every one of them has to make these beliefs and ideals his own in any case, irrespective of their moral

value and justification, in order "to avoid the pain of failure" to be agreeable to others and to save himself from being "disliked, ridiculed or shut off from favourable recognition" and also "to get happiness" which results from winning the 'approval' of his elders and becoming "fully a recognized member of his group". The approval of beliefs and ideas that are relevant to the common end or ideal of the community and the disapproval of beliefs and ideas that are irrelevant to it are thus the two forces by which a community manages to nurture its young and immature members into its own social form.

- (7) The most "decisive" part of the process of education—
  the process of the transmission of beliefs and ideals—
  is that which is "independent of schooling" and takes shape
  in "the constant give and take of relationship with others".
  Although this part of education is un-conscious and unintentional, it determines our "conscious thinking" and
  makes us "decide our conclusions", "What conscious and
  deliberate teaching can do is at most to free the capacities
  thus formed for further exercise, to purge them of some
  of their grossness and to furnish objects which made their
  activity more productive of meaning".
- (8) The quality of education in a community varies with the quality of the beliefs and ideals of that community the best education being evidently that which prevails in a community which has the best beliefs and ideals.
- (9) One of the fundamental problems of "education conducted by a national state is how to assure that "the full social ends of the educative process are not restricted, constrained and corrupted" by the narrow ends of the national ideal.

So far Dr. Dewey is perfectly right and no one can have any reason to disagree with him. But unfortunately he soon begins to contradict himself thus betraying his confusion. Thus when he says that it is a false idea of growth or development to think.

"That it is movement towards a fixed goal. Growth is regarded as having an end instead of being an end......

The adult environment is accepted as a standard for the child. He is to be brought up to it."

he goes against his original view according to which the natural result of education is that the beliefs and ideas of the young take a form similar to those of others in the group. Education as growth has, we were told, (Quotations No. C, D, G, H, P. above) a definite end for each separate community and it is to bring up the young into the "social form" of the group to make them "like-minded" with their elders, "robust trustees" of their "resources and ideals" and partakers "in the current interests, purposes and ideas of the group". All this meant evidently that the adult environment is a standard for the child and he is to be brought up to it.

He lays further emphasis on this strange deviation on his part from his original standpoint when he says;—

"The lucational process has no end beyond itself, it is its own end......the educational process is one of continual re-organising, re-constructing, transforming (instead of reorganizing reconstructing and transforming for the creation and maintenance of the social form of the group in the new generation—author) since in reality there is nothing to which growth is relevant save more growth, there is nothing to which education is subordinate save more education. Since life means growth a living creature lives as truly and positively at one stage as at another with the same intrinsic fullness and the same absolute claims. Hence education means supplying the conditions which insure growth or adequacy of life, irrespective of age".

He has adduced the similarity of educational growth to the biological growth of a living creature in support of his general view of education. But he has overlooked the fact that no living creature grows indefinitely. Every living creature grows in the direction of a definite biological form and it is the form of the species to which it belongs. The rate of its growth too is not uniform at all stages of its life. It becomes less and less as the animal approaches the complete biological form of its species till when it has achieved that form to the fullest extent it ceases to grow further. It is true that the biological processes of his body which made it to grow earlier still continue but they no longer result in growth so far as the individual animal is concerned. Their only result is that they help the animal to maintain the biological form that it has already achieved with all its capacities and powers and even this maintenance becomes less and less efficient with the advancing age of the animal till it dies. Evidently growth and maintenances are not identical concepts.

As the biological growth of an animal is circumscribed by the biological form of its species, so the social or psychological growth of a human individual which we call education is circumscribed by the psycho-social form of the community to which he belongs. Supposing an individual has made the beliefs, and ideas of the community to which he belongs, his own and his educational growth still continues. What effect will it have on the individual? Will it change his beliefs and ideas further so as to make them vary from those of his community? This cannot be on the premises of Dr. Dewey himself for there is no social environment to make it possible. For as Dr. Dewey says such a variation becomes possible only "by means of the action of the environment in calling out certain responses". Will it lead him to a further realization of those very beliefs and ideas in practice? If this is so, it means that he has already grown up to the social form of the community and is regulating his activity according to it. He is maintaining a social form already achieved and not growing towards a new one. Thus in no case will the growth of the individual as education enable him to cross his social form.

But Dr. Dewey contradicts this new position of his again when he writes stressing the necessity of having an aim of education; "The aim as a forseen end gives direction to the activity; it is not an idle view of a mere spectator, but influences the steps taken to reach the end. The foresight involves careful observation of the given conditions to see what are the means available for reaching the end, and to discover the hinderances in the way. It suggests the the proper order of sequence in the use of means. It facilitates an economical selection and arrangement. It makes choice of alternative possible......The net conclusion is that acting with an aim is all one with acting intelligently. To foresee a terminus of an act is to have a basis upon which to observe, to select and to order objects and our capacities......A man is stupid or blind or unintelligent just in the degree in which in any activity he does not know what he is about namely, the probable consequences of his acts......To have an aim is to act with meaning not like an automatic machine; it is to mean to do something and to perceive the meaning of things in the light of the intent".

But what is the aim of education? Dr. Dewey writes:-

- "The aim of education is to enable individuals to continue their education".
- "There is nothing to which education is subordinate save more education".

Such statements of the aim of education can hardly enable a person to know what the aim of education is? When we pose the question: What is the aim of education, what we really desire to know is: What is the need that education fulfils, what is the good or the benefit that it aims at? To say that the aim of education is more education is no answer to this guestion. It is like saying: The aim of farming is more farming. The question arises: why should we not stop farming (along with its demand for more farming) altogether and save ourselves from the worries that it entails. But the aim of farming is to get food. It cannot be stopped. It must go on ever more and more efficiently because it fulfills a need and aims at a good. Can we say the same about education? If so on what grounds? If we should'nt stop education, what is the difference that it makes to our life, what is the good that it aims at and what is the need that it fulfills. The aim of an activity is always an idea for the realization of which it must be started and

continued. The fact that education leads to more education is no reason for continuing it. An act of learning, no doubt enables a person to learn more and learn better. But this quality is not peculiar to learning. Every human activity good or bad becomes easier and more efficient as it proceeds onwards. When a man has performed a wicked deed he is prone to perform it again. When he tells a lie he finds it easier to tell another. When he commits a theft he develops the capacity to commit another theft more efficiently. This is no reason why any of the activities should be continued. The aim of no human activity can be the activity itself. It must always lie outside it; otherwise the activity will be "un-intelligent", "meaningless" and "blind". In any case when we define the aim of an activity in terms of the activity itself, the aim cannot be of any help to us in controlling and directing the activity. The aim of education as stated by Dr. Dewey can have no meaning for the educator. For it cannot fulfil any of the functions of an aim which he has himself enumerated above. It is not a forseen end or terminus. It cannot influence the steps taken by the educator to accomplish his task or to observe, select or order the conditions and means that are necessary for its accomplishment nor to notice the hinderances that beset his path. Dr. Dewey writes:-

"The aim set up must be an outgrowth of existing conditions. It must be based upon a consideration of what is already going on, upon the resources and difficulties of the situation".

But how can there be any "existing conditions" anything "already going on" in education without an aim. How can we think of any resources or difficulties with reference to the continuation of an activity unless the activity is intelligently directed that it is unless it has already an aim? Difficulties are said to be difficulties just because they stand in the way of the achievement of an aim and resources are said to be resources just because we judge them to be helpful in the achievement of an aim. We have already known Dr. Dewey's view that the aim of education as a forseen end gives direction to educational activity and enables us to manage properly its conditions, resources and difficulties. But in this statement he says something which is just

#### JOHN DEWEY

the reverse of it—that it is our educational activity and conditions, resources and difficulties which control the aim of education. He has turned a truth up side down and made it to stand on its head. This is similar to the famous Marxian fallacy that it is not our ideals that control our economic activity, but it is our economic activity which controls our ideals.

## Again he writes:-

"An aim must be flexible, it must be capable of alteration to meet circumstances. The aim in short is experimental and hence constantly growing as it is tested in action"

Does not this statement of Dr. Dewey conflict with his earlier statement that "The aim as a forseen end gives direction to the activity". Is he not telling us here that it is not the aim that gives direction to the activity but the activity that gives direction to the aim? Evidently both the statements cannot be true. The activity will change to suit the aim only if the aim is fixed and the aim will change to suit the activity only if the activity has already a fixed groove to follow. But can it have a fixed groove without a fixed aim?

The question arises: What is the justification for having an aim if it is not to control and alter the circumstances but is to be controlled and altered by them itself. It is evident that it is our aim that tests and measures our successes or failures.

If we test an aim in order to find out whether it is good or bad, we can do so only in the light of another bigger, final aim and if an aim grows and changes it can do so only to conform more strictly to a bigger final aim. This is only another way of saying that our final aim tests and therefore directs the results of our activity. Dr. Dewey writes opposing this view:

"We have just pointed out the futility of trying to establish the aim of education—some one final aim which subordinates all others to itself. We have indicated that since general aims are prospective points of view from which to survey the existing conditions and estimate their possibilities, we might have any number of them all consistent with one another".

The statement embodied in the last sentence is hardly intelligible. If, we have a large number of possible aims or prospective points of view from which we survey the existing conditions and estimate their possibilities, we must as a result of unavoidable comparison ultimately discover one aim or one prospective point of view which reveals the largest and the highest possibilities of the existing conditions and must therefore choose that aim or point of view as our final aim under which these conditions ought to be utilized. This means that when we begin to act we must either reject all aims or points of view except one or make all of them subordinate to it and dependent upon it because none of them as our final aim will be equal to it.

It passes ones' comprehension how a number of different aims can be mutually consistent without being subordinate to a bigger final aim. If there is really any standard by which their consistency can be judged or if they have any common quality by which they become consistent with one another then that standard or quality must be the ruling aim, the final aim of all the aims of our activity.

Dr. Dewey has laid a great and varied emphasis on his distinction between an aim of education that is external to educational activity and an aim that is internal to it and grown out of it, and he rejects the external aim as harmful. But this distinction has absolutely no basis. The aim of an activity is always external to it and that is why it creates and rules the activity. Our educational activity or any other activity, for the matter of that, cannot begin (and cannot therefore create an aim or anything else out of itself) till we have become fully aware of its aim. It is our activity that grows out of an aim and not the vice versa. It is true that when we have an aim to achieve and start an activity to achieve it we set up, or come across, a number of subordinate aims, the realization of each of which brings us a step nearer to the final aim. All of these aims are consistent with each other, not by chance but because they are determined by a single aim, the final one.

Whenever the pursuit of any of these subordinate aims creates an activity the results of which are found to be unfavourable to the final aim, this subordinate aim has to be changed, because it is discovered by its results to be irrelevant to the final aim and a new aim, judged as relevant to the final aim, has to be substituted for it. But in this case it is certainly not our activity that has tested the results of the subordinate aim to be undesirable, but it is our final aim that has done so. An activity cannot be a criterion for anything; it is itself the follower of a criterion and that is the final aim of the activity.

Dewey tells us that education should not be left to "drift aimlessly" and should be "an intelligently directed development of the possibilities inherent in ordinary experience". He writes emphasising the need of having a definite aim of education:—

"The difference between educational practices that are influenced by a well-thought out philosophy and practices that are not so influenced is that between education conducted with some clear idea of the ends in the way of ruling attitudes of desire and purpose that are to be created and an education that is conducted blindly under the control of customs and traditions that have not been examined or in response to immediate social pressures".

But he contradicts this position when he says:-

"Philosophy of education is not an external application of readymade ideas to a system of practice having a radically different origin and purpose: it is only an explicit formula of the problems of the formation of right mental and moral habitudes in respect to the difficulties of contemporary social life".

The aim of an activity is nothing if it is not a pre-conceived and ready-made idea of something that has a value worthy of being striven after and realized. A "well-thought-out philosophy" which influences practice must be ready-made-before practice begins otherwise it cannot be well-thought out and cannot in-

fluence practice at all. And how can we have a "clear idea" of an end that is always changing and is therefore not an end at all? Let us consider the meaning of the expression "the difficulties of contemporary social life"? used by Dewey in the above sentence.

The difficulties of social life cannot exist unless we look upon them as difficulties that is unless we have a pre-conceived idea of the aim or the destination of social life and feel convinced that social life is not moving towards that aim or destination on account of certain obstacles. The word "difficulties" implies the idea of a goal that is already known and desired and obstacles in the way of the achievement of that goal. If we start to make an attempt to overcome these obstacles or difficulties and reach the goal, we cannot succeed unless we plan the attempt in advance and have a pre-conceived idea of the whole course of our endeavour leading to the goal. If the goal can be achieved by training the growing generation of the community to have a particular set of mental and moral habitudes, we must know before hand what those habitudes are and how best they can be created so that we may be able to plan successfully for their creation. The advance knowledge of the required habitudes so essential for our success, can be derived only from the nature of our goal which must be already known and this knowledge can only take the form of a philosophy of education. How can we say under these circumstances that "Philosophy of Education" is not a set of ready-made ideas. Of course a philosophy of education is subject to revision and improvement with the advancement of our knowledge of ourselves with respect to our environment. But is it not true of every branch of knowledge? A philosophy of education must remain in spite of all the revisions and improvements that it may have undergone, a body of readymade ideas awaiting application. To the extent a philosophy of education needs revision or improvement, it is not a correct philosophy of education and contains some wrong ideas which must be removed as quickly as possible. That is why it needs to be revised and improved.

If we agree that education is really a process of the natural and continuous growth of the individual, as Dewey believes it is,

then Pragmatism becomes out of question in matters educational and Educational Pragmatism becomes a meaningless term. For, then, the question that matters is not what we regard as useful in education at any time but what is the natural direction of education, whether it is useful to us or not at that time. What should concern us as educators in such a case is not in what direction the learner should develop in order to be useful to us in the solution of what appear to us to be our social problems, but in what direction he can develop in view of his nature whether he is or is not able to help us in the solution of these problems. It is not the individual who must be changed to suit our purposes but our purposes that must be changed to suit the individual, to suit his natural development in all directions. The important point is that the individual will not develop profitably in a direction which is inconsistent with his nature, however much we may desire it, in view of our supposed "difficulties of contemporary social life". We can no more make human beings to develop in a way which is inconsistent with their nature but which we think would solve our social problems, than we can make wheat plants to grow into thorny bushes because the latter are scarce and are needed for making hedges. If education is really a process of natural and continuous growth we cannot interfere with this process for our own selfish, thoughtless ends with impunity. The moment we begin to use education to serve our own incidental ideas and immediate purposes it ceases to be education and becomes miseducation instead. Education can lead to a real and permanent solution of our real social problems and of all real problems in fact, only if it is directed to, or rather allowed to take the direction of, its own natural end, because only then it will be truly education.

The statement of Dewey given above implies that according to him the end of education is the creation of some sort of ruling attitudes of desire and purpose in the individual. But unfortunately he does not tell us definitely what those ruling attitudes of desire and purpose are which the educator ought to create in the individual. Unless these attitudes are specified the educator cannot work to create them and since in such a case he will have no clear idea of the ends to be achieved, his educational activity will be conducted blindly and allowed to "drift aimlessly"

He rightly believes that education should be based on experience and should be an "intelligently directed development of the possibilities inherent in ordinary experience". But he does not tell us again what are the possibilities inherent in ordinary experience which ought to be developed, how is it possible to direct their development intelligently and what sort of individual-whether a perfect democrat, a perfect communist, a perfect Christian, a perfect national socialist, a perfect Fascist, a perfect burglar or a perfect high-way robber, will be the result if they are intelligently directed and developed. Obviously it is these possibilities which according to Dewey yield in their development "the ruling attitudes of desire and purpose" to which he has made a reference in his passage, quoted earlier. It is evident that the "ruling attitudes of desire and purpose" are different in the case of highly educated persons of different ideals, ideologies, creeds and beliefs. That is why they have different opinions (appropriate to their own ideals and beliefs) on ethical, political, economic, social, legal, and educational matters. This means that in their case the possibilities inherent in ordinary experience take different directions of development relevant to their ideals and beliefs. This means further that their development is not intelligently directed in each case otherwise it must take the same direction and yield the same results and create the same ruling attitudes of desire and purpose in each case. Dewey realizes that all experiences are not genuinely or equally educative. Thus he writes:-

"The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other. For some experiences are mis-educative".

But what is the distinction between educative and noneducative experiences. According to him,

"An experience is miseducative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience".

"The central problem of an education based upon exper-

ience is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences".

This means that the educator must know beforehand

(a) What is a distorted or arrested experience?

What are the indications that a present experience will become distorted or arrested in future?

(b) What is meant by the fruitfulness and creativeness of an experience?

What are the indications that an existing experience will prove fruitful and creative in future?

If he does not know the answer to these questions **before** starting the process of education he will not be able to guide his pupils to acquire the experiences that are really educative. If on the other hand he knows their answer **beforehand** he will have by his side a philosophy of education consisting of readymade ideas for application.

Dr. Dewey himself does not answer those questions and hence does not make any contribution to the solution of a problem which in his opinion has a central importance in an education based upon experience of which he himself is an advocate. People can certainly differ in their opinion as to what a "distorted" or "arrested" or "fruitful" or "creative" experience is. As a expert educationist it was for him to give a definite answer to the question raised by his own proposition and thus to remove the confusion.

Evidently, whether in the opinion of an educator an experience has really become "distorted" or "arrested", whether or not an experience is really going to be "fruitful" and "creative" in future, must depend on the ultimate end or ideal which he intends the experience to serve. Hence it is his ideal that determines whether an experience will be educative or not. This means that in order that the educator may have definite opinions

about the relative educative value of various experiences and may be thus able to perform his duties properly, he must have an ideal of education.

An experience may lead to further experiences and yet may not be educative at least from the common sense point of view. This happens when it grows in the direction of an end or an ideal that is not desired. For, as Dr. Dewey has himself pointed out "a man may grow in efficiency as a burglar, as a gangster or as a corrupt politician". Dr. Dewey answers this objection to his own view as follows:—

"But from the standpoint of growth as education and education as growth the question is whether growth in this direction promotes or retards growth in general. Does this form of growth create conditions for further growth or does it set up conditions that shut off the person who has grown in this particular direction from the occasion, stimuli and opportunities of continuing growth in new directions?.....When and only when development in a particular line conduces to continuing growth, does it answer to the criterion of education as growing".

But this reply is not enough. It still continues to be a problem of the educator, how to know in advance whether growth in a particular line will or will not conduce to continuing growth. What is the line in which development can take place continuously without coming to an end? Unfortunately Dr. Dewey gives no answer to this question. Nor does he explain what he means by his expressions "growth in general" and "growth in new directions". A successful burglar may continue to grow in wealth and power and in the number of his helpers and associates without a limit or he may change his direction of growth and having amased sufficient wealth may become a corrupt politician or a high way robber and may continue to prosper as such without an end. In what sense it is true to say that he has not grown "in general" or not grown "in new directions."

Is there any end to growth "in genesal" which the educator should have in view. If there is no end to such a growth so far as

the educator has to control it, education as an intelligently directed process is not possible. Is there any limit to the number of "new directions" in which the educator should arrange the growth to continue under his care. If the growth must be intended by the educator in any case to continue in a particular direction (and not in all new directions) and to reach a particular goal being that of an individual of a particular type, we must give some reason why we object to the growth of a man towards the goal of becoming an expert burglar or a successful corrupt politician. A burglar or a corrupt politician may say that his growth has reached the desired end and no further growth is necessary and that the growth of an honest law abiding citizen becomes arrested and distorted on account of his submitting completely and permanently to the unnatural pressure of law.

This confusion cannot be removed unless the educator specifies the direction and the aim of the growth of his pupils, *i.e.* unless he lays before them a definite ideal towards which, in his opinion, their growth can and should continue.

### Dr. Dewey writes:-

"The principle of the continuity of experience may operate so as to have a person arrested on a low plane of development in a way which limits later capacity for growth".

This statement can have no meaning unless we are told what is the highest plane of the development of an individual by reference to which other planes of development may be described as low.

## He goes on:-

"On the other hand if an experience arouses curiosity strengthens initiative and sets up desires and purposes that are sufficiently intense to carry a person over dead places in the future, continuity works in a very different way. Every experience is a moving force. Its value can be judged only on the ground of what it moves toward and into. The greater maturity of experience

which should belong to the adult as educator puts him in a position to evaluate each experience of the young in a way in which the one having the less mature experience cannot do. It is then the business of the educator to see in what direction an experience is heading. There is no point in his being more mature, if instead of using his greater insight to help organise the conditions of the experience of the immature, he throws away his insight. Failure to take the moving force of an experience into account so as to judge and direct it on the ground of what it is moving into means disloyalty to the principle of experience itself. The disloyalty operates in two directions. The educator is false to the understanding that he should have obtained from his own past experience. He is also unfaithful to the fact that all human experience is ultimately social, that it involves contact and communication".

In the first place, the marks of an educative experience enumerated by Dr. Dewey viz. that it arouses curiosity, strengthens initiative and creates intense desires and purposes may belong equally to a miseducative experience. For example, a corrupt politician who has made it a point to manoeuvre himself into a very high position in the state by bringing his corrupt practices to their highest artistic perfection and ultimately succeeds, has many an experience in his career which is characterized by these qualities and that is why he is ultimately successful. Hence we are still without a criterion for discriminating between educative and miseducative experiences.

Secondly what Dr. Dewey has here said means definitely that the aim, or the goal of education by experience should be already there in the mind of the adult educator. For, the educator according to him must "see in what direction an experience is heading" must "organize the conditions of experience" and must "evaluate" it and "judge and direct" it, so as to be able to alter the mental and moral attitudes of the learner in a manner which he thinks (on the basis of his own past experience) is educationally valuable. But experience cannot be judged and directed unless values and standards exist before hand. The educator

must in other words impose his own values and standards on his pupils, stamp them with his own mental and moral attitudes and create his own models out of them, though he must indeed do so only in an indirect manner by arranging the conditions of experience. Unfortunately Dr. Dewey has, here, entirely ignored the fact that all educators cannot have the same values and standards and the same moral and mental attitudes and that the values and standards and the moral and mental attitudes of an educator cannot be always satisfactory. A communist and a democrat for example cannot be equally good educators. Dr. Dewey's view of education by experience can lead us nowhere as long as he does not tell us what attitudes it is educationally valuable both for the teacher and the learner to have, what is the direction in which experience should grow and what should be its goal. Educators believing in different ideologies have different ideas of the value of an experience and the goal to which development of experience should lead. We should know before hand the standards and values that should guide the educator in exerting his influence.

Thus we see that although Dr. Dewey is forced to assume that education must be guided and directed by certain previously conceived values and standards, yet he keeps silent as to what those values and standards ought to be.

When we say "What should be the aim of education" in a social community what we really mean to say is "What should be the aim or the ideal or the creed of a social community"? For when we are thinking of a community which is already established on the basis of a definite social ideal and does not want to change that basis, there can be no question of what its aim of education should be. Its aim of education is already fixed by the laws of its existence and that aim is to bring up its young and immature members so that their beliefs and ideas and the stock of knowledge needed in their service take the form prevalent in the community. For the social environment of the community—the most powerful instrument of education that it commands—can permit its education to proceed in one direction only and that is the direction of the accepted social form of the community. Dewey himself subscribes to this view when

he compares education to nutrition and re-production. As a young animal is bound to grow into the biological form of the species to which he belongs so a young human individual, a child, is bound to grow into the psycho-social form of the community of which he is a member.

It follows that the real problem of the educator is to discover what kind of society is capable of giving the best education to its members on account of the quality of its social ideal and the mode of its social life. Alternatively expressed it is to discover what social ideal is the best and the highest and hence capable of creating a social environment that is needed for an education of the best and the highest quality. That Dewey realizes this fact will be apparent from the quotations from his book "Democracy and Education" given below:—

"The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind. Since education is a social process and there are many kinds of societies, a criterion for educational criticism and construction implies a particular social ideal".

"To say that education is a social function, securing direction of development in the immature through their participation in the life of the group to which they belong is to say in effect that education will vary with the quality of life which prevails in the group".

"Any education given by a group tends to socialize its members, the quality and value of the socialization depends upon the habits and aims of the group. Hence once more the need of a measure for the worth of any given mode of social life".

(Italics my own).

That is not all Dr. Dewey actually gives us a "measure" for judging the worth of a social ideal from the point of view of education. But before we can judge the worth of his "measure"

we must know what is the nature of a social ideal as it can be ascertained from its manifestations in the community that it creates. For it is only when we know the nature of an ideal that we can judge the worth of a proposed measure of its worth.

The quotations from Dewey given above (pp. 11-15) will show that according to him (and Dewey is here perfectly right) the social ideal of a community manifests itself in the beliefs, aims, aspirations, expectations, hopes, standards, emotional and intellectual dispositions, opinions, customs, institutions, attitudes, demands, ends, interests, aversions and affections, likes and dislikes, approvals, and disapprovals of its members. Evidently each of these psychological manifestations of a social ideal is the result of an idea which is for the community a criterion of what is good and what is bad, what is true, and what is false, what is beautiful and what is ugly. In other words the social ideal of a community is the idea of something to which the community ascribes the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth and believes whether rightly or wrongly that it possesses these qualities up to the highest degree. It is this belief that binds the members of a community together and makes their social life possible. In view of this we could expect that while inventing a measure to judge the educational worth of an ideal, Dewey would be led by his own premises to the conclusion that this worth can be measured by the degree in which an ideal really possesses the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth and that a social ideal which possesses these qualities upto the highest degree will be educationally the best. But unfortunately Dewey fails to see the implications of his own hypothesis and suggests a "measure" for judging the worth of an ideal which has no relevance to his basic theory of education. According to him this measure is two-fold::-

- "How numerous and varied are the interests which are consciously shared."
- "How full and free is the interplay with other forms of association."

Dewey means to say that the best social ideal is that of a

community whose members share among themselves consciously the largest number of interests and which has the greatest amount of cooperative inter-course with other communities. Evidently neither of these two elements in his criterion can indicate the worth of an ideal, since each of them may belong as much to a bad ideal as to a good one.

Let us examine the first element first. Supposing, individuals of a particular colour, belonging to a particular race, speaking a particular language and living within particular geographical boundaries fall into an error and begin to consider themselves honestly as the best community in the world who have a right to live and grow, expand and multiply at the expense of other human beings, for the good of the world so that God's earth may be filled with the best of the races of mankind as quickly as possible. They have an age of peace and prosperity during which they advance in science and technology and develop powerful weapons of attack to invade and conquer other lands and subjugate and enslave their inhabitants, plunder and exploit them, impoyerish them physically and culturally till they perish making over their lands to their conquerors. They continue to succeed in such pursuits for centuries. This will be no doubt a prolonged act of skilful killing and looting of fellow human beings on a large scale by a community of civilized robbers and murderers from the point of view of all good people.

If this community of honest but misguided well-wishers of the world really love their ideal and want to carry out the programme of expansion demanded by it, successfully they will endeavour to maintain their harmony, unity and solidarity at as high a level as possible. They will consequently desire to share an ever larger and larger number and variety of interests and purposes among themselves and this desire will find a smooth and easy satisfaction for itself on account of their love for their common ideal. Their interests, ends and purposes will be similar and common because they will be all the product of the same ideal. But will this fact indicate that their ideal is worthy and rightly educative?

Dewey supports this view-point and thus contradicts himself

and denies the worth of his own criterion when he says:-

"Gangs are marked by fraternal feelings and narrow cliques by intense loyalty to their own codes. Family life may be marked by exclusiveness, suspicion and jeolousy as to those without and yet be a model of amity and mutual aid within. Any education given by a group tends to socialize its members but the quality and value of the socialization depends upon the habits and aims of the groups".

He could not say more clearly that the worth of a society must be judged not by the number and variety of the shared interests of its members but by the moral quality or the standard of beauty, goodness and truth of its aims and ideals. Indeed if the interests of a community which are, of course, all derived from or sanctioned by its aim are low and unworthy they cannot become worthy simply because a very large number of them are shared by its members.

Similar is the case with the second element in Dewey's criterion. Dewey seems to think that because education is a social process, the community that provides the best opportunities for the external social inter-course of the community as a whole with other communities is capable of giving the best education. But unfortunately he has ignored what he said earlier, that the only object of the social process that we call education is the transmission of the beliefs and ideals of a community to its rising generation. The force that starts and keeps up this process is the community's sentiment for its ideal and hence the process works and progresses only in the service of and within the limits prescribed by this sentiment. The interaction or the cooperative intercourse of a group with other groups however full and free it may be is always subordinate to the requirements of its ideal and hence its quality as well as its result for itself and other groups depends upon the moral standard of that ideal. A community owes its existence to the fact that it believes a certain ideal to be absolutely Good, Beautiful and True. Hence there is no room left for it to learn from other communities, in spite of its full and free interaction or cooperative intercourse with them,

as to what is there, apart from its own ideal, that is Good, Beautiful and True.

It may at the most learn from them, as it may learn from the study of nature at large too, some new methods of serving efficiently the beliefs and ideals that it already holds. Its interaction or intercourse with other communities is, therefore, never absolutely full and free. It is always guarded and gualified by secret reservations and expectations. It is in fact attended by a hidden dislike and even hostility for the ideals of other communities. If the ideal of a community is bad or low its interaction or cooperative intercourse with other communities, however full and free we may imagine it to be, will be to the detriment of the latter and for the achievement of its own selfish ends and the only benefit that will come to other communities as a result of it will be that which can do it no harm or which it cannot stop. Thus the community, the example of which has been given above, will find it indispensible to the achievement of its ideal not only to maintain a perfect internal harmony and community of interests for the sake of its efficiency and power but also to develop a considerable amount of cooperative intercourse with other communities which are going to be its victims in order to benefit from them economically and also to understand them better and better. The more it will be able to know them and understand them as a result of such intercourse the better will it be able to exploit them and crush them for the supposed good of humanity. Hence it is clear that if an ideal demands intercourse with other communities it is not necessarily an indication of its worth. It needs this intercourse in any case for its self realization, no matter whether it is worthy or unworthy good or bad, true or false, right or wrong.

Dewey goes on to say:-

"The two elements in our criterion both point to democracy".

We have seen above that as a matter of tact neither of them points to any particular ideal, but properly understood they indicate two crames of a social ideal which are general and

common to all social ideals, good or bad, worthy or unworthy. A social community whether it bears the name of democracy, a dictatorship or a kingship tends by its very nature and on account of the very laws that create and sustain it, to become internally homogeneous and to dispose its members to share as large a number and variety of interests among themselves as possible, in view of their common end; it tends to become a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Democracy, dictatorship and kingship are only the various forms in which this tendency operates and whether it will operate successfully or not depends not so much on the form of Government through which it operates but on the quality of leadership which implements its operation. A government which calls itself democratic on account of its being the result of the observance of certain formalities, supposed to make it a government of the people, by the people and for the people, may not be at all such a government, while a dictatorship may be such a government without being the result of these formalities. The individuals under such a government may have a far larger number and variety of interests in common than they may have under a democracy of the definition of Dewey. Similarly a social group whether it calls itself a democracy or not tends to have as full and free an intercourse with other groups as its ideal permits in order to be able to further and promote its own interests.

Dewey talks of Democracy sometimes as a social ideal and sometimes as a mode of social life for the realization of a social ideal and often vaguely regards the two as identical. As a matter of fact democracy is not the whole of a social ideal. It is only that part of it which relates to the form of government set up by a community for the realization of its ideal.

To say that a society is a democracy is not enough to describe it. We have to say in addition what is the ideal that it has undertaken to serve through a democratic form of government. In our own times all democracies are national states and the ideal of each of them is some kind of nationalism e.g. American Nationalism, French Nationalism, Italian Nationalism and English Nationalism etc. which means that the object of each of them is to safeguard and promote the interests of the particular nation

with which it identifies itself. Whether a democratic society is capable of providing a social environment needed for an education of the best quality depends upon the fact whether its ideal is of the best quality educationally. Is nationalism such an ideal? Dewey realizes that it is not, since it is too narrow and restricted to be educationally useful. Thus he writes:—

"One of the fundamental problems of education in and for a democratic society is set by the conflict of a nationalistic and wider social aim......In Europe, in continental states particularly, the new idea of the importance of education for human welfare and progress was captured by national interests and harnessed to do a work whose social aim was definitely narrow and exclusive. The social aim of education and its national aim were identified and the result was a marked obscuring of the meaning of a social aim. This confusion corresponds to the existing situation of human intercourse. On the one hand science, commerce and art transcend national boundaries. At the same time the idea of national sovereignty has never been as accentuated in politics as it is at the present time. Such a nation lives in a state of suppressed hostility and incipient war with its neighbours. Each is supposed to be the supreme judge of its own interests, and it is assumed as a matter of course that each has interests which are exclusively its own.....This contradiction exacts of educational theory a clearer conception of the meaning of "social" as a function and test of education, than has yet been attained".

Dewey, therefore, poses a question:-

"Is it possible for an educational system to be conducted by a national state and yet the full social ends of the educative process not be restricted, constrained and corrupted?"

Without telling us how he comes to his conclusion, what are the facts of the nature of a national ideal which point to the possibility of its being reconciled with the "wider social ends of the educative process", Dewey answers this question in the affirmative. But he mentions also that there are some internal and external difficulties in the way of realizing this possibility and the fact that these difficulties are insurmountable turns his affirmative answer into a negative one. He writes:—

"Internally the question has to face the tendencies due to present economic conditions which split society into classes some of which are made merely tools for the higher culture of others. Externally the question is concerned with the reconciliation of national loyalty, of patriotism with superior devotion to the things which unites men into common ends, irrespective of national political boundaries".

Here Dewey appears to be contradicting another earlier statement of his that the two elements in his criterion for the worth of a society namely internal community of interests and external cooperative intercourse with other groups "both point to democracy". If even a democratic society needs to be corrected because it is split up into classes "some of which are made merely tools for the higher culture of others" and "lacks proper reconciliation of national loyalty, of patriotism with superior, devotion to things which unite men into common ends, irrespective of national, political boundaries", it passes one's comprehension in what sense a democratic society possesses the qualities of "internal community of interests", and "external cooperative intercourse with other groups" and in what sense these two elements in Dewey's criterion for the worth of a society "point to democracy" and not to any other form of society.

As a remedy of the internal and external narrowness of the national ideal he suggests:—

"School facilities must be secured of such amplitude and efficiency as will in fact and not simply in name, discount the effects of economic inequalities and secure to all wards of the nation equality of equipment for their future careers.....The accomplishment of this end demands...

modification of traditional ideals of culture......It is not enough to teach the horrors of war and to avoid everything which would stimulate international jeolousy and animosity. The emphasis must be put upon whatever binds people together in cooperative human pursuit and results, apart from geographical limitations. The secondary and provisional character of national sovereignty in respect to the fuller freer and more fruitful association and intercourse of all human beings with one another must be instilled as a working disposition of mind"

What Dewey means to say in the above statement is that the national ideal must be modified suitably to make it an ideal of universal sympathies transcending class prejudices inside and geographical boundaries outside the country. That is why he suggests that a number of new elements of faith which are not supposed to form a part of the national ideal so far, must be introduced into it causing naturally the elimination from it of those element of faith which represent their antithesis.

The new elements of belief that he thinks must be introduced into the national ideal and made the "working disposition" of the individuals' mind through the agency of schools are:—

- 1. International jealousy is bad.
- 2. International animosity is bad.
- 3. Cooperative human pursuits and results are good.
- National loyalty or patriotism is bad, if it stands in the way of such pursuits and results.
- National sovereignty has only a secondary and provisional importance.
- 6. The first and absolute importance is that of the free intercourse of all human beings with one another.
- 7. National sovereignty is bad if it is allowed to stand in

the way of the free intercourse of all human beings with one another.

Dewey thinks that after adding these elements of belief to the national ideal and substracting the opposite elements from it, the national ideal will still remain a national ideal. But the fact is that these additions and the corresponding substractions must alter all parts of the national ideal even those parts of it which do not appear to have been directly touched and must turn it into a new ideal. The reason is that an ideal is an organic whole every part of which is related to and influenced by its every other part. Hence every part of it has to be modified to meet the demands and requirements of the new additions and subtractions. Thus the ideal becomes a new whole which replaces the old whole completely. The two ideals—the new one and the old one—may appear to be similar but in effect they become completely different from each other.

Evidently the view of Dr. Dewey contained in his statement quoted above regarding the formation of the working disposition of mind by means of school education contradicts his earlier view, that "the main texture of disposition is formed independently of schooling", by the indirect and unconscious influence of the community's approval of beliefs and actions that are relevant to the common social ideal and disapproval of beliefs and actions that are irrelevant to it. "What conscious and deliberate teaching can do" he said, "is at the most to free the capacities thus formed for fuller exercise, to purge them of some of their grossness and to furnish objects which make their activity more productive of meaning" implying thereby that the capacities or dispositions themselves are not altered by such teaching at all.

But let us suppose for a while that the view expressed by Dewey now that school education can alter fundamentally the disposition of the child which he has already formed under the influence of his elders and not the one he had expressed earlier, is the correct one. The question arises how will the schools begin to provide for the inculcation of the new international, altruistic, universal and cosmopolitan elements of faith which Dewey

recommends to the lovers of nationalism. This is not possible unless the schools are manned by teachers who believe in these elements of faith. But it will be difficult to get teachers who in spite of being educated to love and serve the national ideal from early childhood, believe honestly and sincerely in social internationalism or universalism. If it may be supposed that the schools will be managed by the government and their teachers will be directed by the government to provide for the inculcation of the international and the universal ideal instead of the national ideal, the question will arise who will be the persons forming this government and how will they come to love the international ideal instead of the national one. If they will be the representatives or the trustees of the people then internationalism or altruism will not be their ideal alone. It will be the ideal of all the people in the country. This means that in a social community school education cannot bring about any change of ideal in the rising generation unless the change has already taken place in the ideal of the adult population as a whole.

This conclusion agrees with the view of Dewey that the process of education is the process of the transmission of the beliefs and ideas of the elders of a community to its young and immature members and that the two forces as a result of which this transmission takes place are the approval and disapproval of the community. A national ideal demands of the community that loves it, to approve certain ideas and actions of its young and immature members which are consistent with it and to disapprove those ideas and actions which are their antithesis. As a consequence, these members of the community come to love the national ideal exactly as their elders do and it implies to them everything that it implies to their elders. If any change is to be effected in this ideal, so far as the young generations are concerned, it should appear first of all in the elders of the community. They should begin to hate certain things in their ideal which they formerly loved and to love certain things which their ideal did not contain and which therefore they previously hated. Wherefrom will this transformation of their loves and hates, their views and opinions their attitudes and dispositions come? How will it be possible to make these elders to give up loving certain things and hating certain others. The education

they have had from their childhood onwards is a guarantee that their present loves and hates will continue as they are and there are no arrangements for a new education powerful enough to uproot these loves and hates and implant new loves and hates instead. Thus it is clear that it is not easy to carry out the suggestions of Dewey regarding the modification or improvement of the national ideal in order to make it educationally sound. It needs the re-education of the whole population by a leader or a set of leaders inspired by the new belief and capable of inspiring others with it. If they succeed in converting the population to their views, it will be nothing short of a great intellectual revolution after which a new community with a new ideal to love and serve will be born. The new ideal will not be called nationalism any more. It will be necessary to give it a new name in order to differentiate it from the old discarded ideal and to bid farewell to the mentality that used to go with its name. It may be called for example by the name of internationalism or humanism or some other ism that is able to describe it more appropriately.

It is the height of simplicity to think that a national state can have an altruistic or a universal outlook, can be free from the jealousy or animosity of other nations, can maintain good, cooperative relations with other nations regardless of its own national interests, can ignore its own national sovereignty, national loyalty or patriotism for the sake of the national interests of other states and yet remain fully conscious of being a separate nation and mind its own national interests adequately. It is not possible for a social ideal to be universal and territorial at one and the same time. Every social community (the very existence of which, of course, depends upon the social ideal that it has come to love and serve) has certain definite tendencies inherent in the nature of its ideal which goad it to think, feel and act in a definite manner, as surely as a tree bears its own fruit. The behaviour of a national state is determined strictly by its ideal and no one can change it as he desires unless he makes the state to discard its old ideal and love a new one demanding the changed behaviour. A nation is a politico-socio-cultural group of human beings that exists by virtue of its separation from the rest of mankind. To be conscious of its life and individuality as much as possible it has a tendency to separate itself culturally and socially as much as possible from other such groups. It wants to have its own distinctive language, its own history, its own traditions and its own mode of living and behaving. It wants to excel other nations in everything. An altruism or a universalism extending beyond the group is incompatible with its very nature. The oneness or the wholeness of a national group results from its consciousness of separation from other groups and of the necessity that it feels to defend itself against them. It cannot therefore expand its narrower sympathies to embrace the whole of humanity as long as it remains a national group. When it ceases to be selfish it ceases to be itself. When a nation really decides to behave towards other nations morally and justly as a principle, their ideal changes in fact from nationalism to moralism or some other ism to which their new attitude may be considered relevant although one may continue to call it nationalism. If Dewey believes, as in fact he does, that the national idea, as it is, is too narrow to be fully and properly educative, it is all the same whether he recommends that the ideal may be modified so as to be made universal and altruistic or that it may be replaced by another ideal that is universal and altruistic. The national ideal even though it may be that of a country which believes in Democracy stands discarded educationally in any case even according to his own standards. These facts make it abandantly clear that Dr. Dewey's measure of the worth of an ideal does not work.

The reason why he has not been able to give a dependable criterion of the worth of a social ideal is the fact that he has failed to realise that the stock of knowledge, habits, attitudes, skills beleifs, ideas and opinions, motives and desires, standards and values, interests and purpose, hopes and aspirations and likes and dislikes which, as he has himself admitted, constitute the educational heritage of a community, are engendered by an idea which serves them as a criterion of what is beautiful and what is ugly, what is good and what is bad, what is true and what is false, that in other words, a social ideal is, at bottom, an idea of Beauty. Goodness and Truth, that the cause of the variety of social ideals is that different human communities have different ideas of Beauty, Goodness and Truth, that every community attributes

these qualities to its ideal irrespective of the fact whether it does really possess them or not and that, as a matter of fact, there can be only one ideal which really possesses these qualities upto the highest degree of perfection. Had he realized these facts he would have easily come to the conclusion that there can be only one dependable measure or criterion for a social ideal that is educationally perfect and it is, whether or not it does really possessall the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth upto the highest degree of perfection.

# EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF JAMES ROSS

Let us now study the educational philosophy of another eminent modern educationist Sir James Ross. He writes stressing the importance of having a philosophy of education:—

"All educational questions are ultimately questions of philosophy".

But what is the subject matter of philosophy? He rightly believes that philosophy deals with the nature of Reality and the nature of Man.

"Thus it is reality itself and nothing less that is the subject of philosophical inquiry. While this is so a major question of philosophy always has been and always will be, the ancient query of the psalmist: "What is man? The consideration of the heavens, the moon and the stars is always subsidiary to the all absorbing questions of the nature of life, the nature of man, his origin and destiny, the goal of his strivings"........

This means that according to him a true philosophy of education can be based only on a true philosophy of the nature of Reality and of the nature of man. He thinks that such a philosophy can be only an idealism which lays stress on Beauty, Goodness and Truth, as qualities inherent in the constitution

of the universe which man should seek and find. He wirtes in his book "Groundwork of Educational Theory":—

"The general argument of this book has been that the worthiest aims and movements in education are those which derive not from naturalism and pragmatism but from an indealistic philosophy of values. Truth, beauty and goodness are considered to be absolutes inherent in the constitution of the spiritual universe; and man can fulfil himself only by seeking and finding these absolutes. They are objects of supreme worth which exist in their own right and they demand our reverence and claim our allegiance. Education, therefore, must above all else set the feet of youth on the road to the things that are true, honest, just, pure, lovely and of good report".

How do we find the path to these absolutes? The path to these absolute qualities, he thinks, lies through religion which should be made the very basis of education.

"Today it is the conviction of an increasing number of thoughtful people, that education if it is to produce and maintain a high degree of civilization and to safeguard against periodical lapses into barbarism must be based on religion".

But when it comes to defining what religion should mean to the educator he forgets philosophy altogether. Instead of seeking the aid of the facts of the nature of Reality and of man to discover what religious values ought to be made the basis of education and why, he decides arbitrarily in favour of a particular religion-Christianity-thus leaving all the communities professing other religions, who are, of course, equally desirous of getting the best possible education, without any advice that could be expected of a philosopher of education like him.

Thus he writes:-

"Let us be clear what we mean by religion. We mean something much more vital than a vague theism or a code

of ethics, however lofty; and, with no disrespect towards Judaism, or Buddhism or Mohammadanism or any other exalted religion which directs and inspires the lives of many of our fellow member of the British Commonwealth, we must emphasize that, for the vast majority of citizens of the mother country itself, religion means the Christian religion.....The Christian religion then must return to its traditional place in the schools as well as in the wider life of the nation".

Ross then goes on to quote from an editorial of "The Times" London published in February 1940 in which the writer complains that "in a country professedly Christian and a country which at the moment is staking its all in defence of Christian principles, there is a system of national education which allows the citizens of the future to have a purely heathen upbringing". He expresses the view that "religion must form the very basis of any education worth the name and that education with religion omitted is not really education at all", that "the basis of good citizenship is character and a man's character depends on his beliefs" and asks how it is that the state "can afford to ignore these simple truths and to view the teaching of religion as a task with which it has no concern". Says the editor of "The Times":—

"For many years we have been living on spiritual capital, on traditions inherited from the past, instead of providing for the future. Christianity cannot be imbibed from the air. It is not a philosophy but a historic religion which must dwindle unless the facts upon which it is founded are taught and such teaching made the centre of our educational system.....The highest of all knowledge must be given the highest of all places in the training of the young citizens".

Finally Sir Ross recommends emphatically that:-

"Religion must be something much more than a subject on the time table, although time must be allocated for its special study; it must be an activity and a spirit pervading the whole of the life and work. We must attempt more than the instruction of pupils in the doctrine and ethic of Christianity. We must not merely provide an objective study of the Christian foundations of our civilization, but do something that is calculated to make Christians. In general we must seek to create conditions favourable for pupils spontaneously giving their allegiance to Christ and formulating and confirming their faith. Our schools as Dr. J.W. Skinner has said, borrowing a phrase from John Wesley, must be "nurseries of Christians". In the minds of our pupils we must sow the seed that produce "loyers and servers of God, lovers and servers of men" and we must continue our efforts whether or not we can see immediate results"

This is hardly an intellectual and scientific approach to the problem of education. While one cannot but agree with Ross, for reasons to be explained in the following chapters of this book, that there are some fundamental religious values common to all great religions including Christianity which must be made the basis of every system of education, one cannot agree with the reason suggested by him for making Christianity as a whole the basis of education "for the vast majority of the citizens of the Mother Country" of the British Commonwealth, namely, that they happen to believe in this religion. Does it mean that the best philosophical basis of education for a community is the religion in which it believes? If as a philosopher of education his conclusion was that Christianity is the most educative of all religions for any community he had a right to come to this conclusion but as a philosopher of education he should have given also his rational or intellectual justification for it for the benefit of other educationists. His attitude, unfortunately, is more like that of a priest than that of a philosopher of education approaching the subject of education from the point of view of reason or intellect alone.

#### CHAPTER II

#### THE URGE FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH

If education means any favourable change in the human individual it cannot but mean growth, since growth is the only favourable change known to life. Indeed the word "growth" gives us a clue to a completely systematic and scientific theory of education. both as regards its aims and methods. Modern philosophers of education of all shades of opinion, whether naturalists, pragmatists or idealists, agree that the process of education is that of a natural growth or development which takes place automatically under conditions favourable to it. The pragmatist philosophers of education, who claim to estimate educational activity solely by its practical bearing on human interests, could be expected least of all to subscribe to the view of education as growth. But the soundness of this view is so clear and compelling that Dewey, one of the most prominent of them, is forced to support it, forgetting for a moment that its implications must run counter to his pragmatic theory of education. He writes:-

"Education is thus a fostering, a nurturing and a cultivating process. All of these words mean that it implies attention to the conditions of growth."

"What nutrition and reproduction are to physiological life, education is to social life."

"Hence education means supplying the conditions which ensure growth."

Gone are the days when education was considered as pumping and re-pumping of information into the human mind. Lester Smith writes in his *Education* (1957):

"As recently as twenty-eight years ago one finds Mr. Aldous Huxley vigorously protesting. 'The mind' he observed, 'is not a receptacle that can be mechanically filled. It is alive and must be nourished. Nourishment is best

absorbed by the organism that feeds with appetite'. Mr. Huxley's scathing words had positive and constructive value, for they helped to breach ramparts still stubbornly resisting the advance of new knowledge about child; but today they are interesting only as a period piece. For we are all biologists now and there are few schools in which his contention about growth, nurture and appetite is not fully appreciated and acted upon."

(Italics my own).

Modern philosophers of education rightly insist, therefore, that all that the practical educator needs to do for the young individual entrusted to his care, is to create the conditions that are favourable to his educational growth and the growth will then take place of itself. But, unfortunately, they have not yet been able to work out and utilize in the formulation of their theories, the full implications of the fact that education is growth and that is one reason why there is hardly any philosophy of education at present which is systematic and coherent and which explains adequately all the facts of education as a natural human activity. The only implication of this fact which they have, so far, taken into account, while developing their philosophies of education, is that, since growth is a natural process, it should be, like all natural processes, favoured and helped, but never interfered with; otherwise it is certain to be misdirected.

This inference from the fact that education is a natural growth is perfectly legitimate and has recently secured further stress and support from the theories of psycho-analysts according to which interference with natural and normal human activity leads to repressions and mental disorders and is, therefore, extremely injurious. That is why the modern educator is so anxious to assure that nothing is imposed upon the child from above and that his natural impulses, however crude and primitive they may be, are allowed to have the free-est and the fullest expression. After creating the conditions in which he thinks the child can educate himself properly, he himself is content to play the role of a mere spectator of his development.

But it is evident that the moment we say that education is a

process of natural growth from within we make two assumptions whether we are fully conscious of the fact that we are making them or not and they are:—

- 1. That there is something in the human individual which grows as a result of his education.
- That the human individual has within him a natural internal urge for educational growth.

This means that in order to understand the process of growth known as education we must understand properly what each of these two assumptions implies.

Let us take up the first assumption first. The idea of growth cannot be separated from the thing that grows. The fact that there is something in the human individual which grows as a result of his education raises the question: "What is that something"?

To discover the answer to this question we have to realise that though all animals have a physical body, the need and the capacity to be educated is the privilege of man alone. It is true that some animals can be trained to act in a particular manner under particular conditions. But training an animal is no more than altering the usual channel of the expression of one of its instincts (by linking it with, or bringing it under the influence of, the activity of other instincts) in a manner that suits the trainer. This alteration never crosses the limits prescribed by the nature and object of the instinct. That is why the altered channel or the conditioned activity of the instinct continues to serve the natural biological objectives of the instinct and has no effect on the rest of the life of the animal which continues to be controlled by other instincts. Nothing grows in the animal except its physical body whether we channel the activity of its instincts in one way or another. The training of an animal, therefore, cannot be confused with the education of a human individual which is not the growth of his physical body, but the growth of something which is over and above his physical body and is not possessed by other animals.

This something can be known if we know the difference

between the nature of a human being and the nature of an animal. All biologists agree that the human form of life is the highest culmination of biological evolution and the most perfect of all species and that there is no possibility of man being ever superseded by a higher type of life. Facts of biology have, moreover, led them to conclude that human consciousness is unique in its characteristics and that the difference between man and other animals is not, therefore, a difference of degree but a difference of kind. Man is not a higher kind of animal, nor is animal a lower kind of man. With the emergence of man the character of evolution has altered. It is no longer biological but psychological.

Julian Huxley, one of the top biologists of the age, writes:—

"With the evolution of man the character of evolution becomes altered. With human consciousness value and ideals appeared on earth for the first time. The criteria for further progress must include the degree to which those ideal values are satisfied".

"The highest and the richest product of the cosmic process is the developed human personality".

"The course of human evolution is as unique as its result. It is unique not in the trivial sense of being a different course from that of any other organism but in the profounder sense of being the only path that could have achieved the essential characters of man".

"It is apparently a biological impossibility for any other line of life to progress into a new dominant type".

What is that entity in man not present in other animals which makes it possible for him to love values or ideals or to acquire a developed personality which, according to Huxley, is the highest and the richest product of the cosmic process. It is certainly this entity which grows in man as a result of his education.

A fundamental difference between a man and an animal is that while an animal only knows, feels and thinks, a man not only knows, feels and thinks but when he does so, he also knows that he knows, feels and thinks. In other words, while an animal is only conscious, a human being is self-conscious. It is this fact that creates all the difference that is there between the natures of the animal and the human being. Hence what grows in man as a result of education is his self-consciousness, which means his consciousness of himself, his awareness of himself or knowledge of himself. Evidently man's knowledge of himself will mean his knowledge of the true answer to all sorts of questions that he can ask about himself in relation to the world in which he is born. For example, what am I in relation to the world of men and things around me? What should I be in relation to this world? What is it in this world that I like or love? What is it that I should like or love? What is it that is really worthy of being liked or loved? What should I be doing? How should I be doing it? What am I doing actually? What is the meaning and purpose of my life that I have in view or should have in view? Thus his knowledge of himself in relation to the world implies his knowledge of the world in relation to himself. Consequently the more he knows about the world—the world of matter, life and mind the more he knows about himself and the better is he able to answer such questions about himself as the above. His knowledge of the answer to these questions, that is to say, his knowledge of himself, is ultimately in the form of a feeling, a realization or an inner experience. As his knowledge of himself grows, he feels, realizes and experiences better and better and more and more truly, how is he situated with respect to the world of men and things around him and how is the world of men and things situated with respect to him, what is it that is really good and what is it that that is really bad for him to love, like or do, in view of the nature of the world and his own nature as he discovers each to be. Thus man has two capacities: He is an animal and he is in addition a self-consciousness or briefly a self. What grows in man particularly as a result of his education is not the animal but the self. Educational growth is essentially psychological and not biological although there is no doubt that an educated man is able to look after his biological growth better than an uneducated man.

This is not Cartesian dualism, for the growth of the animal

in the universe is only an earlier stage of the growth of self. The universe itself has undergone a process of growth as a result of which the self has come to its own in the human being who is biologically the most perfect of all animals. The animal in man is an instrument fashioned by the self for its own future growth and when it comes to its own in him it does not neglect the instrument but takes proper care of it for its own continued growth.

We may now turn to the second assumption stated above which is implied in the view of education as growth. The validity of this assumption is quite evident for we know that biological growth takes place because the organism, whether a plant or an animal, has a powerful natural urge for biological growth within it. Without such an urge the biological growth of the organism would have been impossible. Similarly, the psychological growth which we call education can take place only in case the human individual has within him a powerful natural urge for such a growth. If we suppose that there is no such urge present in the nature of man we come to the conclusion-the falsity of which is known to us already-that education as a process of natural growth is not possible. The reason is that no educator, can produce in a human individual artificially and by external means, in the absence of the latter's natural and internal capacity, anything capable of being described as growth. On the other hand, if his capacity for psychological growth is natural and internal it can only take the form of an urge. Even if it were possible for an educator to produce in a young human individual a psychological growth of some sort artificially, it will not be a natural development from within; it will be, at best, only an external, superficial grafting of something upon his personality.

The question, therefore, arises:-

"What are the outstanding characteristics of the urge for educational growth by which it can be identified and distinguished from the other urges of man and in the light of which we can know the conditions of its proper satisfaction?"

To find a correct answer to this question is one of the foremost

problems of the educator. For, if education is really a process of growth, and the educator is not able to identify in the nature of man the urge which is the cause of this growth, he cannot know its qualities and characteristics, cannot create a sound theory of education as growth and as a consequence his efforts as an educator cannot be intelligently directed and cannot produce the desired results. Unfortunately the modern educationists, to say nothing of their attempting to solve this problem, are not even aware that such a problem exists. This is so in spite of the fact that, as Lester Smith has pointed out, all of them have turned biologists. They never feel tired of comparing the processes of the educational growth of a human individual to the processes of the biological growth of an organism, but ignore that the biological growth of an organism is made possible by the fact that it has an internal urge for such a growth and that unless the human individual has a similar internal urge for psychological growth, education as growth cannot be possible and all their comparisons between the educational growth of a human individual and the biological growth of an organism become meaningless.

One quality of man's urge for educational growth by which it can be recognized and distinguished from the other urges of his nature we have already known—that it is the urge of his self and not the urge of his body, the urge for psychological growth and not the urge for biological growth. As such it has nothing to do with the instincts of man the object of which is the growth and the maintenance of the body.

When we consider the relation of the urge of self or the urge for educational growth in man, to his instincts we get a clue to another quality of this urge which enables us to identify it.

We know that although the human personality consists of a number of different urges or desires it becomes organised as a single unity. The urges or desires of an animal all of which proceed from his instincts never take the form of a unified whole. An instinct is an inflexible and unalterable tendency of an animal to act in a particular manner for the preservation of its life and race. Every instinct exerts an internal biological pressure on the

animal on account of which the animal is compelled to seek its satisfaction and this satisfaction of the instinct is accompanied by a special kind of pleasure. Whenever an instinct is stimulated the animal is forced to start and complete the activity that is necessary for its satisfaction. It cannot check, oppose or limit the satisfaction of an instinct for the sake of a higher end. Indeed it has no higher end to pursue. Whenever an animal is found to have opposed any of its instincts, the opposition is not the result of a voluntary choice. It is always a case of one instinct opposing another, the stronger defeating the weaker and weaker yielding automatically to the force of the stronger. Such is not the case with a human being.

Man possesses all the instincts of the higher animals such as feeding, sex, escape, pugnacity, self-assertion, self-abasement, etc. Moreover, their basic character in man is the same as it is in the higher animals. McDougall's definition of an instinct is meant to be applicable equally to man and to the animal. He defines an instinct as an "inherited and innate psycho-physical disposition which determines its possessor to perceive and pay attention to objects of a certain class and experience an emotional excitement of a particular quality upon perceiving such an object and to act in regard to it in a particular manner or at least to experience an impulse to such action".

Unlike the animal, however, man is able to oppose and check the expression and satisfaction of any instinct he likes up to any extent in order to organize and unify the activity of all in a chosen direction. The opposition of man to his instincts is not automatic and involuntary as in the case of an animal but the result of a free voluntary choice. He opposes his instincts in such a way that the impulse of no particular instinct is found to be in the process of satisfaction, during the opposition. So, often he would rather starve his instincts, and even give up his life for the preservation of which the instincts are meant to function, than abandon a particular course of action chosen by him.

The life of an animal consists of a series of isolated compartments of activity each dominated by an instinct, and no compartment has anything to do with the one preceding or

following it. On the other hand the life of a human being tends to become organized into a whole and the activity of every instinct, to whatever extent it is allowed to have its way, is organizally related to this whole. This organization or unity of instinctive desires in man, arising as a result of his ability to oppose them, is impossible unless he has an urge or a desire which is able to dominate and rule all of them.

Imagine a coach being pulled by a dozen horses. If all the horses happen to be pulling the coach in different directions and the coach itself is moving sometime in one direction and at another time in another, we shall be right in concluding that there is no driver inside the coach to control the horses. But if the coach is moving swiftly and smoothly in the same direction it will be an indication that the horses are being controlled and urged by a driver who is fully aware of the destination of the coach. The activity of a grown-up human individual is not like the motion of a driverless coach, being pulled by a number of horses in different directions. It is rather like a swiftly running coach driven by a man who has full control over all the horses pulling it. We cannot, therefore, avoid the conclusion that there is an urge or desire in man which controls and rules all his instinctive or animal urges or desires.

An animal is able to move about for the satisfaction of its instincts in opposition to the force of gravity and other physical laws. It is able to oppose the resistance of the laws of matter because it has developed, and is impelled by, the urge of instincts. There must be some urge in man not possessed by the animal and specially developed by him in the course of evolution, by virtue of which he is able to oppose the resistance of his animal instincts. Since this urge, the driver in the coach of human personality, the ruling urge of man, which is able to check and control all his instincts without exception for its own expression and satisfaction, cannot be one of his instincts, it is evident that it can be no other than the urge of his self which we have already known to be his urgeforeducational growth. Thus we come to know another quality of man's urge for educational growth by which it can be recognized and identified, namely, that it is the ruling urge of his nature. All that we now need to do, therefore, in order to find out which of the different natural urges of man is his urge for educational growth, is to have in view a complete list of all his natural urges, and then to eliminate from this list all those urges; known as instincts which he shares with the animals and which have for their object the growth and maintenance of the body, and finally to examine each of his remaining urges in relation to others in order to know which of them rules the rest.

The urges and desires of man that remain over for scrutiny in our search for his ruling desire, after rejecting his animal desires, are the desire for an ideal, the desire for knowledge, the desire for moral action and the desire for art. Some of the most important characteristics of these desires are that they are the special privilege of man not enjoyed by other animals. They are not the desires of the animal in nim but the desires of his self. They are not biological but psychological desires. The course of their satisfaction is not biologically fixed and there is no biological compulsion attached to them. Each of them is biologically free but each of them has a psychological force or pressure of its own which an individual finds it is very difficult to resist, provided he becomes really conscious of the object desired by him as a result of its operation. Each of them is pursued and satisfied at its best and highest for its own sake and not for the sake of any ulterior biological or utilitarian motive. The satisfaction of each of them yields a special kind of pleasure which is far superior in quality and intensity to any pleasure derived from the satisfaction of any of the instinctive desires. The object of all of them is the same and that is the search for Beauty which includes Goodness and Truth. Thus the desire for an ideal is the desire to love, admire, adore, revere and worship an idea of beauty. The desire for knowledge is the desire for truth which we love and admire and which is, therefore, an aspect of beauty. The desire for moral action is a desire to express beauty in one's deeds. The desire for art is the desire to express beauty through a medium and to admire beauty which is so expressed. When the desire to admire and adore, revere and worship an ideal is expressed and satisfied we have a spiritual experience or an experience of the adorable and the sacred. When the desire for knowledge is expressed and satisfied we have an intellectual experience, or an experience of the true or the valid. When the

desire for morality is expressed and satisfied we have a moral experience or an experience of the right or the good. When the desire for art is expressed and satisfied we have an aesthetic experience or an experience of the beautiful and the attractive. All these urges or desires of manare really the various facets or aspects of a single desire, namely, the desire for beauty and the experiences that result from them are ultimately the experiences of beauty depending upon our judgments of approval and disapproval. That is why we use the terms holy, unholy, true; false, valid, invalid, right, wrong, good, bad, beautiful, ugly, attractive, unattractive, lovable, detestable, must, must not, etc., equally for our spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic judgments in one context or another. The urge of self, the satisfaction of which leads to its growth is thus an urge for beauty.

An individual attributes to his ideal all the beauty that he desires and gives it all the love of which he is capable. Hence, although he pursues each of his other three desires for beauty, namely, his desire for art or desire for knowledge or desire for moral action for its own sake, his pursuit of these desires cannot cross the limits set by the requirements of his ideal which is his idea of total beauty and, therefore, remains subservient to his ideal. Whenever he feels that the pursuit of any of these desires for its own sake does not serve the requirements of his. ideal, he no longer regards it as a quest for either Beauty, or Goodness or Truth and, consequently, twists his spiritual, intellectual, moralor aesthetic judgment, consciously or unconsciously, to make it consistent with his ideal. This explains why there is a different moral law, a different philosophy, a different view and use of science and a different art for every ideal. This means that of these four desires, it is neither the desire for art nor the desire for knowledge, nor the desire for moral action, but the desire for an ideal that rules the other desires, and the other desires only assist the perfect satisfaction of the desire for an ideal. The urge of self or the urge for beauty is, therefore, ultimately, the urge for an ideal.

That man's urge to love an ideal is really the ruling urge of his nature is verified further by the fact that it is really this desire of his self which dominates and controls also his instinctive desires which he shares with the lower animals. Obviously, the object of nature in strengthening each of these desires by a biological force of its own was to compel the half-conscious animal to attend properly to the business of maintaining its life and race for the purpose of evolution. But as a self-conscious being man knows how to live and how to die for the sake of an ideal. The reason why an animal cannot oppose the compulsion of his instincts is that it has no desire higher than an instinct for the sake of which it could do so. But since man has the capacity to love an ideal, none of his instincts can have its satisfaction without the sanction of his ideal and it can have its satisfaction only to the extent to which this sanction is given and no more. When the ideal of an individual demands the continuation of his life, he exerts himself to the utmost for the proper satisfaction of his instincts; but when the demands of the ideal are otherwise, he ignores his instincts and even becomes ready to sacrifice his life, for the protection of which the instincts are meant. This explains the innumerable instances that come to our knowledge of individuals willingly ignoring or suppressing their animal instincts, undergoing extreme hardships and privations, endangering their lives, dying on the scaffold or bleeding to death on the batltefield for the sake of their ideals. An individual's ideal may rise very high or may fall very low in the scale of beauty; it may be raised in the standard of its excellence to the ideal of a saint or may be lowered in the level of its ugliness to the ideal of a burglar; it may become identified with the bliss of a Paradise which he expects in a life here-after or with the pleasure which he expects from the satisfaction of an instinctive appetite here; but it always remains the ruler of the rest of his desires. As soon as we have known that the urge for educational growth in man is his urge for an ideal we are faced with the question:

"What is that ideal in the direction of which the human individual can grow educationally to the fullest extent"?

For, it is evident that man can love and strive after a large number of dfferent ideals and every ideal cannot permit the educational growth of an individual to the same extent or in the same direction. The answer to this question is implied in the very nature of the human urge for an ideal. Since this urge is an urge for beauty, goodness and truth, the ideal which can satisfy it perfectly and which can, therefore, permit the educational growth of an individual to the fullest extent, can be only an ideal of the highest and the most perfect beauty, goodness and truth.

Aldous Huxley has referred in a sentence quoted above to the educational growth of the child as depending upon the satisfaction of an appetite and the provision of a nourishment. His contention is perfectly justified. But we must also know what this peculiar appetite of the child is for and what the nature of this peculiar nourishment that he needs for his educational growth is. The fact is that just as the human body has an appetite for food so the human self has an appetite for beauty and just as the body cannot grow and cannot actualize its biological potentialities to the fullest extent, unless its appetite for food is properly satisfied, so the self cannot grow and cannot actualize its psychological (i.e., spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic) potentialities to the fullest extent, unless its appetite for beauty is properly satisfied. As the body must have for the proper satisfaction of its appetite and its own full development, a food that is perfect, so the self must have for the proper satisfaction of its appetite and its own perfect growth an ideal that is perfect.

If the body is able to get a food that is perfect, its urge for biological growth is properly satisfied and it is strong and healthy. The health of the body takes the form of a smooth and harmonious operation of its biological functions and its strength takes the form of its ability to act physically for the satisfaction of its own requirements in spite of the opposition of the force of gravity and other physical laws to its movement.

If the self is able to love an ideal that is perfect, its urge for psychological growth is properly satisfied and it is strong and healthy. The health of the self takes the form of its smooth and harmonious operation of its psychological functions resulting in its continuous growth and inner satisfaction, happiness and peace of mind and its strength takes the form of its ability to make right judgments and have the right kind of

experiences in the spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic spheres of its life in spite of the resistance of the opposing forces of instincts and habits. When the ideal of an individual is perfect he is able to develop his love for it to the maximum limit of his natural capacity for love. The result is that he becomes safe from all possible errors moral, spiritual, intellectual and aesthetic.

Just as disease interferes with the biological functions of the body, impairs its health and weakens it physically so, error in the spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic experiences of the self interferes with the psychological functions of the self, impairs its satisfaction, happiness and joy and weakens it psychologically. When the body is strong and healthy it is able to resist and conquer disease and the disease cannot establish itself in the body. The result is that it grows further as far as its potentialities can allow it to grow. Similarly, when the self is strong and healthy and growing properly, it is able to resist and conquer error and the error is unable to establish itself in the self. The result is that it grows further as far as its potentialities can allow it to grow.

The urge for an ideal operates in the self as the vital force operates in the body. The greater and stronger the vital force in the body, the healthier and stronger the body is. The greater and stronger the love of a man for his ideal the more unified, the more powerful and the healthier is his personality. As the obstruction of the vital force in the body makes it suffer from debility and diseases of all kinds and its full and free operation makes it strong and healthy, so the obstruction or the frustration of the urge for an ideal in the self causes a stunted, weak and cramped personality, unhappiness, grief, worries, nervous disorders and even madness. The power and freedom of the vital force operating in the body depends upon the fact whether the food being taken by the body is perfect or imperfect. Similarly, the power and freedom of the urge for an ideal functioning in the self depends upon the fact whether the ideal being loved by the self is perfect or imperfect. A perfect ideal creates a happy, strong, healthy and unified personality while an imperfect ideal creates an unhappy, weak, unhealthy and disintegrated personality.

A food will be perfect only if its perfection is unassailable from the **positive** as well as the **negative** points of view, in other words if it not only (1) contains upto the highest degree all the vitamins, minerals and other dietary constituents which are needed by the body in view of its nature but (2) is also free from all obnoxious, toxic or poisonous ingredients which are harmful to it in view of its nature. Such a food alone is fully enjoyed, digested and assimilated by the body thus leading to the development of its health and strength to the fullest extent.

An ideal will be perfect only if its perfection is unassailable from the positive as well as the negative points of view, in other words, if it not only (1) possesses upto the highest degree all the qualities and attributes which the human self, by its nature looks upon as loveable, admirable and beautiful and which we describe briefly as the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth but (2) is also free from every defect or blemish that the self can possibly regard as a defect or blemish in view of its nature. Defect is the enemy of love. Hence the awareness of the presence of the slightest defect or of the absence of the smallest element of beauty in a man's ideal turns the whole of his love for it into hatred. A man can love a low, ugly or imperfect ideal too but only as long as he can attribute to it all the imaginable qualities of beauty, goodness and truth and can deceive himself that it does really possess all these qualities in actual fact. From these general qualities of the perfect ideal we can easily deduce its specific qualities.

We can know, for example, that an ideal cannot be perfectly beautiful, admirable and lovable to a human being unless he believes:—

- (a) That the beauty of his ideal is unlimited and eternal. For, if he knows that the beauty of his ideal has a limit beyond which it cannot go, he must believe that a part or an aspect of it is ugly. Again, if he knows that its beauty will come to an end after some time, he must consider it to be ugly even now.
- (b) That his ideal is alive. For, he cannot love, admire,

adore and serve with his self-sacrifice the idea of any thing that he believes to be dead or lifeless and therefore inferior to himself as a living human being.

- (c) That the life of his ideal like its beauty is eternal. For if he thinks that his ideal must die sometime in the future he must feel that it is potentially dead even today.
- (d) That his ideal possesses up to the highest degree all the attributes of life with which he is familiar in his own case. In other words, he must believe that his ideal is a self-consciousness or a personality which hears, sees, knows, understands, feels, loves and responds, has a purpose to be achieved in the human world and has the power to act for and succeed in the realization of that purpose. This means that he must believe that his ideal has certain likes and dislikes and possesses the power to encourage and support what it likes and to discourage and destroy what it dislikes, to reward its lovers and helpers and to punish its enemies and opponents, that in brief, it has all the qualities of love and hatred and can exercise them for the achievement of its purpose. If a man's ideal lacks any of these qualities and he becomes aware of it, it becomes impossible for him to love and serve his ideal any more.

Love always demands action in the service of the beloved and the object of such action is to please the beloved and to have the satisfaction of winning the favour or the nearness of the beloved. Loving an ideal has no other meaning except striving after it, serving it and thereby approaching it more and more. But if the ideal that a man loves has no likes and dislikes, no criterion of discrimination between right and wrong, i.e., no purpose to be achieved in the human world, no purpose in which its lover can cooperate with it, how can the lover know what he should do and what he should not do in order to serve it. Man wants to act and to know how to act in the service of his ideal. He cannot be satisfied with a love that is incapable of being

translated into action. If he thinks that his ideal cannot hear, see, feel, know, understand or respond to what he does in its service, he will derive no satisfaction from his actions and will have no incentive to continue them. What a man regards as virtue is, strictly speaking, never its own reward. It is always rewarded by the pleasing conviction that it is approved by his ideal which he always imagines to be a person or a personality.

- (e) That his ideal is all powerful. For, if it is not all-powerful it will not be able to reward its supporters and punish its enemies and he will feel that loving and serving it is a useless task. The reason is that while he will do his utmost to change the world in accordance with the demands of his ideal, its opponents will undo his endeavours and unmake with ease and impunity what he has made. In such a case he will feel that his ideal is weak and helpless and unworthy of his love and devotion.
  - (f) That his ideal possesses all the moral qualities or the qualities of goodness upto the highest degree of perfection. For, should he think that his ideal lacks any of these qualities or lacks any of them upto the highest degree, he must consider it to be a defect or blemish and must cease to love it. Man is so made that he looks upon moral qualities as lovable, admirable and beautiful. Goodness as we know, is, like Truth, an aspect of Beauty.
  - (g) That his ideal is unique and without a peer or a partner in its qualities. For, if he thinks that there is another ideal which shares its qualities, he will be forced to love two ideals equally and at the same time, and this is something which his nature makes it impossible for him to do. Indeed, in such a case, he will be able to love and serve whole-heartedly neither one ideal nor the other. For he will think that if he is not able to win the love of one ideal by his love and devotion he may win that of the other.

(h) That the whole creation of the world is subservient to the purpose of his ideal. This is not possible unless he believes that his ideal is itself the Creator as well as the Controller of the Universe and possesses all the qualities implied in these two attributes. If it is not so, the laws operating in the universe on the physical, biological and psychological planes-laws which will not be the creation of his ideal in such a case-will come into conflict with the common purpose of his ideal and his own and neither he himself nor his ideal will be able to achieve that purpose. Moreover, if he believes that the Universe including his own person has come into being of itself and is out of the control of his ideal he will feel that his ideal is inferior to him or at the most equal to him and will not, therefore. feel the urge to love, admire, adore or serve it.

These outstanding qualities of Beauty and Perfection imply innumerable other qualities which can be worked out in the same way.

It is an ideal of such qualities which can fully satisfy the self's appetite for beauty, which can save it from error in its spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic experiences and from ignorance, immorality, unhappiness, grief, worries and nervous disorders, which can enable it to actualize all its psychological potentialities and to grow educationally to the fullest extent. Since it is in the nature of man to love these qualities, the more he loves them, the greater is the satisfaction that he derives from his love. As the self contemplates the beauty of such an ideal, it is able to admire, adore, and serve it fully and freely and without any mental reservation or hindrance and the pleasure or the joy that he derives from its contemplation goes on developing continuously. The result is that he begins to love the ideal to the maximum of his capacity for love and his self becomes as strong and healthy as it can be on account of its nature. The qualities of such an ideal are so real, so attractive to the self and so agreeable to its nature that when it contemplates their beauty it gets lost into its admiration for them and for a time feels one with the ideal. The result is that it begins to emulate, "absorb, own and

reflect in itself more and more of these qualities. Thus it not only enjoys the beauty of such an ideal but also digests and assimilates its beauty and that is why the love of such an ideal enables it to grow to the maximum capacity of its growth.

When the body is having a perfect food, all its biological urges meant to subserve its growth function rightly and their functioning really assists the growth of the body. Similarly, when the self is loving a perfect ideal all its psychological urges meant to subserve its growth, namely, the urge for knowledge, the urge for morality and the urge for art function rightly and their functioning really assists the growth of the self. For, in such a case, the individual's intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic activities take their natural direction and become perfectly consistent with the qualities of truth, goodness and beauty. In other words in such a case, his intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic experiences are really the experiences of truth, goodness and beauty. The individual acquires a pattern of knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations, motives and purposes, beliefs and standards, ideas and opinions and desires and inclinations which are perfectly in accord with the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth and, therefore, worthy of an educated man. He develops a character of the best and the highest quality. He acquires the most contented, the most unified and the most perfect of all types of personality.

A belief in the actual existence of an entity, which possesses all the qualities of the Perfect Ideal mentioned above, is thus a biological necessity for man. That is the reason why this belief, commonly known as a belief in God, has been widely held by human beings all over the world from the earliest known times. Even those who generally deny the existence of God cannot help expressing their belief in Him sometimes, thus indicating that the belief really exists in the heart of their hearts all the time. The conclusion that we have arrived at above, viz, that the urge for educational growth is an urge for a perfect ideal, can, therefore, be stated alternatively by saying that the best and the highest educational development of the chlid is possible only in the direction of the idea of God and that this idea is the ideal of the educator which he cannot ignore at any stage of the education of

his pupils without serious harm to the latter's educational development.

What makes the Godless attitude of the educator most harmful to the educational growth of his pupil is the fact that just as the desire of the body for food is irresistible so the desire of the self for an ideal is irresistible. Consequently, if he does not endeayour to make the idea of God the determining force of the life activity of his pupil he is certain to give him a bad substitute for it. It is not possible for any educator to be ideologically neutral in the matter of education. If an individual is unable to get a food that is perfect from the point of view of its nutritive value and its constituents in the form of vitamins and minerals, he is obliged to satisfy his hunger by taking any food that becomes available to him and to develop a taste for it, to relish it and enjoy it. Similarly if an individual is unable to feel and experience the beauty of an ideal that is perfect from the point of view of its educative value and its qualities of beauty and perfection, he is obliged to satisfy his appetite for beauty by taking for his ideal an idea the beauty of which he is able to feel and experience, irrespective of the fact whether it has really any qualities of beauty in it or not. He attributes to this idea the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth wrongly in order to satisfy a very powerful and irresistible urge of his nature.

In his case, what happens is that some qualities of beauty appear to him to be clearly visible in his ideal. He, therefore, begins to love it totally in order to satisfy his urge for beauty which demands an ideal of total beauty for being loved totally. In so doin, he attributes to the ideal the remaining qualities of beauty not visible to him, unconsciously, in order to complete his self-deception forced upon him by the necessity of his nature to love some ideal. He is obliged to make himself believe that these qualities exist in his ideal and it is very agreeable to him not to examine his belief critically and to see whether it is justified or not. No matter what his ideal may be—it may be a stone, a river, a tree, an idol, a nation, a race, a colour, a country, an ideology, a religion, an ism or a cracy—he behaves towards it as if it is a person endowed with all the qualities of life, power, beauty, goodness and truth and that is what make it possible for

him to love and serve it with the whole of his being. But since the ideal that he thus begins to love is really lacking in the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth, it does not enable him to express and satisfy completely his urge for beauty and perfection in any of its different aspects mentioned above. The force of his wrong love distorts his vision of truth, goodness and beauty and mars the validity of his spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic judgments. He cannot, for example, admire and adore his ideal fully and freely. For, he is obliged to exclude from his admiration and adoration of the ideal those qualities of beauty which are not visible to him and which he attributes to it unconsciously. Since the ideal is wrong many true facts become inconsistent with it and many untrue facts become consistent with it. He takes many true facts which are inconsistent with it as untrue and many untrue "facts" which are consistent with it as true. Actions which are really moral but inconsistent with his ideal appear to him to be immoral and actions which are really immoral but consistent with his ideal appear to him to be moral. Similarly, forms and appearances which are really ugly but unsuitable to his ideal appear to him to be beautiful and the forms and appearances which are really beautiful but out of harmony with his ideal appear to him to be ugly. Thus his educational growth takes a wrong direction. It is consequently retarded and comes to a stop long before his personality has fully developed. His personality, therefore, remains dwarfed and stunted. He develops a pattern of knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations, motives and manners, standards and opinions. desires and inclinations and beliefs and ideas which are consistent with his wrong ideal but not fully consistent with the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth and, therefore, not worthy of an educated man. His personality deviates in its development from the pattern of the perfect or full-grown personality to the extent his ideal deviates from the Perfect Ideal.

Just as an imperfect food results in an imperfect growth of the body so an imperfect ideal, however much its lover may admire it owing to his error, results in an imperfect growth of his personality. There is no doubt that when an individual is forced by his circumstances to take continuously a kind of food that is wrong and inferior and deficient in the required dietary constituents he is impelled by his hunger to relish it and to develop a taste for it. But it does not mean that this food can enable him to grow bodily to the fullest extent. Similarly, when a man is forced by his circumstances (his lack of knowledge and unsatisfactory educational environment) to love an ideal which is wrong and inferior and deficient in the required qualities of beauty, he is no doubt impelled by his urge for beauty to form a habit of admiring it sincerely. But it does not mean that this ideal can enable him to grow his personality to the fullest extent. The educator who desires the perfect educational development of his pupil cannot succeed as long as he does not make the ideal of God the very core of his educational system in all its parts and aspects.

Unfortunately the idea of God is being ignored too much by the modern educationists at present. They have not yet realized that it is needed for the satisfaction of an important appetite of the human individual and that it is as indispensable to his educational development as food is indispensable to his physical growth. The reason is a deep-rooted and widespread prejudice—which generally passes for a rational or scientific attitude of mind—of the modern scholars of human nature and human activity, against a spiritual interpretation of the human being. They think that no interpretation of the human individual can be intellectually sound which is not mechanical or secular. If any facts come to light in favour of a spiritual view of man they are forced by this prejudice to misinterpret or misrepresent those facts consciously or unconsciously. They are dominated by the fear that if they allow the idea of God to enter into their academic theories of human activity their theories must become unscientific.

A number of events in the history of Europe have contributed to the emergence and continuation of this prejudice till this day. It arose with the reaction against religion engendered by the penalization and suppression of intellectual freedom by the church, the tyranny of the inquisitions and the prolonged and bitter conflicts of the state and the church, which ultimately brought about the separation of the two. Once religion was openly separated from politics it could not be expected to retain

## URGE FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH

its hold on any important aspect of the life of the individual, and the community. The result was the secularization of not only the political activity of the individual and the community but also of the legal, economic, social, educational and intellectual activities of both. The prejudice was further strengthened by the attitude of the nineteenth century physicists who believed that matter was real. It was generally believed that the Universe is like a machine which is operated by its own laws and does not need an external power to work. Religion and science have nothing in common with each other. Religion is irrelevant to man's life on earth. It is meant for the betterment of the life to come. Knowledge and science are on the other hand required for the betterment of this life. Religion is dogmatic and irrational and deals with a world which cannot be seen while the conclusions of science are based on reason, intellect, observation and experiment. To mention God as a part of an intellectual argument destroys its rational character and brings the discussion into the realm of religion with all its emphasis upon dogma, prejudice and intellectual slavery.

The prejudice against God and religion was finally bestowed the status of an intellectual or rational view and raised to the pedestal of a scientific idea by the evolutionary theory of Darwin who was himself a product of the intellectual climate of the cold and rigid mechanism and materialism of the 19th century. He explained evolution and the emergence of man as an outcome of the blind and fortuitod play of the reckless forces of nature, which he described as the struggle for existence, natural selection and the survival of the fittest. According to him, it was a mere chance that man had developed such faculties as reason, conscience and imagination and could indulge in such activities as religion, morals, politics, education, law, art, science and philosophy. What is now a human being might have been easily a worm crawling in a gutter.

Here was a theory of man and the universe which could explain everything without the aid of any ultimate spiritual factors and forces that may be operating in nature. How well did it suit the nineteenthc entury materialism and disgust for religion? No wonder, therefore, that it was generally accepted by the

intellectual world of Darwin's own time and since then has had a profound effect on the development of all branches of knowledge. It is believed that every phenomenon of nature whether it relates to the world of matter, life or mind is a chance product of the evolutionary process and should be capable of being explained adequately by reference to its immediate visible past which really creates it. It has, therefore, become an academic fashion to explain all human activity mechanically and without reference to God, spirit, purpose or consciousness. It does not occur to anyone of our scholars of human nature and human activity that if the existence of God may be a fact and if the human personality may be constitutionally related to Him and dependent upon Him, it will not be possible for them to acquire a true and scientific understanding of human nature or of any human activity -all human activity is, of course, an expression of human nature -without taking this fact into account. So strong is their prejudice against the idea of God as an intellectual concept that they do not suspect that their ignorance of human nature, which they believe to be fraught with dangerous possibilities for the entire human race, may be due to the fact they are ignoring the possibility of the notion of God being the only key to a scientific understanding of human nature. They are not prepared to acquire a scientific knowledge of human nature at the cost of their intellectual atheism. They cannot in fact conceive the possibility of a theory of human nature being at once scientific and spiritual. When they complain of their ignorance of human nature they have in mind that a scientific theory of human nature, when discovered, will be secular or non-spiritual. But it can never be so. For, man is himself a spiritual being and if spirit is actually in existence it cannot be externed from the domain of science and knowledge without making science unscientific and turning knowledge into ignorance.

It is not true to say that what cannot be observed or subjected to experiments in the laboratory cannot be scientifically true. No scientist has ever seen an atom. Yet how firm is the belief of the scientists in the existence of the atom as a scientific fact? Unfortunately, when it comes to the concept of God most of the philosophers of human nature and human activity of our times forget that scientific

facts are of two kinds. First, the inferences that are directly based on experiment and observation. Secondly, the assumptions that explain and order such inferences. It is, therefore, rarely considered a possibility, in spite of a host of internally discrepant and incoherent philosophies of man and the universe that are known to exist at present, that the idea of God may be the only assumption that can really explain and order all the true inferences not only of Physics and Biology but also of Psychology and thus create a really coherent philosophy of man and the Universe. As a matter of fact such is actually the case. The concept of God is, therefore, a scientific fact of the second category—the category to which the atom belongs—and we cannot ignore it in the formulation of any theory of h nan nature and human activity—much less in the formulation of a theory of education—without making the theory absurd.

We have known that a belief in the existence of God with all his qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth or to put the same thing in a philosophical language the belief that a Self-Conciousness of the highest Beauty and Perfection is the Ultimate Reality of the Universe, is indispensable to the educator and his pupil. For, without it, there can be no outlet for man's urge. for educational growth and no possibility of its full expression and satisfaction. But that is not all that the educator can say in its favour. This belief is also thoroughly justified from the intellectual point of view, even when we ignore the argument that, if it were not so justified, it could not lead to the full expression and satisfaction of the urge for educational growth. The conclusion follows from the nature of this urge which is also man's urge for an ideal. We know that this urge is an independent urge of man as a self-conscious being. It does not emanate from and does not subserve any of his instincts but rules and controls all his instincts. It is the urge of his personality or his self-consciousness and not the urge of his body. It exists for its own satisfaction and not for the satisfaction of any of the biological needs of the body. On the other hand it employs the body and its instincts in its own service. It can check and oppose the instincts to any extent even to the extent of destroying the body, for the achievement of its own ends, whenever necessary.

Its ends are essentially psychological or spiritual and not biological or material. All this means that self-consciousness has made its way to man in the process of evolution without the aid of any material or biological forces and that on the other hand it is itself responsible for any material or biological forces that exist.

The fact that self-consciousness is not the creation of instincts can have no other significance except this that it is the creator of instincts, i.e., the creator of the human body through all its material and biological stages and, therefore, the Creator of the Universe right from its beginning in the earliest form of matter. We cannot explain the independent nature of the urge of human self-consciousness without assuming that selfconsciousness is the Reality of the Universe itself. The human self-consciousness desires an ideal of perfection. This is so because the Ultimate Self-Consciousness known to the common man as God, has created and evolved the Universe in order to manifest itself in the human form of life to strive-through that form as its instrument-after its own ideal of perfection. The urge of the human self-consciousness for an ideal is really the urge of the universal self-consciousness for an ideal, seeking conscious expression and satisfaction through man. The end of the human self-consciousness is the same as that of the universal self-consciousness, viz., the perfection of man or the emergence of a perfect human society based on an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection. That self-consciousness is not only the driving force of psychological evolution going on now but it was also the driving force of biological evolution earlier and of material evolution still earlier, must become more and more evident with the discovery of new facts in the domains of Physics and Biology. That explains why the scientists of the 20th, century unlike those of the 19th, century believe that the facts of Physics' and Biology cannot be explained adequately without assuming the Reality of Consciousness.

In spite of apparently radical difference between mind and matter, philosophers and scientists have, perhaps owing to an unconscious intuitive conviction that ultimately the Universe must be a single reality, endeavoured to prove the fundamental identity of the two all along holding either that mind is really a form of matter or that matter is essentially a manifestation of mind. While the scientists of the Nineteenth century generally inclined to the former view, the philosophers mostly asserted the truth of the latter in one form or another.

Among the ola scientists the genius of Lord Kelvin (1824-1907) came to the conclusion that nature was not without something of the attributes of a mind and that there was a creative and directive force operating in the Universe. But Philosophy, never content like Science with a sectional and fragmentary view of Reality and to a large extent free from the restrictions of the purely scientific method in its search after truth, always insisted that a coherent and consistent explanation of the Universe so eagerly desired by man, was impossible without giving a prominent place to consciousness. Consciousness in God and Universe is the one great subject not only of the mediaeval philosophy, the object of which was to rationalise Christian theology, but also of the great modern philosophic theories of Descrates, Leibniz, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Kant, Spinoza, Hegel, Fichte, Croce and Bergson, in which it is treated under the various titles of God, the Universal Spirit, the Absolute, the Absolute Idea, Mental Activity, World-will, the Eternal Mind, Monads, Self, Elan Vital etc. However the first serious challenge of philosophy to scientific materialism came from Bishop George Berkeley of England who contended that the material world cannot have an independent existence because we can know it only with the help of our perception which is an experience of the mind. Because the physical world, as we perceive it, has no existence apart from mind therefore what really exists is mind and not the physical world. What we perceive is not matter but certain qualities of colour, form, shape, sound, hardness, etc., and in order that these qualities may exist as we know them to exist they have to be perceived by the mind. Without mind nothing would exist. The reality of the physical world is, therefore, mind or consciousness. In the light of his theory Berkeley argues the existence of an Eternal Mind as follows:-

"All the choir of heaven and furniture of earth, in a word, all those bodies which compose the mighty frame of the

world have not any substance without the mind.....So long as they are not actually perceived by me or do not exist in my mind or that of any other created spirit, they must have either no existence at all or else subsist in the mind of some Eternal Spirit".

The subjective idealism of Berkeley has been strongly supported in modern times by the school of Neo-Idealism of which the chief exponents are two Italian philosophers, Beneditto Croce and Giovanni Gentile. Both of these philosophers hold that the Universe is nothing but mind or spirit. Their system is not only the most recent but, according to many philosophers, also one of the most original and the most remarkable developments of modern philosophy. It is based on the hypothesis that the experience of our mind is the only reality of which we can be certain. It leads to the logical conclusion that the reality of the Universe, if it is anything which can be known by the human mind, must be similar to our own mental experience. Because self-consciousness is the clearest and the highest mental experience, therefore the reality of the Universe must be of the type of self-consciousness.

As already mentioned the scientists of the Nineteenth century could not accept any ideas of this kind, as they knocked out the very foundation of their physical laws. When the axioms of Newtonian Physics were first questioned by Berkeley, he was met by a scornful derision by the scientists, but who could have known that in the controversy whether mind or matter was real the philosopher was soon to have the better of the scientists and that also through weapons made accessible by the discoveries of the scientists themselves. Philosophers had always insisted on a spiritual explanation of the Universe. If their view-point could not receive a general acceptance, it was due mainly to the hindrance of science. But thanks to the Theory of Relativity, the Quantum Theory and the discovery of some facts of Biology, that hindrance has now ceased to exist and materialism, the idol of science, has received a shattering blow from science itself. The discoveries of Physics have reduced matter (once a hard, simple, obvious fact) and along with it energy, motion, space, time and ether to an absolute nothing, "Modern matter",

to quote Dr. Joad "is something infinitely attenuated and elusive; it is a hump in space-time, a mush of electricity, a wave of probability undulating into nothingness, frequently it is not matter at all but a projection of the consciousness of its perceiver."

Professor Roughier, while discussing the implications of the Relativity Theory, says in his book. Philosophy and New Physics:—

"Thus matter is resolved into electrons which themselves vanish in etherised undulations, so that there is a final loss of matter, and an uncompensated dissipation of energy. For the universal principle of invariance which the ionic natural philosophers placed at the basis of natural philosophy and which assured its intellegibility, namely, 'nothing is created nothing is lost' one must now substitute the contrary principle 'nothing is created, everything is lost'. The world marches towards a final bankruptcy and the ether of which it has been asserted in vain that it is the matrix of the worlds is revealed as being their final tomb."

Dr. Harry Schmidt in his book Relativity and Universe is almost touched with despair while giving an account of the universe as it was discovered to be when the theory of Relativity entered into the scheme of things. "Space and time". says he "sank to shadows, motion itself became meaningless, the shape of bodies a matter of view point, and the word ether was banished for ever".

If matter is not real and permanent, how are we to account for all the rich variety of creation in which there is beauty, art, design, purpose, harmony and accurate mathematical thinking. These are surely the attributes of consciousness which must be the sole reality of the Universe. It is evident, therefore, that the disappearance of matter has not only cleared the way for a spiritual explanation of the world but has also made it indispensable. To assume a mataphysical reality of the Universe is, today, at least, as imperative as it was in the Nineteenth century to assume that the Universe was nothing but matter. Philosophical thought generally had emphasised all along in its history a

spiritual explanation of the Universe independently of science, rather, inspite of it. Alreadythis explanation was in no way less convincing than the materialist explanation, and now here was science offering a strong evidence in support of it.

Because matter has proved to be unreal, the physicists feel that they are unable to solve the problems of Physics by confining themselves merely to the realm of matter. They are compelled to go beyond the world of matter in their search after truth because now it is there that they hope to discover the reality of matter. Thus we find quite a large number of them in England as well as in Europe, for example, Eddington, Jeans, Whitehead, Einstein, Schrodinger and Planck attempting to explain the material world from a spiritual point of view; from physicists they have turned into metaphysicists. The reasoning of all these scientists attempts to support the hypothesis that the reality of the Universe is a form of consciousness. Professor Planck, the propounder of the Quantum Theory remarked in an interview with J.W.N. Sullivan which appeared in the "Observer" of the 26th. January 1931: "I regard consciousness as fundamental. I regard matter as derivative from consciousness. We cannot get behind consciousness. Everything that we talk about everything that we postulate as existing, requires consciousness." Einstein writes:-

"The Universe is ruled by mind and whether it be the mind of a mathematician or of an artist or of a poet or all of them, it is the one reality which gives meaning to existence, enriches our daily life, encourages our hope and energizes us with faith when knowledge fails."

Sir James Jeans argues that all matter can be reduced to mathematical relations. Mathematics is involved in the constitution of the atom as well as in the systems of heavenly bodies. Laws of Mathematics are strictly obeyed by the nearest physical objects as well as by the most distant parts of the universe. But all the knowledge of Mathematics that we have, is acquired by us as a result of logical reasoning carried on independently of any reference to nature. Having formulated the laws of Mathematics as a product of our own minds and being-guided by our own reasoning powers, when we turn to the physical world we find

not only that it is built up in accordance with these laws but also that these laws are its ultimate nature. Since matter is unreal, nothing remains of the material universe ultimately except the laws of Mathematics. How could it be possible for us to discover these laws all by ourselves and how could these laws become involved in the construction of the material world, unless it is a fact that the material world is a creation of a mind like our own—a mind that is capable of thinking accurately and mathematically, as we are? Both the external world and our own minds must be the result of the creative activity of this mind.

"The Universe", writes Sir James Jeans in his book The Mysterious Universe, "cannot admit of material representation and the reason, I think is, that it has become a mere mental concept.....Thirty years ago we thought or assumed that we were heading towards an ultimate reality of a mechanical nature .....Today there is wide measure of agreement which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a nonmechanical reality; the Universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator or the governor of the realm of matter.....not of course our individual minds but the mind in which the atoms out of which our individual minds have grown exist as thoughts. The new knowledge compels us to revise our hasty first impressions that we had stumbled into a Universe which either did not concern itself with life or was actively hostile to life. The old dualism between mind and matter which was mainly responsible for the supposed hostility seems likely to disappear, not through matter becoming in any way more shadowy or unsubstantial than heretofore or through mind becoming resolved into a function of the working of matter but through substantial matter resolving into a creation and manifestation of mind. We discover that the Universe shows evidence of a designing and controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds-not so far as we have discovered, emotion, morality or aesthetic appreciation but the tendency to think in the way which for want of a better word we describe as mathematical. And while much in it may be

hostile to the material appendages of life; much also is akin to the fundamental activities of life; we are not so much strangers or intruders in the Universe as we at first thought. Those inert atoms in the primaeval slime which first began to foreshadow the attributes of life were putting themselves more and not less in accord with the fundamental nature of Universe."

Apart from the theories of the Idealist and the Neo-Idealist philosophers and the evidence of new Physics which we have seen to be strongly in favour of a spiritual interpretation of the world, there are some facts of Biology which lead to the same conclusion. Some regular systems of philosophy have developed around these facts. One of these philosophical systems is the theory of Creative Evolution, evolved by Professor Henri Bergson of France. The materialists believe that life is nothing but a property of a particular type of matter that comes to acquire a particular chemical composition. The organism that comes into existence in this way reacts as a sensitive mechanism to the conditions of the environment and the result is that it undergoes a modification in its physical structure. The modification goes on accumulating in the course of ages on account of ever fresh conditions of environment which the organism has to face, with the result that new species continue to appear. But recent developments in the science of Biology do not support this contention.

Serious students of Biology, according to Professor J.S. Haldane no longer entertain the view that life is merely the result of a definite chemical constitution of matter. The experiments of the German biologist Driesch, in particular, have led to the conclusion that the behaviour of a living organism, in its reaction to the external conditions of environment, is categorically different from the working of a machine. A machine is controlled from outside and is no more than the sum total of a number of parts. An organism exhibits an internal drive to acquire and maintain a particular form or structure of the body. It behaves as a whole with an inner drive which attends to the needs of the whole. When we cut off the leg of a crab another leg appears in its place. No machine is capable of replacing its broken parts automatically. Driesch cut an embryo into two parts in the earliest stages of its growth, that is, at a time when the tissues are yet

plastic and before the cells are irrevocably determined by chemo-differentiation and found that a portion developed into a complete animal. The results remain the same no matter where the cut is made, or what happens to be the relation of the part to the whole. Thus the cells that may have grown to form the head in an individual embryo may grow to form a leg. In fact, any part of the embryo may develop into any limb in accordance with the needs of the whole organism. The question arises: How is it possible for that which is part to acquire the properties of the whole? The same principle is found to govern the development of the embryonic tissues. If a newt's tail is cut off another tail grows in its place; and if the tail is cut off early enough and grafted on to the freshly cut stump of a leg the tail grows into a leg and not into a tail.

Such facts cannot be explained in terms of the physical categories of the Universe. Driesch, therefore, abandoned the attempt to explain the development of the embryo on the assumption that life results from the operation of definite laws of Physics and Chemistry. It was necessary to assign a separate category to processes of life and therefore he substituted for the chemico-physical theory a vitalistic theory of entelecthies. Driesch concluded that the organism was impelled by a spontaneous drive to reach its appropriate form and to perform its appropriate function. He assumed that there was an internal regulating principle active in the organism which moulded and formed it in the interests of the whole, changing and directing its purpose to suit these interests. This regulating principle must be interested in the growth and evolution of life. Bergson gives it the name of the 'Elan Vital' or the vital impetus and identifies it with consciousness.

The study of life reveals some other facts too which support the conclusions of Driesch. These facts have been adduced by Bergson in his book *Creative Evolution* to show that the inward impulse of life is the cause of the first appearance of animal life on earth and of its reproduction and evolution into higher and higher forms. Lamarck explained the evolution of life as a result of the fact that living beings must be adapted to the conditions of the environment. Adaptation causes a slight alteration in the

form of the animal, which alteration is inherited by the offspring, which being itself subjected to the necessity of adaptation undergoes further change. In this way modifications go on accumulating gradually till we have a new species.

For one thing this explanation is incompatible with the facts now well-established that variations may not only be due to an accumulated effect but may also take place suddenly. This is impossible unless there were a conscious or unconscious drive in the organism itself causing it to develop a sudden change and improvement. Secondly, the necessity for adaptation to the conditions of environment is a reason which explains why the evolution of life should stop rather than why it should go on. As soon as a creature has adapted itself to its environment sufficiently to be able to maintain its life, it would not require to change or evolve any further. Adaptation, in so far as it is determined by the need of self-preservation, should explain the arrest of life rather than its progress towards forms of ever higher and higher organization. "A very inferior organism" says Bergson, "is as well adapted as ours to the conditions of existence judged by its success in maintaining its life. Why then does life which succeeds in adapting itself go on complicating itself.....more and more dangerously? Some living forms to be met with today have come down unchanged from the remotest palaeozoic times, they have persisted unchanged throughout the ages. Life then might have stopped at some one definite form. Why did it not stop wherever it was possible? Why has it gone on, why, unless it be that there is an impulse driving it to take ever greater and greater risks towards its goal of an ever higher and higher efficiency".

Such facts lend support to the view that consciousness does not emanate from matter, but has an independent existence of its own, that it is fundamental and not a derivative from the properties of matter. If consciousness is a reality by itself, it is but a step to the inference that it is the sole reality of the Universe, matter itself having emanated from it. Matter no less than organic life, has evolved in the course of ages. That inner drive which has been responsible for the maintenance and evolution of organic life must be responsible for the evolution of matter as

well, so that matter too is a form of consciousness. This conclusion is, moreover, eminently supported by the discoveries of modern Physics.

Sir James Jeans with the caution of a scientist admits only one quality of his Universal Mind, that of intelligence and mathematical thought, the only quality which could be established and which has been established scientifically or mathematically. But, naturally when you grant one attribute of consciousness to an entity you cannot resist the conclusion that it must have all the attributes with which consciousness is associated in our own knowledge. Sir James Jeans concludes that the Universal Mind is a mind like our own in the quality of mathematical thinking, but, there is no reason why it should not be a mind like our own, in other qualities as well. In our own experience we have never known mathematical thinking to exist in a mind independently of ethical qualities. The highest intelligence indicates the highest form of consciousness which is self-consciousness. Ethical qualities always go with the quality of self-observation, so far as we know. Consciousness, therefore, cannot be merely a quality of mathematical thinking. Consciousness is self-consciousness. It is aware of itself and is, therefore, a Personality or Self. It is inseparable from the qualities of Power, Truth, Goodness and Love. Our nature, because of the fundamental similarity of the human mind with the Universal Mind, is such that we love to own these qualities and in as much as they are lovable to us they can be described by one word. Beauty.

The self-consciousness of the Universe has revealed itself already in man and it is revealing itself in him more and more in the process of evolution. God and man are both self-conscious and, therefore, have the same moral qualities and attributes. These moral qualities exist actually in the nature of God and potentially in the nature of man. If the human self grows freely and without any external or internal hinderance or interference it is able to actualize the Divine qualities potential in its nature to the fullest extent. The urge for an ideal in the human self-consciousness is really a pull of attraction for the Universal Self-consciousness and for its qualities and attributes. If the ideal of man is perfect and perfectly satisfactory to his nature, if it is,

in other words, God, man is true to himself and his love for this ideal enables him to manifest in his activity the moral qualities of God latent in his nature. The evolution of the Universe is, like the growth of a tree, completing a cycle. It starts with a Self-Consciousness—that of God—and ends with a self-consciousness—that of the perfect man—as the growth of a tree starts with a seed and ends in a seed.

The first thing to become visible above the surface of the earth in the case of a tree is the stem, then come the branches and the leaves and finally we have the flower in which there is a growing seed. In the case of the evolution of the universe the first thing revealing itself to the sight of an observer was matter, next there was the animal and finally there was the human being with his gift of a growing self-consciousness.

The life of the tree does not begin with the stem. It has an earlier beginning in the seed and the seed is not only the beginning and the end of the tree but also the sole factor that determines the nature and direction of its growth at every step. The seed that is the final product of the tree must, if it is to become perfect, conform in its development strictly to the pattern of the original seed out of which the tree has grown. In fact it can grow only in the direction of that pattern or cannot grow at all.

Similar is the case with the universe. The life of the universe does not begin with the emergence of matter. Self-consciousness in the form of man, who is the final product of the evolution of the universe, was in existence also at the beginning of the world in the form of the self-consciousness of the universe. It is not only the beginning and the end of the universe but also the only force that determines the nature and the direction of its evolution at all stages. The human being must, if he is to become perfect, conform in his educational development, strictly to the pattern of the original self-consciousness out of which the universe has emerged. In fact he can develop educationally in the direction of that pattern only or cannot develop at all.

We shall have a very poor opinion of the knowledge and the intelligence of a man who ignores the seed of a tree simply because it happens to have remained hidden from his sight and believes that the growth of the tree begins right from its visible

stem and that the nature and the qualities of the seed play no part in this growth. We should have an equally poor opinion of the knowledge and the intelligence of the educator who ignores the Self-consciousness of the Universe, the seed of the world, simply because it happens to be hidden from his sight and believes that the evolution of the universe begins right from the appearance of visible matter and that the nature and qualities of the self-consciousness of the Universe play no part in its evolution, especially in its final stages, when it takes the form of the educational growth of man.

It does not mean, however, that God is immanent in man and the Universe as the pantheists believe. Just as an artist is not immanent in a picture of his creation and transcends the picture so God is not immanent in the Universe and transcends the Universe. Yet we cannot overlook the fact that although an artist is apart from the picture that he creates, he is still in the picture with the whole of his personality or self-consciousness which projects itself into the picture by willing it to be what it is at each new step of its evolution. The artist gives expression to all the qualities and attributes of his personality in his creative activity which evolves the picture towards the stage of its perfection. That is why the perfect picture reflects his qualities and attributes. In one sense it is not the artist himself who is in the picture but it is really the creative desire of his personality, the force of his will or the urge of his self-consciousness, that is operating in the picture. But in another sense, since his desire or will or urge is the whole of himself with all his qualities and attributes, he is the whole of himself in the picture.

Similarly, although the Creator is apart from the Universe that He is creating, He is still in the Universe with the whole of His personality or Self-Consciousness which wills the Universe to be what it is at each new step of its evolution. The final form of the Universe (the perfect man) is the ideal of the Self-Consciousness of the Universe. The Creator gives expression to all His qualities and attributes in His creative activity which evolves the Universe (the perfect man) towards the stage of its perfection. That is why the perfect man must reflect the Divine qualities and attributes. In one sense it is not the Creator Who is in the Universe but it is the Creative Desire of His personality,

the force of His Will or the urge of His Self-consciousness (which takes the shape of the force of electricity, the urge for biological growth and the urge for psychological growth at the material, biological and psychological levels of evolution, respectively) that is operating in the Universe. But since His desire, or will or urge is the whole of Himself with all His qualities and attributes, He is the whole of Himself in the Universe. In spite of this, however, we can identify neither the artist with the picture nor the Creator with the Universe, since as the artist can create many pictures so the Creator can create innumerable Universes.

Self-consciousness means consciousness which is conscious of itself, of its qualities and capacities and it can be conscious of itself only with reference to something other than itself and that something is conceived by it in the form of an ideal of beauty which it sets out to achieve. That is why self-consciousness whether Divine or human has an ideal to love and realize. But since self-consciousness alone is beauty and nothing beautiful or worthy of love can possibly exist outside it, outside the demands of its urge for beauty, the ideal which it begins to love (whether it is the Perfect Man, as in the case of the Divine artist, or it is the perfect picture, as in the case of the human artist) is really a mirror which reflects its own beauty.

Thus self-consciousness by its very nature divides itself into two parts, the knower and known, the lover and the beloved, the creator and the creation, the seeker and the sought. These two parts of self-consciousness are separate and yet not separat from each other, they are distinguishable and yet belong to a single indivisible personality. They are, moreover, not separate compartments of the same mind but each of them is the whole mind.

A self-consciousness is something which is capable of projecting itself beyond itself into a created otherness which is no other than itself and nothing beyond itself without altering or diminishing itself or losing its oneness or uniqueness in the least. There is nothing in the material world which can be compared to self-consciousness in this quality. We may imagine a sun which sheds its rays far and wide into space without losing any of its energy or brilliance but a sun of this kind is not yet known to exist.

## CHAPTER III

## THE MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE URGE FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH

All psychologists and writers on human nature agree that man has an urge for ideals. But unfortunately they have failed to see that this urge is the real and the ultimate motivating power of all the activities of man, that it is not a product or servant of his instincts and that it is an independent urge of his nature which has its own ends to achieve and which rules and controls the instincts for the achievement of those ends. Following the Darwinian concept of evolution, which is, by the way, the intellectually fashionable concept of it, they believe that what comes first in the sequence of the results of evolution is matter with its physical laws, then comes the animal with its instincts and last of all there appears the human being with his gifts of self-consciousness and urge for ideals. They conclude, therefore, that the urge for ideals in man must be due to a complicated or distorted operation of one or more of his instincts. This has given rise to a number of misinterpretations of the role and place of the urge for ideals in human nature. Thus we see McDougall misunderstanding this urge as a result of the reinforcement of the sentiment of selfregard-itself a combination of all the instincts-by the instinct of self-assertion, Freud misinterpreting it as a sublimated version of the sex instinct, Adler mistaking it as an abnormal and unnatural turn of the instinct of self assertion and Karl Marx misrepresenting it as an unconscious distortion of the economic urge in the human being.

Since the view that the urge for ideals is an independent urge of man which is the real motivating force of all his activities, even those which have their immediate source in his instincts, constitutes the very foundation of the theory of education sketched in this book and since this view comes into conflict with the psychological theories of McDougall, Freud, Adler and Marx it becomes necessary to examine in detail its justification vis a vis all these theories. This we shall attempt in the pages that follow.

## THE VIEW OF Mc'DOUGALL

McDougall believes that all the activities of man emerge from his instincts and that his urge for ideals is also a product of his instincts. Thus he writes:

"The instincts are the prime movers of all human activity; by the conative and impulsive force of some instinct every train of thought, however cold and passionless it may seem, is borne along towards its end.....All the complex intellectual apparatus of the most highly developed mind is but the instrument by which these impulses seek their satisfaction. Take away these instinctive dispositions with their powerful mechanisms and the organism would become incapable of activity of any kind; it would be inert and motionless like a powerful piece of clock-work whose manspring has been removed".

McDougall also believes, and very rightly too, that man inherits all his instincts from the animals and shares with them now. This is only natural, since the object of instincts is to enable the animal to maintain its life and race and, as an animal that is able to maintain its life and race, man must feel and satisfy the same needs as other animals. But if the inner forces and capacities that motivate human activity are the same as those which motivate the activity of an animal, then the natural activities of man must also be the same as those of an animal. If the animal instincts of man are "the prime movers of all human activity" as McDougall believes, the nature of man should correspond totally to the nature of an animal. But we know that human nature differs from animal nature in several respects. For example:—

- (1) An animal can only know feel and think but a man can not only know feel and think, but when he does so, he also knows that he knows, feels and thinks. We express this by saying that while an animal is only conscious, man is gifted with self-consciousness.
- (2) An animal cannot check or oppose the biological pressure of its instincts and cannot stop or limit their

satisfaction at will and by its own free choice, but a man can do so whenever he likes.

It appears to us sometimes that an animal too can oppose its instincts. For example, when a cow enters a garden and begins to feed on the green grass in the lawns it is satisfying its instinct of hunger. But when the gardener drives it away with a whip it runs for its safety stopping the satisfaction of its instinct of hunger. But in all such examples the opposition of an animal to an instinct is due to the fact that it has another more powerful or pressing instinct to satisfy. In this case the cow has abandoned the satisfaction of its instinct of hunger in order to satisfy its instinct of flight. The object of both the instincts was the maintenance of life and the immediate requirements of this object could be served by the cow not by continuing to feed but by running away. The opposition of one instinct for the sake of another more powerful and more pressing instinct occurs in the human being too. But a human individual opposes an instinct or a number of instincts in such a manner sometimes that no instinct is being satisfied and no requirement of the maintenance of life and race is being fulfilled as a consequence and, on the other hand, the demands of the instincts and the requirements of the preservation of life and race are positively ignored. For example, when a religious man stops the normal satisfaction of his instinct of hunger in order to fast continuously for the sake of his own spiritual elevation or when a patriotic soldier lays down his life in the battlefield or when a pious man who decides not to marry, gives up the satisfaction of his sexual desires or when an explorer travels far and wide and starves his instinctive appetites to acquire knowledge for its own sake etc. Such opposition of instincts for the achievement of a moral end is known as the phenomenon of will or volition.

(3) An animal never desires to satisfy any of its instincts beyond the natural, biological limits of its satisfaction.

instinct that is sometimes modified by man. The reason is that even after an individual has brought about its so-called "modification" several times he can, if he so desires, allow it to have its natural expression again in the manner it has in an animal. This means that a'human instinct remains always as it is in nature and it is its expression that man can modify. This is perhaps what McDougall also intends to say. But he has overlooked the fact that an instinct is an urge for action and its expression can be modified only by another urge and not by reason, although reason can help its modification by another urge. Reason can quide a desire and point out the way in which it can satisfy itself most suitably and in perfect harmony with other desires of our nature but since it is not a desire itself, it can have no conative or impulsive force which belongs to instincts. It is only a discriminating faculty helpful to us in the satisfaction of our desires. It is rightly known as the handmaid of our desires. The Psychologists agree that animals too have an intelligence of some sort which sub-serves their instincts. Intelligence, therefore, cannot explain any distinctive quality of human activity in so far as the latter depends upon instincts.

The expression of an instinctive urge is modified only when its strength is increased or decreased above or below its natural level which is the same in man and in animal. We sometimes satisfy an instinctive appetite much less than we need biologically by our own choice and intentionally. It may be said that it is due to reason. But it is also well known that sometimes we have a much greater attraction for our animal or instinctive desires and indulge in them to a much greater extent than our instincts, considered as natural biological demands of our body, would require. This cannot be due to reason because it is unreasonable on the surface of it. It cannot be due to any of the instincts because an animal never does it; although the satisfaction of an instinctive impulse is accompanied by the same pleasure in man as in the animal. It can be only due to the fact that some other urge not related to any of our instincts is at work adding to the normal force of our instinctive desires and making them more powerful than they really are. The same urge must be responsible for diminishing the force of our instinctive appetites sometimes. It increases or decreases the force of our instinctive desires according as it suits it. The expression of an instinctive urge becomes modified because the demands of this urge have to be accommodated. All that reason can do is to guide this urge internally in its own satisfaction, at the expense of or with the help of other urges of man, as it may require. It is this urge which we are satisfying when we are busy resisting or opposing the natural power of the instincts thus displaying the phenomena which is commonly known as will or volition. No reasonable explanation of will or volition is possible unless it is assumed that it is an urge of man apart from and over and above his instincts.

However, McDougall, in spite of his view expressed in a sentence quoted above, concedes practically that reason is not able to oppose an instinct or to create will or volition. For, while explaining the source of will or volition in human nature in detaillater on, he does not even once mention reason as a factor in its emergence and on the other hand discredits it as a cause of volition. He begins his explanation by defining the nature of moral impulse or will or volition. He writes:—

"We have to recognise that the desire that springs from the completed moral sentiment is usually of a thin and feeble sort in comparison with the fiercer coarser desires that spring directly from our instincts and from our concrete sentiments. It is therefore no matter for surprise that in so many cases the acquirement of an ideal of conduct and of the sentiment for it does not suffice to secure its realization. How then are we to account for the fact that the conduct of the good man is in the main regulated according to the promptings of these weaker desires and against the stronger more urgent promptings of the more primitive desires? It is this appearance of the overcoming of the stronger by the weaker impulse or motive, in so many cases of right action following upon a conflict of motives and the exercise of moral effort, that leads Professor James to define moral action as action in the line of the greatest resistance. It is in these cases of moral conflict that volition or effort of will in the fullest sense of the word comes to determine the victory to the side of the weaker impulse".

Professor James wrote in his Principles of Psychology:-

"And if a brief definition of ideal or moral action were required none could be given which would better fit the appearances than this 'it is action in the line of the greatest resistance'.

The facts may be most briefly symbolised thus, P standing for the propensity I for the ideal impulse and E for the effort (of will)

I per se < P I+E > P"

What is the origin of the effort E which overcomes the resistance and brings about the moral action? Professor James writes nothing in answer to this question.

McDougall writes criticising Professor James:-

"Professor James like many others finds here an ultimate and irresolvable problem in face of which we can only say—The will exerts itself on the side of the weaker motive and enables it to triumph over its stronger antagonists—While leaving the word 'will' simply as the name for this possibility of an influx of energy of whose source, causes or antecedents we can say nothing.....Presumably according to Professor James this is where every attempt to trace the volitional process from its effects backwards comes against a dead wall of mystery because the inhibiting stroke (i.e. the stroke of volition which inhibits rival impulses due to instincts) issues from some region inaccessible to our intellects or simply happens without antecedents."

McDougall's own explanation is that the source of the additional motive power, which in the moral effort of will is thrown upon the side of the weaker, more ideal impulse is the instinct of self-display or self-assertion. "That this is true" says Dr. McDougall, "we may see clearly in such a simple case of volition as that of a boy overcoming by effort of the will, owing

to the presence of spectators, an impulse of fear that restrains him from some desired object. He makes his effort and overcomes his fear impulse because we say, he knows his companions are looking at him; the impulse of self-display is evoked on the side of the weaker motive. And the same is true of those more refined efforts of the will in which the operation of this impulse is so deeply obscured that it has not hitherto been recognized."

And McDougall assures us that there is no awkwardness about this explanation although "it may seem paradoxical and repugnant to our sense of the nobility of moral conduct that it (moral conduct) should be exhibited as dependent on an impulse that we share with the animals and which in them plays a part that is of a secondary importance and utterly amoral......The humble nature of the remote origins of anything we justly admire or revere in no wise detracts from its intrinsic worth or dignity and the ascertainment of those origins need not and should not diminish by one jot our admiration or reverence."

A really admirable thing may no doubt easily have a very humble origin, but McDougall's explanation of the source of will is not only repugnant to our sense of the nobility of moral conduct however unreasonable this repugnance may be according to him, but is also unjustified and unconvincing from a purely rational point of view.

If will is due to the instinct of self-assertion the question arises: Why does the instinct become active in favour of the weaker desire rather than the stronger one? Both the desires, the weaker as well as the stronger one, have their source in the instincts. Why should the weaker desire be an object of special favour with the instinct of self-assertion? The instinct can satisfy itself equally, nay, perhaps more easily and more adequately by siding with the stronger desire, for example, when you fight an enemy rather than forgive him or when you give him a slap for a slap rather than turn the other cheek towards him; then why does it support the weaker desire alone? Moreover, it is in connection with such coarser and stronger desires of the animal nature that this instinct was most active all along in its history. Why should

it forget its old habit and lose its original function entirely and begin to side with the weaker desire for moral action as soon as it reaches man?

The only distinction of man over the animal which McDougall concedes is his capacity for reason. Then, should we think that the instinct's preference for the weaker desire in the case of man is due to the influence of reason? But there are innumerable cases in which the effort of will cannot be justified on the score of reason. People otherwise sane show readiness to suffer all sorts of privations and even death for the sake of avowed principles. Many a martyr in the history of our race was confronted with one of the two alternatives; dignity, power and riches on the one hand and death and disgrace on the other, but he decided in favour of the latter course and preferred self-annihilation to self-assertion. Reason cannot justify it, nor can one understand by any stretch of imagination how the preference of poverty to power in such cases is due to the instinct of self-assertion.

McDougall himself says that a person's desire for even that form of self-assertion by means of which he seeks the approval of others and consequently puts forth volitional effort is inexplicable on grounds of rationality. Contradicting his earlier standpoint that the instincts of man become modified under the influence of his reason, "giving rise to the character and will of individuals and nations" he writes:—

"The strength of the regard men pay to public opinion, the strength of their desire to secure the approval and avoid the disapproval of their fellow men goes beyond all rational grounds; it cannot be wholly explained as due to regard for their own actual welfare or material prosperity or anticipation of the pain or the pleasure that would be felt on hearing men's blame or priase. For, as we know, some men otherwise rational and sane enough are prepared to sacrifice ease and enjoyments of every kiud—in fact all the good things of life—if only they may achieve posthumous fame; that is to say their conduct is dominated by the desire that men shall admire or praise them long after they themselves shall have become incapable of

being affected pleasurably or painfully by any expression of the opinions of others. The great strength in so many men of this regard for the opinions of others and the almost universal distribution of it in some degree may, then, fairly be said to present the most important and difficult of the psychological problems that underlie the theory of morals."

Thus for one thing it is not clear why the instinct of selfassertion should become active on behalf of the weaker desire in order to reinforce it, rather than on behalf of the stronger motive, when reason too is not responsible for this discrimination.

Secondly Dr. McDougall appears to be arguing here in a circle. Why in the particular case mentioned by him does the boy's moral effort satisfy his instinct of self-assertion when others are looking on? His answer is, because society generally approves of such an effort and the boy's companions are sure to admire it. But why does society approve of it?

According to McDougall the society's approval is due to the fact that it has absorbed the higher moral tradition on account of the influence of rare personalities, the prophets and saints, who exert this influence in virtue of the admiration they evoke in us. It is apparent that McDougall's explanation has not solved the difficulty but only pushed it a step backwards or transformed it into another difficulty. For we must know what is the cause of the admirable moral efforts of the saints and prophets who. according to McDougall, are the founders of the moral tradition? Certainly the cause of these efforts cannot be again the approval and admiraion of the society (which is itself the result of the tradition founded by the saints and prophets) stimulating the saints and prophets' instinct of self-display. This will be arguing in a circle. And moreover what is the cause of our own admiration of the moral efforts of the saints and prophets because unless we admire them no tradition can be founded?

McDougall seems to have, at this place, lost sight of the fact that it will not be possible for us to admire the moral efforts of the saints and prophets and to absorb from them the higher moral

tradition, unless there existed in our own nature something which renders their moral efforts admirable in our eyes. In that something, whatever it is, we ought to look for the cause of our own moral and volitional effort as well as of our admiration for the moral efforts of the saints and prophets as also for the cause of the moral efforts (resulting in the establishment of moral tradition) of the saints and prophets. If we say that that something is nothing other than the urge of self-consciousness for an ideal peculiar to man and independent of the instincts, we are able to explain all the facts adequately. The urge of self-consciousness has no aim but its own satisfaction. It does not, therefore, obey the common standards of rationality. Like every impulse it has its own rational standard. Reason is its servant and not its master. The weaker desire springs from this urge and is not weak as a matter of fact but is only supressed by instinctive desires. It comes into its own whenever on account of our intense love for the ideal we are able to turn our attention away from the instinctive desires and to fix it on the ideal. It conquers the instinctive impulses by virtue of its own intrinsic strength. The inhibiting stroke comes from the love of the ideal and its force is directly in proportion to this love. When the love of the ideal is very strong the instinctive desires are too weak to compete with the so-called 'weaker desire'. In such a case the proportion of strength of the two kinds of desires is reversed, the weaker becoming the stronger and the stronger becoming the weaker one, and in such a case moral action involves no exertion or effort of the will because no resistance exists. Such is the case with the heroes, martyrs, saints and prophets who act morally not as a result of effort and struggle like many of us but as a result of a desire which they do not like to resist. We see, therefore, that professor Jamess definition of moral action that it is 'action in the line of the greatest resistance' by no means holds good under all circumstances. In very many cases moral action is action in the line of the least resistance.

The boy whose example has been cited by McDougall was able to overcome the impulse of fear because his impulse for the ideal (which ideal was, of course, the approval of his friends) was able to gain in strength sufficiently to defeat the impulse of fear, at a time when his friends were looking on.

The desire of the self is our own desire and we hold it to be more important than any desire of the instincts. When the self asserts its own desire over the instinctive desires we call it volition or will. That McDougall in spite of his effort to trace all the activities of man to the sole urge of instincts is compelled to assume this fact is clear from the following passage:—

"The essential mark of volition—that which distinguishes it from simple desire or simple conflict of desires is that the personality as a whole or the central feature or nucleus of personality, the man himself or all that which is regarded by himself and others as the most essential part of himself is thrown upon the side of the weaker motive; whereas a mere desire may be felt to be something that in comparison with this most intimate nucleus of personality is foreign to the self, a force that we do not acknowledge as our own, which we or the intimate self may look upon with horror and detestation."

McDougall gives the various names of "personality as a whole", "the central feature or nucleus of personality", "the most intimate nucleus of personality", "the man himself", "the most essential part of man", the "intimate self" of man, to something which he is unable to define consistently with his theory of instincts but which is really no other than what we have denoted above as the self or the self-consciousness in man which has an urge to love and strive after an ideal. Although McDougall does not define what exactly this "most essential part of man" is, yet he realizes that it has a desire which, though weak in itself, is ultimately capable of controlling and dominating a stronger desire, directly due to one of the instincts-a desire which it not only refuses to "acknowledge" as its "own" but also looks upon "with horror and detestation". It is very surprising indeed that in spite of such a clear admission that there is something in the nature of man which is the most essential part of man which has a desire of its own-a desire which is not only apart from the instincts but also opposed to them to the extent of inducing "horror and detestation" and which though apparently weak, ultimately controls and rules the instincts-McDougall continues to think that it is "the instincts which are the prime movers of all human activity!"

McDougall adds to the instinct of self-assertion as a cause of volition or moral effort another factor which he calls the sentiment of self regard. This sentiment is, according to him, the source of the weaker desire proceeding from "the most essential part of man" with which the stronger instinctive desires come into conflict. A full grown sentiment according to him is nothing but a constellation or a group of all the instinctive emotions organising themselves gradually around an object. But, if this desire is really an out-come of a combination of all the instincts and is brought into existence by the combined emotional force of all of them as McDougall thinks, one cannot understand why it remains so weak in spite of it.

## He writes:-

"The organization of sentiments in the developing mind is determined by the course of experience; that is to say the sentiment is a growth in the structure of the mind that is **not** natively given in the inherited constitution".

"Each sentiment has a life-history like every other vital organization. It is gradually built up, increasing in complexity and strength and may continue to grow indefinitely or may enter upon a period of decline and may decay slowly or rapidly partially or completely. When any of the emotions is strongly or repeatedly excited by a particular object there is formed the rudiment of a sentiment ..... But it can seldom happen that a sentiment persists in this rudimentary condition for any long period of time. Any such sentiment is liable to die away for lack of stimulus or if further relations are maintained with its object, to develop into a more complex organization. Thus the simple sentiment of fear.....will tend to develop and will most readily become hate by the incorporation of other emotional dispositions...they all in virtue of their repeated excitement by this one object become associated with the object more and more intimately until the mere idea of it may suffice to throw them all at once into a condition of such excitement, or to arouse all of them in turn or in

conjunction to full activity. So the rudimentary sentiment whose emotional constituent is fear develops into a full blown hatred."

This description of the emergence of a sentiment is congrary to our experience. We know that a sentiment exists already before an emotion is excited. The excitement of emotion is the result and not the cause of a sentiment. Emotions are events in the career of a sentiment. When a man loves, for example, the ideal of Communism his love is able to arouse in him the emotions of pleasure, anger, fear, disgust, wonder, subjection, elation. gratitude, admiration, hope, relief, regret, disappointment, etc. He admires the ideal, hopes that it will rule the world, fears that its enemies may wipe it out, wonders at its captivating philosophy, is displeased when a person condemns it, feels elated when it wins a victory, shows gratitude to a person who helps it, regrets when it suffers a set-back and so on. Evidently the fact is that each of these emotions is aroused in the man at its ow... particular occasion because he loves Communism. It is not a fact, as McDougall believes, that he loves Communism because the creed was able to exicte each of these emotions in him continuously for some time, till each became a fixed attitude with respect to that ideal, so that his sentiment is nothing but a sumtotal of these acquired attitudes.

When we love, our sentiment is capable of exciting every emotion of which man is capable provided the situation corresponding to that emotion is created. The view of McDougall, therefore, necessitates the conclusion that a man cannot love an object till the object has had the chance of exciting each of his emotions without any exception sufficiently in duration and intensity to render it into a fixed attitude. It implies that as long as the excitation and the consequent fixation of the total number of emotions of which he is capable as a human being is not exhausted, love cannot make its appearance, because if the sentiment of love is an organization of emotions, it is an organization of all of them without exception. This view is contrary to our experience. We love persons, objects or ideas because they are lovable, because we judge them as lovable and beautiful and not because they excite our emotions one after the other

again and again till all of them become fixed and rooted and prone to be excited again. We feel that our love, for whatever object it may be, exists before any of our emotions gets the chance to be excited aud that the emotion is excited because the love is already there.

A person changes his love from one object or idea to another sometimes so suddenly that no excitement of emotions is thinkable, as for example, when a Nazi may turn into a Communist overnight by studying a few lines in a book or by listening to a lecture. His conversion is due to his added knowledge of the case for Communism, of the arguments in its favour, resulting in a judgment of its greatness and a conviction of its truth. No excitement of emotions comes into the picture.

When the object of sentiment changes, the situations under which the emotions may be excited also change along with it immediately. The Nazi who turns a Communist finds that the occasions when he can feel gratitude, admiration, anger, disgust, disappointment, etc., have altered simultaneously with his conversion. This would have been impossible unless it is a fact that the excitement of a person's emotions is determined by his love.

The emotions of a cultured man are aroused under situations which are vastly different from those which suffice to excite the emotions of a relatively uncivilized, uneducated person. When people come to be inspired by lofty ideals their emotional response towards events undergoes a marked change. For example, they forgive personal insults more readily than other men can do. Even when the change from one object of love to another is gradual (as when we take time to understand, appreciate or judge the beauty of an object) it is never preceded by a repeated excitement of emotions.

Let us now consider this view with particular reference to the sentiment of hate. "Typical sentiments," says McDougall "are love and hate". If all sentiments are gradually developed organizations of emotions then hate as a sentiment must also be a similar organization and must have its own independent career

of growth and decay like the sentiment of love. But it is easy to see that hate is not a separate sentiment, nor has it a separate career of growth and decay. It is subservient to our love, comes into existence with it, appears and disappears, increases and decreases in intensity along with it. There can be no love without hate. Hate is an aspect or facet of love. There is only one fundamental sentiment of which man is capable and that is love. We hate only those objects which interfere with and prove inconsistent with our love or our ideal. The strength of our hate is in proportion to our love. The more we love an object the more we hate the objects that oppose, violate or interfere with this love. Hate being the direct and immediate result of a love cannot be an organization of emotions developing gradually around an object. Its object is determined strictly, immediately, by the object of love and not by the accidental excitement of emotions. When our love changes its object our hate also changes its object at once. When we come to be thoroughly inspired by a new ideal suddenly, all our hates irrelevant to that ideal disappear at once and new hates relevant and subservient to that ideal appear immediately. How does it happen if the sentiment of hate is an organization of emotions and develops gradually by their repeated excitement? What is true of the sentiment of hate is true also of the sentiment of love. Just as the sentiment of hate is not a gradually developed organization of emotions so also the sentiment of love too cannot be a gradually developed constellation of emotions.

McDougall counts a third sentiment, that of respect, besides hate and love. But if respect is formal it is not a sentiment at all. It is a kind of discipline necessitated by some other object of love. If it is a genuine feeling it can be nothing but an aspect of love. We cannot really respect without loving or love without respecting at least in the case of a perfect love and a perfect respect. When we love a person and do not respect him we love only a part of him and hate the other part and when we respect a person and do not love him we respect only a part of him and do not respect the other part. The highest love and the highest respect are ultimately one and the same. They partake of a common quality which we call reverence.

If a sentiment does not result from the excitement of emotions what then is the cause of it? The sentiment of love-and this is the only basic sentiment we can have—is due to our direct judgment of beauty. It is a function of our consciousness, a function of what McDougall vaguely describes as the 'most essential part of man' or the 'intimate self of man'. The self must perform this function always sometimes with one object and sometimes with another. The object of the sentiment is the ideal. All the emotions exist already in our nature as parts of this function. The sentiment of self comes into existence simultaneously with the idea of self. Only our view of the object that is lovable to us continues to change throughout life. A sentiment is, therefore, 'determined by the course of experience in this sense only that with the growth of experience and knowledge the object of sentiment, that is, the ideal, becomes more and more perfect but the function of loving itself is 'natively given in the inherited constitution'. It is an innate quality of the self. No sentiment can 'decay completely without yielding place to another because the self must perform its function of loving always. It cannot hold this function in check and, therefore, if it cannot love one object (because according to its judgment, it is lacking in beauty) it must love another object immediately. The self loves an object or an idea which appears to it to be the most beautiful at the time. From our earliest childhood till the last day of our life we are always ready to love the most admirable or lovable object or idea that we come to know of from time to time. Judgements of beauty are made directly. They do not acquire and do not wait for an excitement and much less a repeated excitement of emotions.

Since a sentiment is a characteristic of consciousness and since consciousness is free only in man, it is man alone who is capable of having a sentiment. It is true that some of the higher animals also appear to have sentiments but in the animal the brain is too incomplete to satisfy the needs of consciousness. It does not afford consciousness the freedom that it requires in order to perform its functions adequately. In the animal consciousness is suppressed and labours under material limitations which it has not yet been able to overcome. The sentiment of the animal therefore (if at all we should use

the word sentiment for it) is crude and incomplete, half-conscious and automatic. It is incapable of shifting to higher and higher ideas. It is more of the nature of an inflexible, inherited attitude and a developed and intensified instinct than of a love or a hatred that is capable of ruling the instincts consciously or of exciting all the emotions that are latent in a sentiment.

McDougall tries to prove his thesis that a sentiment results from the excitement of emotions by giving the example of a boy whose father displays his anger repeatedly before him in such a way that the boy developes first of all what he calls a 'rudimentary sentiment' of fear which later on grows into a full-blown hatred by incorporating into itself other emotional dispositions which the detestable behaviour of the father is able to create.

Evidently, this example is too convenient for the purpose of the writer. Even in this case the sentiment of love or the ideal existed before the emotion of fear was excited. But naturally, in view of the tender age and the limited knowledge and experience of the boy, his ideal was very low in the scale of beauty; it was no other than the satisfaction of his 'instincts of attraction' itself. Therefore whoever stood in the way of a smooth satisfaction of these instincts, in other words, whoever was able to arouse the instincts of repulsion, was bound to become the object of the boy's hatred. It will be a mistake to derive, from this example, a general conclusion that hatred results from the excitement of emotions, because here too, the fundamental cause of the boy's hatred is an already existing love of which the object is rather low in the standard of beauty. His hatred appeared in the service of a love that was already present. The repeated excitement of his fear resulted in hatred because it enabled the boy to judge his father as a person who had proved himself to be out of harmony and sympathy with what he loved and liked. If there had been no innate capacity in him to love certain things and he had not loved them, he would have never hated his father even if he had repeatedly aroused his fear. If the boy had grown sufficiently in years and had acquired a sufficient amount of self-knowledge he would have had a higher ideal and would have probably found reason to justify,

excuse or explain the behaviour of his father in the light of that ideal. In that case his ideal would have controlled his instincts so that the father's behaviour would have neither excited his fear unduly nor induced his hatred.

Because our fears are excited by our ideals we revise them in the light of our ideals in order to ascertain whether they are well-founded or otherwise. We retain the fears that are based on a real threat to our ideal and give up all the others. It is not fear that creates the sentiment of hate but it is rather an already existing sentiment of love that arouses our fears and induces our hates at relevant occasions. A grown-up cultured man may not fear the boy's father on account of his repeated display of anger and yet may hate him because his behaviour offends the man's ideal of excellence. We hate whatever offends our ideals. Because we love certain things we have to hate certain other things. The basis of our hatred is our innate desire to love the object that appears to us to be the most admirable and lovable whether it is our instinctive desires as in childhood or a standard of excellence as in the case of a grown-up cultured man.

McDougall thinks that a complete sentiment grows out of a rudimentary sentiment. But since a sentiment is not a gradually developing organization of emotions the distinction between a full-grown and a rudimentary sentiment is uncalled for. The capacity for love is innate, but the object of love continues to grow in perfection and uniqueness. What the writer calls a rudimentary sentiment can be no more than an emotional attitude resulting from a sentiment which is already present. Our principle love determines our smaller loves and hates. Love is not one sentiment but a system of sentiments. We love all those objects which favour our love and hate all those objects which thwart it. No subservient attitude of love or hate can grow in us unless it is permitted or required by our principal love or our ideal. It can grow only when an object favours or interferes with our principal love. To say nothing of a so-called 'rudimentary sentiment' which, according to McDougall, is a growth out of an instinct, even an instinct cannot have its own way if its demand is contrary to the requirements of the ideal.

In man the emotions serve the ideal, in the animal they serve the physical body. The emotions connected with the instincts serve a biological purpose and become active when the needs of the body are either favoured or opposed. Their object is to start and sustain to its end the activity characteristic of the instinct in order to secure for the animal the preservation of its life and race. But in man these emotions are ultimately held in check, ruled and dominated by the ideal. In other words, the emotions are excited in man ultimately, when the continuation of love and not the continuation of life is favoured, or opposed. When we are living almost on the animal plane of life, as in the case of a child or a savage, our ideal is no higher than the satisfaction of our instinctive desires and consequently when these desires are favoured or thwarted our emotions are aroused. The cause of the excitement of emotions, even in this case, is our innate sentiment of love for an ideal. In the example cited by McDougall, as long as the boy's ideal remains close to his instinctive desires, his loves and hates must remain confined to objects that favour or disfavour these desires and consequently it is these objects that must arouse his emotions. But as his ideal improves in perfection and rises above the instinctive desires he must learn to control his instincts more and more for the sake of his ideal. In a highly cultured man a man who is deeply in love with a lofty ideal, it is ultimately the danger to the ideal rather than to the body, that will arouse the emotion of fear. Similar is the case with other emotions like disgust, wonder, anger, subjection and elation, that are bound up with our animal instincts. They are kept under a strict control by the love of the ideal. It suffices as a proof of the fact that emotions are inseparable from love that even in the animal they serve a sort of love which is, however, not free like that of the human being but which is automatic and inflexible and takes the form of instincts. For, we know that every instinct of the animal is either an instinct of attraction or an instinct of repulsion.

The error of McDougall that a sentiment results from the excitement of emotions is, naturally, due to the fact that he regards the emotions as belonging primarily to our animal instincts of which according to him the human personality is entirely composed. He make sa distinction between the primary

and the secondary emotions and says that the emotions connected with the instincts, that is, those which man possesses in common with the higher animals, are primary and all others peculiar to man are derived from them as their combinations. But if emotions belong to the instincts how is it that they fail to combine into so-called secondary or derived emotions in the case of animal as they do in the case of man? Why is it that man alone is able to exhibit so rich a variety of emotions and not the animal? Why is it again that emotions organize themselves into the form of sentiments only in the case of man and not in the case of the animal although they are excited as frequently in the animal as in man? Reason, which is, according to McDougall, the only distinction enjoyed by man over the animal, is certainly not responsible for this supposed chemical composition of instincts and emotions in man, on account of which the nature of man becomes so vastly different from that of the animal. To what else can we attribute these distinctive features of the human psychology?

The fact is that emotions being fundamentally to consciousness, to what McDougall vaguely understands as 'the most essential part' of man or the 'intimate self' of man. They belong essentially and primarily to the man in us and not the animal. The emotions connected with our animal instincts may be the most important for the preservation of life, but they are not primary in the sense that all the other emotions, which it is possible for us to experience, represent their mixture or fusion in various shades or degrees. We have seen that it is not the instincts and their connected emotions that combine in various quantities to make consciousness but it is consciousness that has evolved the instincts to be what they are. What is primary and fundamental is consciousness and not the instincts. Instincts derive their existence as well as their character from consciousness. It was consciousness that built up the instincts in order to make a passage for itself and not the instincts that built up consciousness. Instincts are only some of the tendencies latent in consciousness. which become fixed and automatic, in a way, materialized, to compel the half-conscious animal to preserve its life and race for the purposes of evolution. In the course of its struggle with matter consciousness left behind some of its own tendencies embedded in matter and passed on to its own freedom. All emotions are, therefore, present in the nature of consciousness and consequently appear in their fullest richness and variety in man in whom consciousness has achieved its freedom.

Emotions belong to the sentiment, to the love in us which is a function of our consciousness. They do not create the sentiment but they are parts of the sentiment itself. They serve love. Love protects itself and continues its growth through them. They are the phases of love or the modes in which love expresses itself. They are included in love itself, otherwise love would not cause their excitement. An emotion is the response of love to an event. To give expression to an emotion, whatever the emotion may be, is to love, to exercise the function of loving, in a manner suitable to the situation exciting the emotion.

Except when we indulge in a real and not a feigned laughter, we are always loving and, therefore, always expressing some emotion or another in a greater or a lesser degree. Laughter is the self's state of zero emotion when the self has a momentary respite from constant emotional demands of its love. The ideal of the self makes life a very serious business for it. It exerts upon it a pull of attraction, like the pressure of a spring in the mechanism of a wound-up clock, which keeps it constantly in a state of effort and emotional tension. Effort does not necessarily mean working or thinking hard. Even a state of ordinary rest is attended by emotions of some kind. It is generally a state of a preparation for change from one effort to another in which the ideal as the goal of all serious effort is constantly kept in view. A comic or non-serious situation excites laughter because it gives a momentary suggestion of the meaninglessness or the absence of the ideal, of love and of effort and emotion. Every situation which can give a suggestion of this kind, whether on account of the peculiar temperament or attitude of the person noticing it or on account of its intrinsic character, tends to excite laughter. The effect of a suggestion of this kind is the immediate removal of the emotional tension of the self, resulting in laughter, as if a spring that was tightly wound is suddenly released. That is why real laughter is peculiar to man who alone of all the species has a free consciousness capable of loving an ideal and expressing all the emotions, from zero onwards, latent in the nature of consciousness. When we are serious about life we are always passing through one emotion or another:

Emotions are events in the career of love; they indicate the circumstances through which love is passing. The reaction of love to each of these circumstances with a view to protecting and continuing itself is an emotion. The object of all emotions is to drive the self towards the object of love and away from the object of hate. Emotions which have their source in hate are also aspects of love, since hate itself depends upon love. We hate for the sake of our love and we cannot love without hating.

When the course of love is running smoothly, i.e., when the object of love is being approached and the object of hate is being pushed back successfully, the attending emotion is joy, bliss or happiness and when the reverse is the case we have sorrow, some forms of which are despondency, despair and grief. The emotions range into innumerable varieties from sorrow to joy like the colours of a spectrum. Sorrow is due to the sense of a final failure to approach the beloved which includes the sense of the final loss of the beloved. The love persists in spite of this sense of failure or loss and this is the cause of sorrow. Sorrow is always due to an error of the self. The Beloved of the self, that is, Consciousness, is always alive and always approachable. For this reason sorrow cannot endure for long and ends gradually, in the case of a normal mind, in a reaction of hope which is due to the self's natural (for the time being, overshadowed or repressed) conviction of a permanent possibility of achieving its desire, coming to its own.

The view of McDougall that the human self is an edifice in which the bricks are the instincts does not give an adequate explanation of will. It is not easy to understand how it can be possible for a man willingly to make big sacrifices involving the suppressing and checking of his instinctive desires and even the loss of his life for a sentiment of love which is itself at bottom no more than a group or a combination of instinctive desires and emotions which have for their object the preservation of life. The

sentiment of love, say of God, religion, country or nation which calls upon us sometimes to surrender our life cannot have the instincts as its basis, otherwise it will never seek its satisfaction at the cost of its own foundations. Indeed, the sentiment of love for the ideals which is the source of will, rules the instincts and their emotions and it cannot do so if it is itself a creature of instincts.

As a matter of fact there can be no explanation of the nine distinctive qualities and characteristics of human nature and human activity mentioned above except that the urge of human self-consciousness for ideals which is also an urge for beauty, goodness and truth is the real, the ultimate and the sole dynamic power of all the activities of man even those which have their immediate source in his instincts. We explain them below one by one in the order in which they have been mentioned above in the light of the implications of our own view stated above.

- (1) Man is a self-conscious being because self-consciousness is the ultimate reality of the Universe which has expressed itself in man. Self-consciousness in man is not the product of his instincts. On the other hand it is the instincts which have been evolved by self-consciousness in order to force the animal to preserve its life and race for the purposes of evolution. We cannot, therefore, explain self-consciousness out of instincts, but we can explain instincts out of self-consciousness. In the animal self-consciousness was suppressed by the instincts, but on reaching man it became free from the instincts and began to rule them. Knowing itself is a characteristic of self-consciousness which it regained on becoming free in the human being.
- (2) The cause of the human will or volition is that man is self-conscious and it is a property of self-consciousness that it has an urge to love an ideal or an idea to which it attributes the highest beauty, goodness and truth known to it. But since these qualities belong in their highest perfection only to the Self-Consciousness of the Universe or God, this urge can be perfectly and per-

manently satisfied only by the idea of God. But as long as man is not able to feel and experience the beauty of the qualities of God his urge for an ideal gets misdirected into the channels of other ideals or ideas to which he is able to attribute the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth on the basis or his own feeling or experience which is in such a case always misquided. Man is capable of loving a large variety of such wrong ideals. One of them is the desire for the approval of the society to which an individual belongs. The urge of self-consciousness for an ideal is very powerful and rules and controls the instincts. Will or volition is the impulse to act in accordance with the requirements of the ideal and in opposition to the requirements of the instincts. The source of volition is neither the instinct of self-assertion nor any constellation of all the instincts but it is the love of an ideal. Since the love of an ideal is a distinctive quality of human nature, volition is a speciality of man. An animal is not gifted with this capacity. The love of the ideal opposes the instincts whenever it likes and to whatever extent it likes for its own satisfaction and the result is volition.

- (3) Sometimes a man makes use of some of his instincts to a much greater extent than their natural biological pressure justifies. The reason is that the satisfaction of an instinct is always attended by a pleasure and some persons are attracted by this pleasure so much that they make it the ideal of their life disregarding all moral principles to the contrary. The result is that the urge of their instincts is artificially reinforced by their urge for an ideal and they indulge in the pleasures of their instinctive desires much more than their natural object would justify. An animal cannot do so because it has no urge of love or action which it can use to extend the activity of its instincts beyond their natural boundaries.
- (4) Man is capable of loving an ideal because the love of an ideal is a property of his free self-consciousness. Since

an animal is not self-conscious, it cannot love an ideal. Free self-consciousness is a quality of man alone.

- (5) Man is capable of seeking knowledge or truth for its own sake on account of the urge of his selfconsciousness which seeks beauty, goodness and truth and which is not given to an animal.
- (6) Man is capable of acting morally for the sake of morality itself because goodness or morality is an aspect of beauty which the human self-consciousness loves. An animal must be naturally incapable of moral action because it is not self-conscious and not able to know, admire or seek beauty.
- (7) Since the urge for art too is an urge to admire and create beauty, it is an aspect of the urge of human selfconsciousness which is denied to an animal.
- (8) The variety of human emotions is due to the fact that emotions belong fundamentally to the human selfconsciousness and not to the human instincts which are a creation of self-consciousness for a special purpose. Emotions are qualities of self-consciousness and since every instinct of an animal represents a quality of selfconsciousness which becomes embedded in the biological constitution of the animal, it is attended by an emotion which is aroused only when the relevant biological stimulus is present. Since self-consciousness is not free in an animal it cannot express all the emotions which belong to self-consciousness.
- (9) The extraordinary joy or pleasure that attends the spiritual experience of the mystics is due to the fact that such an experience enables their love for an ideal to get the fullest amount of satisfaction that is possible. This joy or pleasure is denied to the animal because the urge for an ideal is also denied to it. An animal is capable only of that lower and inferior kind of pleasure which accompanies the satisfaction of an instinct.

## THE VIEW OF FREUD

Freud believes that all the activities of man are the outcome of a single instinct—the instinct of sex—and that when this instinct has to be obstructed and suppressed owing to the pressure of society it is "sublimated" and transformed into an impulse for an ideal. Briefly, his theory is that a very small part of the human personality is above the level of consciousness, while the rest of it is below this level. The portion below is known as the "unconscious mind" or simply the "unconscious." It is the larger as well as the more important portion of consciousness. All the contents of the conscious mind are derived from the unconscious and they are to the unconscious as foam is to the ocean. The unconscious self is uncivilized and intensely selfish. Its chief concern is to gratify its desires which are sexual in nature and which are tremendously powerful. It cannot satisfy its desires except through the conscious self. Therefore it forces the conscious self with the whole pressure of its desires to strive for their satisfaction.

The conscious self, which is really a creature of the unconscious, feels the necessity of meeting the needs of the unconscious, but it is often helpless because it is under a strong pressure from an opposite direction which requires it to behave in a respectable, law-abiding and orderly manner and that is the pressure of the society. Since the shameful and unruly desires of the unconscious interfere with the respectability and reputation of the conscious self, therefore the conscious self tries to check them and keep them below the level of consciousness. This function of the conscious self is called the 'censor'.

Unconscious desires which suffer continuous discouragement and repression from the censor are, in spite of their great and insistent power, finally disappointed and no longer insist on rising into consciousness, that is, they are forgotten. They, however, avenge themselves, so to say, for the Yough treatment meted out to them, by creating a diseased condition of the mind, known as a complex, of which the symptoms are hysteria, nervousness, obsession and neurosis.

The psycho-analyst claims to cure these nervous diseases by merely bringing to light the repressed desires and thus altering their character. The repressed energy which is the cause of trouble is played off in this way. The censor, however, permits those desires to rise to consciousness which purify themselves en route by a process which Freud denotes by the name of 'sublimation'. Freud seems to hold that all contents of the conscious mind are sublimated versions of elements in the unconscious. This is true not only of our desires and aversions, hopes and aspirations but also of our ideals, beliefs, thoughts and tastes of all varieties.

In his later publications Freud uses the words id and ego respectively for the unconscious and the conscious selves. He used a third term, super-ego for a part or function of the ego to which he allocates the activities of "self-observation, conscience and the holding up of ideals". It pursues its own ends and is independent of the ego as regards the energy at its disposal. The ego is at the mercy of the super-ego which dictates to it sometimes very severe standards of morality. Our sense of guilt or sinfulness is the result of the tension between the ego and super-ego. Unlike sexuality which exists from the very beginning the super-ego is a later development and is the result of what Freud calls the Oedipus complex.

The sexual urge of the child results in his intense love for his parents who dominate him by granting proofs of affection and by threats of punishment which create an anxiety in the child, because they suggest to him a loss of their love and because they must be feared also on their own account. The objective anxiety which the child develops in this way is the fore-runner of the later moral anxiety. So long as the former is dominant there is neither conscience nor superego. When the child grows in years he succeeds in overcoming more and more the Oedipus complex and its place is taken up by the super-ego which thenceforward observes, guides and threatens the ego in just the same way as the parents acted to the child before. The super-ego, differs from the parental authority in one respect. It takes up and continues its harshness and the preventive and punitive functions but not its loving care.

Moreover, its harshness need not be inherited at all from the parental authority. It is relentlessly harsh and severe in any case, no matter how lovingly the parents may have brought up the child, scrupulously avoiding punishments and threats of all kinds.

When the Oedipus complex passes away the child gives up the intense object cathexes which it has formed towards its parents and to compensate for the loss of object it identifies other objects or persons with its parents. The identification becomes intense in proportion as the object-cathexes lose their influence. "The super-ego", writes Freud "cannot attain to full strength and development if the over-coming of the Oedipus complex has not been completely successful.....The super-ego also takes over the influence of those persons who have taken the place of the parents, that is to say, of persons who have been concerned in the child's up-bringing and 'whom it has regarded as ideal models'. Normally, the super-ego is constantly becoming more and more 'remote from the original parents', becoming as it were 'impersonal'. Another thing that we must not forget is that the 'child values its parents differently at different periods of its life'. At the time at which the Oedipus complex makes way for the super-ego, they seem to be 'splendid figures', but later on they 'lose a good deal of their prestige' ..... We have to mention another important activity which is to be ascribed to the super-ego. It is also the vehicle of the ego-ideal by which the ego measures itself, towards which it strives and 'whose demands for ever, increasing perfection it is always striving to fulfil'. No doubt this ego-ideal is a precipitation of the old idea of parents, an expression of the 'admiration which the child felt for the perfection which it at that time ascribed to them' ..... The super-ego is the representation of all moral restrictions, 'the advocate of the impulse towards perfection'. In general parents and similar authorities follow the dictates of their own super-ego in the upbringing of their children ..... The result is that the super-ego of the child is not really built up on the model of the parents but on that of the parents' super-ego."

Now something about the nature of the conscious and the unconscious minds which Freud calls the ego and id.

The unconscious or the id is a cauldron of seething excitement. It has "no organization and no unified will, only an impulsion to obtain satisfaction for the instinctual needs in accordance with the pleasure principle. The laws of logic, above all, the laws of contradiction-do not hold for processes in the id. Contradictory impulses exist side by side without neutralizing each other ..... There is nothing in the id which can be compared to negation and we are astonished to find in it an exception to the philosopher's assertion that space and time are necessary parts of our acts. In the id there is nothing corresponding to the idea of time, no recognition of the passage of time and (a thing which is very remarkable and awaits adequate attention in philosophic thought) no alteration of mental processes by the passage of time. Conative impulses which have never got beyond the id, and even impressions which have been pushed down to the id by the repression are virtually immortal and are preserved for whole decades as though they had but recently occurred.

"Id knows no values, no good and evil no morality". The ego may be regarded as "that part of the id which has been modified by its proximity to the external world and the influence that the latter has had on it ..... The ego has taken over the task of representing the external world for the id and so of saving it, for the id, blindly striving to gratify its instincts in complete disregard of the superior strength of outside forces, could not otherwise escape annihilation.....In popular language we may say that 'ego stands for reason and circumspection while id stands for the untamed passions'.....The ego is after all only a part of the id, a part purposely modified by its proximity to the dangers of reality. From a dynamic point of view it is weak, 'it borrows its energy from the id'.....By identifying itself with the object it recommends itself to the id in place of the object 'and seeks to attract the libido' of the id on to itself ..... On the whole the ego has to carry out the intentions of the id, it fulfils its duty, if it succeeds in creating the conditions under which these intentions can be best fulfilled. One might compare the relations of the ego to the id with that between a rider and his horse. The horse provides the locomotive energy and the rider has the prerogative of determining the goal and of guiding the movements of his powerful mount towards it. But all too often in the relations

between the ego and the id we find a picture of the less ideal situation in which the rider is obliged to guide his horse in the direction in which it itself wants to go'......"

"The proverb tells us that one cannot serve two masters at once. The poor ego has a still harder time of it; it has to serve three harsh masters and has to do its best to reconcile the claims and demands of all three. These 'demands are always divergent' and often seem quite incomparible; no wonder that the ego so frequently gives way under its task. The three tyrants are the external world, the super-ego and the id ..... it (the ego) is designed to represent the demands of the external world but it also wishes to be a loyal servant of the id, to remain upon good terms with the id, to recommend itself to the id as an object and to draw the id's libido on to itself. In its attempt to mediate between the id and the reality it is often forced to clothe the unconscious commands of the id with its own rationalisations. to gloss over the conflicts between the id and the reality and with diplomatic dishonesty to display a pretended regard for reality even when the id persists in being stubborn and uncompromising. On the other hand its every movement is watched by the severe super-ego which holds up certain norms of behaviour, without regard to any difficulties coming from the id and the external world and if these norms are not acted up to, it punishes the ego with the feelings of tension which manifest themselves as a sense of 'inferiority' and 'guilt'. In this way goaded on by the id, hemmed in by the super-ego and rebuffed by reality the ego struggles to cope with its economic task of reducing the forces and influences which work in it and upon it to some kind of harmony and we may well understand how it is that we so often cannot repress the cry. 'Life is not easy'. When the ego is forced to acknowledge its weakness it breaks out into anxiety, reality anxiety in face of the external world, moral anxiety in face of the super-ego and neurotic anxiety in face of the strength of passions in the id."

Since according to Freud man is vicious by nature, being swayed by an unlimited and passionate sexual desire, he is compelled to deny that our higher activities like art, science, religion or philosophy have any intrinsic worth or merit of their

own. He has tried to show in his book Civilization and its Discontents that these activities are attempts of man to compensate for his unsatisfied sexual desires. They are no more than a useful sop for salving his wounded instincts. They have their root in the evil nature of man which he is unable to express in an undisquised form. Conscience is the result of instinctual renunciations. Its verdict is based on the nature of instincts which society feels to be most dangerous to it. Religion is a desire for a heavenly father necessitated when the earthly father fails us in youth. Ethics and morality is a barrier imposed by society to hold in check the undesirable instincts. Reasoning of all kinds is rationalizing and a compensation for the instincts that are denied expression. We prove things to be true when we want them to be true. Art is needed "to create illusions" and to protect man against the unbearable reality of things. "These illusions are derived from the life of phantasy". "At the head of these phantasy pleasures stands the enjoyment of works of art". Art is "a mild narcotic", a "temporary refuge from the hardships of life". Intellectual activity is also a compensation for thwarted instinctive desires, Our views on abstract questions, on right and wrong are determined by the instinctive desires whose substitute gratification is being sought. The evil impulses of man, according to Freud, create a big necessity for him to delude himself by means of the so-called higher activities that they are being satisfied, without satisfying them actually, in order to be able to pacify an oppressive society. The higher activities are not higher but they are unreal and illusory substitutes for our real desires. In short man must choose one of the following three alternatives:-

- To give full expression to the shameful urge of his nature and become as wicked and licentious as he desires. Of course the society will inflict disgrace, degradation and censure upon him but let him try not to mind these things if he can.
- (2) To repress his sexual desires in order to be able to please the society and thereby expose himself to the danger of suffering from nervousness, hysteria, obsessions, worries, neurosis and madness.

(3) To renounce his instinctive desires and try to deceive himself by such substitute activities as art, religion, science and morality which, he must remember, are, as a matter of fact, no more than illusions devoid of any merit or worth of their own.

Obviously Freud portrays a very miserable picture of the human being. He depicts him as an intellectual beast doomed to misery or madness if he does not deceive himself by using all his intellectual powers that the desires of his intractable evil nature are being satisfied.

But matters need not be as thoroughly bad as he has represented them to be. The apparently distorted and disappointing view of Freud about the lot of man and the value and worth of our higher activities is necessitated by his hypothesis that the nature of our unconscious desires is sexual. If this hypothesis is absurd, the conclusions derived from it must be also absurd. In fact his conclusions cast a further suspicion on the validity of his basic assumptions because when engaged in our higher activities we do not feel that we are deceiving ourselves, or that our pleasure is an illusion. If this had been the case Freud himself would not have devoted the whole of his life to the search for truth.

The passages of Freud quoted above from his *New Introductory Lectures* require only a small modification in order to suit the hypothesis that an ideal of Beauty or Perfection and not sexuality is the urge of the id.

This hypothesis makes the whole theory of the unconscious simple and intelligible. Not only does it fit in with all the facts eminently but it also explains many things which were unintelligible to Freud. Above all it reconciles the conflicting schools of psycho-analysis.

Freud has given an unjustifiably and even a ridiculously wide meaning to the word sexuality. From the beginning the ordinary man has believed, on the grounds of experience, that the sex instinct first manifests itself during adolescence except in the case of some precocious children who are considered as diseased and abnormal. The urge of the unconscious mind is of a permanent nature and in order to give the sex instinct the status of a permanent urge, which remains active from the first day of life to the last, Freud has tried to prove its activity from the earliest childhood by suggesting that such simple activities of the child as swallowing, secreting, sucking the nipple or the thumb are sexual in character. He holds that the child's love for his parents is due to his sexual urge. The child develops a sexual attitude towards the parent of the opposite sex and simultaneously a rivalry towards the other. This he calls the Oedipus complex. When the attitude of the child is the reverse of this Freud suggests that the Oedipus complex, although still sexual in nature, has become inverted. He believes that the function of the sex instinct is not as simple in man as it is in the animal. In man it consists of various component parts that have to fuse into a single whole and often fail to do so. In man, moreover, it has to pass through two periods of development, one commencing from about the age of four and the second beginning just above the age of puberty. In the interval there is the "latency period" during which there is no progress.

Freud assigns a sexual origin not only to all mental and nervous disorders and dreams but also to normal mental processes that have apparently nothing to do with sex. He thinks that the love of ideals, which the child develops later on, is also of a sexual origin, because it is the substitute of the Oedipus complex which disappears gradually yielding place to the love of ideals. Freud makes the Oedipus complex as the very foundation of his whole theory. Ernest Jones justly writes about it, "All other conclusions of psycho-analytical theory are grouped around this complex and by the truth of this finding psyco-analysis stands or falls."

The idea of infantile sexuality, supported as it is, by fantastic arguments, although fundamental to the theory of Freud, has failed to carry conviction with serious students of psychology. Freud was accused of being "sex-mad" of, "reducing everything to sex" or of "pan-sexualism". The worst criticism of psychoanalysis has centred around this point. This is in fact the rock on

which the school of psycho-analysis was shattered into three parties. Adler and Jung, the co-workers and pupils of Freud, found it difficult to agree with their master that the nature of the urge in the sub-conscious was sexual and advanced their own theories about it. Adler maintains that this urge is the impulse to power while Jung seems to hold that it is for both power and sex. The great amount of disagreement that exists among the psychologists in this respect, at least creates a suspicion that none of their theories is perfectly satisfactory and that there is room enough for a fresh theory explaining the nature of the unconscious urge in an entirely different way.

The clue to a different theory is afforded by some of the facts which were observed by Freud himself but of which the true significance he was unable to realize.

We gather from the quotations given above from the writings of Freud that the child loves his parents as "splendid figures", that he feels an "admiration" for his parents and ascribes a "perfection" to them that he loves his teachers because they are "ideal models", that the super-ego (which is a name given by Freud to mental functions causing the love of ideals and which takes the place of the parents' love) "is the advocate of the impulse towards perfection", and that the super-ego demands "an ever-increasing perfection". Is it then too much to say that an individual is under the powerful influence of a desire for the perfect, the admirable and the splendid, throughout his life? In childhood this desire finds an outlet in the persons of the parents and teachers because nothing more perfect and more admirable than them is known to the child. As his knowledge increases he finds other and better objects and ideas worthy of love and devotion and he is naturally attracted by them being compelled by the urge of his nature. The super-ego appears to be demanding an ever increasing perfection of ideals because the child's idea of perfection improves as he grows in years and develops his powers of comparison and thought. His idea ofwhat is perfect grows with knowledge and shifts to better and better objects continuously. This explains why, as the child grows, the parents "lose a good deal of their prestige", why the "super-ego becomes more and more remote from the original

parents", why it becomes more and more "impersonal", and why the child "values his parents differently at different periods of his life". This urge is the cause of the so-called "Oedipus complex" as well as of the "impulse towards perfection" of which according to Freud the super-ego is "the advocate". Superego is not the result of the child's love of parents. On the other hand both the love of parents and super-ego are the result of the urge for perfection in the unconscious.

One of the weakest links in the theory of Freud is his assertion, which he mistakes for an argument, that the super-ego or the mental function responsible for the love of ideals is the substitute of the Oedipus complex in the sense that the former is caused by the latter and is dependent upon it. He skips over the difficulty of proving that it is so and yet assumes it as a fact secure enough to serve him as the very foundation of his theory.

The fundamental attitude of parents towards the child is that of love. Their occasional harshness is also due to love, and the child fully appreciates this fact when he comes of age. If the super-ego is the heir of the parental function why is it that it inherits from that function only harshness (expressed in the rebukes and reproaches of conscience) and nothing of its love and tenderness? Moreover the super-ego is harsh even if the parents have never been harsh to the child on account of their extreme fondness for him. Why is it that the super-ego inherits nothing whatsoever from the parental function in such cases? The Oedipus complex has two aspects—the child loves the parents and also fears them. His fear is the result of his love. What he fears principally is not punishment but the loss of love. Why then does a grown up man fear the super-ego or the ideal and act up to the standards prescribed by it when it does not pay back this effort in terms of love and affection like that of the parents. Why is it that the Oedipus complex in spite of its alleged sexual origin takes such a turn in later life as to emerge in a form which has no relation whatsoever with sex, that is, in the form of a conscience or an ideal of conduct? Freud tells us that the super-ego has a tendency to diverge more and more from the Oedipus complex as time goes on. Why so? If it had been a successor of the Oedipus complex we should have expected it

to conform as much as possible to the character of its origin. Again sometimes the super-ego prescribes ideals which are not only different in form, but also opposed to the wishes and desires of the parents. These facts are inexplicable if we assume that the love of ideals is not an independent natural urge in man but is the resulting substitute of the so-called Oedipus complex. Freud himself writes:—

"I cannot tell you as much as I could wish about the change from the parental function to the super-ego.....partly becausewe ourselves do not feel we have fully understood it" \*

The change from the parental function to the super-ego is not clear to Freud because of his persistence at all costs in the belief that the desires in the unconscious mind are of a sexual nature. He could not ascribe a sexual basis to the urge for ideals without asserting that the super-ego is the result of the Oedipus complex which has a sexual nature. This is no doubt a far-fetched idea.

Here there was a sufficient ground to expect that the cause of the super-ego may not be the accident of the Oedipus complex but something deep down in the nature of man in which we may discover the cause of the Oedipus complex as well. But unfortunately Freud missed the clue and lodged himself into difficulties. All the above facts are explained easily when we assume that the unconscious urge is for an ideal of Beauty and Perfection and the super-ego is the representation or interpretation of the desires of the id by the ego. The love of an ideal is directly caused by the pressure of the unconscious desire for Perfection and Beauty and is a natural function of the mind independent of the so-called "Oedipus complex" which is itself caused by it. The unconscious urge for Perfection or Beauty is permanent. It functions in childhood as well as throughout the rest of the life of an individual. It finds satisfaction in various objects ranging from the parents and teachers to the highest ideals depending upon the stage up to which the ego has deve-

Freud, New Intoductory lectures, p. 85.

loped its knowledge of the perfect at any time. This hypothesis explains the cause of infantile repressions and thereby dispenses with the highly-disputed theory of infantile sexuality which Freud had advanced as an explanation of such repressions.

Freud stretches our imagination rather too much when he explains the child's love for his parents as due to sexuality. It is indeed possible that the child may sometimes love the parent of the opposite sex slightly more than the other parent, but it may be largely due to the fact that the parent of the opposite sex loves the child more than the other parent does and the child merely returns this extra attachment on his or her part. We may even concede that there may be an increased attachment for the parent of the opposite sex on the part of the child even on account of his own sex inclinations particularly in precocious children, but the fact that the child generally loves both his parents almost to the same extent and sometimes the parent of the same sex more than the parent of the opposite sex and that the child may love other persons too like teachers, etc., who are concerned in his up-bringing and whom he regards as perfect and admirable irrespective of their sex, does point to a source of love in him which should be different from sexuality. Obviously the child's love is turning on some internal desire for perfection, which cannot but find an outlet in the persons of his parents and teachers for the time being.

The ego forms an ideal at every stage of its life and the nature and the standard of perfection of its ideal depend upon the amount of knowledge and experience it has gained at any particular time. Naturally, on account of the child's limited knowledge and his proximity to some superior, authoritative and affectionate persons (whom he understands as his parents and teachers) he cannot think of any other models of Perfection, Love and Goodness except them. This first ideal of the child has to be given up by him quite naturally as his knowledge increases and he comes to know of certain other objects, persons or ideas more satisfactory than this. The urge of the id is to love the best that is lovable, to love the object of the highest beauty and perfection known to the self at any time, be it the parents, the teachers or the ideals of ever-increasing perfection.

But the question arises if the unconscious urge is for Beauty or Perfection and not sex, how are we to explain the fact that Freud actually discovered in his experiments that some of his nervous patients were actually suffering from sex repressions or that the treatment to which they were subjected on this assumption actually brought about the cure in very many cases?

## It can be explained as follows:-

Attraction, love, or the search for Beauty is the principal urge of consciousness and this urge has been manifesting itself at every stage of evolution in a manner suitable to and consistent with that stage. There is every truth in the Biblical saying that "God is Love". Hate or Repulsion is the negative aspect of this urge. It indicates a direction opposite to that in which life is moving, opposite to that of love. Consciousness has made use of its own urge of Attraction and its opposite. Repulsion for pushing itself through every stage of its own evolution. Attraction and Repulsion have both been essential for the progress of life at every stage and they will remain essential for the future progress of life as well. These two tendencies in some form or shape form the characteristics of all life. In the material stage life developed the physical laws which can be explained as various forms of attraction and repulsion. We see evidence of it in the affinities of atoms, in a chemical action, in the attraction between the opposite poles of magnets, or the opposite charges of electricity, in the force of gravitation and in all fundamental properties of matter. In the animal stage life evolved the instincts. All instincts are similarly fashioned by life out of its own urge for love and its antithesis hate. While other instincts share the principal urge of consciousness, viz., its urge of love for beauty, by implication and as tendencies subservient to it, a part of the sex instinct—that part on account of which the animal is first attracted to the mate and made available for the later sexual act-is fashioned directly out of this urge. In the operation of the sex instinct, that is, the initial part is played by the attraction for the beautiful. When in the course of evolution the instinct passes on to-man in whom the urge of consciousness comes into its own for the first fime and gains the freedom to seek the real and the final object of its desire,

that is, Beauty or Consciousness, the instinct acquires a force and a meaning which it did not possess in the animal stage.

Sex instinct is to be found in both man and animal but it does not cause nervous diseases in the animal, because there it functions with its normal strength. But in man, in the period of adolescence in particular, the instinct of sex gets an influx of energy from the urge of consciousness which seeks beauty and is; therefore, too ready to flow into the channel of the sex instinct which is fashioned out of the urge for beauty and to express itself erroneously in the love of the mate. The very first joy of love which a man or a woman feels for his or her mate is not sexual in character. It is spiritual as can be understood from the nature of the pleasure attending it, which is akin to the pleasure we derive from the contemplation of a beautiful work of art. The pleasure derived from sex gratification is of a different quality. The idea of sex comes later on when the first, spiritual sort of attraction, has served its purpose of bringing together the male and the female. When on account of the proximity of the male and the female the sex instinct becomes active, the original spiritual pleasure makes room for the lower sexual pleasure: Nature has no doubt utilised the larger desire for beauty in all life, the principle quality of attraction in consciousness, for attracting the male and the female towards each other for the procreation of the race. This is to be found not only in man but also in birds and insects, in whom the beauty of colour, song or plumage is the agency which attracts the male to the female. The sex desire is initiated by a desire for beauty. When the urge of consciousness is not having its own expression, a man feels a sort of repression on account of the force of his unconscious desire for Beauty and it appears to him that he can relieve himself by free sexual indulgence, but such a laxity is really harmful to him as the urge that really seeks expression is that of consciousness and not that of sex. We know that the urge of self generally does not know the real object that can satisfy it and commits mistakes frequently. If the self is not already familiar with its own ideal it mistakes the first attraction for the mate, in adolescence in particular, as the most satisfactory object and gives itself up to it, completely, the urge of self having a full expression in it for the time being. But since the mate cannot be

the real object of the self's desire, the love of self is unable to run a smooth course and before long there is disillusionment and disappointment and sometimes a serious mental conflict and nervous disorder.

It appears to us as if the repression of the sex urge is the cause of all these miseries, but really their cause is the obstruction of the urge of consciousness which is for Beauty, Goodness and Perfection. That is why people disappointed in love find satisfaction in higher and altruistic activities and ultimately forget their love disappointments and that is why people devoted to such activities are able to control easily their sex desires. People who are trained to give suitable expression to their urge of self need not suffer from mental conflicts or nervous diseases at all. All our interests in stories of love, in fiction, novels, poetry and drama is due to the urge of self finding as expression in sex love, and thereby giving the latter a special meaning. Life is made by the urge of self and not by the urge of sex.

The arrangement of nature by which the sex instinct happens to share something of the urge of consciousness, that is, something of the spiritual, serves a useful purpose, as the peculiar joy that a man or a woman feels in the smooth course of his or her first attraction for the mate, which has not yet been replaced by the inferior kind of pleasure derived from the actual sexual act that follows this attraction, makes the self familiar with the nature of the joy that will be experienced by it in the love of Consciousness and therefore serves as a guide and a stimulant to the urge of self. When a man has once experienced the joy of an intense, pure and sincere love for a woman and when being ultimately disillusioned after a failure or a success, he wants to replace it by the love of his Creator through a course of prayers and devotions, he succeeds more readily than a man who has never gone through an experience of such an intense love. He discovers soon that a joy similar to his previous joy but surpassing it by far in quality and intensity, is animating him gradually more and more. To love sincerely and passionately is a great virtue, whatever the object of love. It gives a free and full expression, at least once in our life, to an urge which we need most of all to express. Such a love is bound to end in an intense

love for the Creator. The fact that the urge of self gets mixed up with the urge of sex explains why Freud regards the sex instinct in man as complicated and composed of various parts which have to fuse into an entity but seldom do so. If the urge of id had been for sex, then free sexual indulgence should have given us a complete satisfaction while actually it makes us miserable in the long run because we feel that we have ignored and violated our ideal. The ideal satisfies one aspect of our desire for Beauty and the sex love, if a part of the urge of consciousness is finding expression through it, satisfies another, but at the same time the sex love comes into a clash with our desire for the ideal. This gives rise to a mental conflict because we want to satisfy two conflicting desires at once. These desires are really a single desire and are meant to be satisfied by a single object of love, the Divine Self, but we make them two desires because we are not able to see the whole of Beauty in our Ideal for the time being and feel in a hurry to satisfy them at once. Complete satisfaction can come to us only when our ideal is able to satisfy the whole of the urge of consciousness for Beauty and that is possible only when we are able to feel increasingly the Beauty of Consciousness, the Perfect Ideal.

Nervous disorders are caused by the obstruction of the urge of consciousness and not by the repression of the urge of sex which in its unmixed form is no more than a biological function as simple and harmless as in the lower animals. But frequently and in youth in particular, the urge of consciousness finds an expression in the love of the mate, so that the sex attraction is tremendously enhanced. The nervous disorders will be caused whenever the urge of self is suppressed or obstructed on account of the wrong choice of the ideal or on account of insufficient vision, impression or appreciation of the beauty of the Right Ideal. We are miserable whenever our desire for an ideal cannot find a full expression, whether the ideal is a mate or duty or the approval and admiration of society, sought through position, power or anything else.

What causes the worry or the nervous trouble is that the whole of the love of self is not being utilised by the ideal and a portion of it is being attracted by one of the instinctive desires

making what is really one desire into two conflicting desires pulling the self in opposite directions. This happens when the ideal lacks intrinsic beauty or when its beauty is not sufficiently felt. All individuals having the same ideal do not love it equally. The beauty of the same ideal is felt differently by different persons at the same time and by the same person at different times. It is important to note that sex is not the only impulse that competes with the ideal in the case of a mental conflict. Sex instinct is only one of so many other instincts which come into a clash with the impulse for an ideal. The conflict may be caused equally by other impulses when they are competing with the ideal and dividing a portion of the self's love. The shell-shock cases in the first World-War were due to the instinct of a self-preservation vying with the ideal or the love of duty.

The conflict can be made impossible by increasing our love for the ideal whatever the ideal may be.

But there can be no love unless there is faith, which means a feeling or vision of the ideal's beauty and this ultimately depends upon what intrinsic beauty the ideal has. The nearer an ideal is to Beauty or Consciousness the greater the possibility of our loving it completely and constantly.

A patriotic soldier risks his life in the battle-field because he is convinced that it is his duty to do so. Duty is the call of the ideal and his ideal is his country. He desires to perform his duty because he loves his ideal. It depends on the strength of his love how far he will go in risking his life and performing his duty. If his attraction to the ideal is very great, that is, if he has really a vision of the ideal's beauty, the desire to perform his duty will be strong enough to oust all other desires, including his desire to preserve his life. If on the other hand his attraction for the ideal is weak, a part of the urge of self will find expression in the love of life and there will be a conflict between two desires, one for the ideal goading him to lay down his life and the other for the preservation of life itself, goading him to run away. The conflict will reach its maximum when the shell bursts near the soldier resulting in what is known as a shell-shock.

The soldier has no faith in the ideal probably because the ideal has no permanent value for him. He thinks, for example, that all will end with his death and he will not be rewarded for losing his life. In such a case his ideal is imperfect and lacks the qualities of Beauty one of which is permanence so that the soldier is unable to be deceived by it. The Right Ideal, since it contains all the qualities that we desire (that being precisely the reason why it is the Right Ideal) is capable of attracting us in such a way that no instinctive desire is able to compete with it and make a conflict possible.

If, on the other hand, the soldier's attraction to the ideal of his country is very great he will readily lay down his life for it and will fight willingly while the shells are breaking all around him. He will not suffer from a shell-shock because his urge for Beauty is being satisfied completely by a single ideal throughout. In such a case, although his ideal is imperfect yet, in his error, he invests it with all the qualities of the Perfect Ideal. He is mistaken. He may be deceiving himself, for example, by persuading the belief that he will become immortal by sacrificing his life for his country or that he wants nothing besides the good of his countrymen which will be permanently achieved by fighting to death.

Let us take another example in which the sex impulse is involved.

Supposing an orderly and law-abiding man falls in love with the wife of his neighbour. The approval of society is the ideal of his life and he loves this ideal. His ego interprets beauty in the form of this ideal and hence all his actions are dictated by it. If his attraction for the ideal is strong enough it will succeed in curbing all other desires, which come into a clash with it including his love for the woman. If his love for the ideal is not sufficiently strong a portion of the urge of consciousness will find expression in the sexual impulse towards the woman. What was really one desire, for the Right Ideal, will be thus split up into two desires, opposite and conflicting in their nature, one for the approval of the society and the other for the woman's love. The result will be a mental conflict and a dissociation of the mind manifesting itself in a nervous disorder. The trouble is caused by the fact

that the man lacks sufficient faith in his ideal. He fears his ideal on account of his long attachment to it and yet thinks that it will be unable to reward him sufficiently for the sacrifice of his sexual impulse. The psycho-therapist and the patient are both to be excused if they think that the nervous trouble is caused by the repression of the sexual impulse because the apparent circumstances are such, but the real cause of the trouble is that his ideal is incapable of giving the fullest expression to his urge for beauty. He cannot love his ideal as much as his nature wants him to love it. He will be cured if we manage to increase his love for the existing ideal, that is, his regard for the approval of the society or, if he can no longer be deceived by this ideal and considers it very low in the scale of beauty, by making him feel the beauty of a higher, more beautiful and more attractive ideal which requires good intentions towards one's neighbours, say the love of the Creator. The ideal which is capable of absorbing the whole of our love permanently without deceiving us is the Right Ideal, and the love of that alone can make nervous diseases impossible.

The psycho-therapist may tell the man to give up his repression and have a liaison with the woman. But this will be a most dangerous advice and a very harmful method of treatment. It will make him worse. The doctor will diminish the patient's love for his ideal of society's approval and reduce its beauty in his eyes, so that for a short time the whole of the urge of his self will run into his sexual impulse and the woman will become his sole ideal. In this way the conflict will disappear, temporarily but, since the woman cannot fill the place of the ideal in his heart permanently, the man will be as a matter of fact preparing himself for a bigger trouble. When his sex impulse is satisfied it will lose its charm and the man will find that it is unable to satisfy the whole of his urge of self for perfection. He will, therefore, return for the full satisfaction of the urge of his self to his ideal and find it wounded and violated. This will make the man extremely dissatisfied with himself and, therefore, extremely miserable. This is another conflict. It is only a foolish psycho-therapist who will treat his patient by asking him to give up his repressions in this way.

In the case of a mental conflict, the urge of our self is divided into two parts and, by playing the libertine, we express one part of it but suppress the other which is the more important part, ultimately, and, therefore, make ourselves worse. The desire to be moral is not the result of social pressure but it is caused by our inner urge for beauty. It is the complete expression of this urge that can cure a neurosis. We are afraid of the society because we identify beauty with the approval of the society, and we cannot get rid of this fear by the persuasions of a half-witted doctor unless we see a greater beauty elsewhere. The neurotic person suffers not because he is unable to reconcile himself to society and its standards but because he is unable to reconcile himself to himself. His libido is always compelling him to seek beauty and he cannot quarrel with it. He suffers from a conflict when, owing to the error of the ego, it appears to him that he can satisfy the libido by two opposite impulses. The soldier who suffered from shell-shock could save himself by running away from the battle-field, but his desire for beauty which takes the form of the society's approval holds him to his post. If the pressure had not been internal, he could have easily given it up and made himself confortable. He cannot be happy by breaking loose from the standards imposed by the society because the approval of the society satisfies 'his' desire for beauty. A respectable man cannot indulge in sexual laxity for the same reason. Libertinism starves the desire for beauty instead of satisfying it. The desire for Beauty is much too large to be satisfied by sexual indulgence. The sex instinct in its pure form is capable of being satisfied completely like every other instinct but the desire for Beauty is infinite and insatiable. Patriotism is really the last resort of scoundrels in very many cases. The reason is that the man who has led the life of a rake and has continually thwarted his urge for Beauty wants to compensate for the wrong he has lone to himself by resorting to higher altruistic activities.

The fact that free sexual indulgence cannot cure a neurosis is a further indication that our unconscious urge is not of a sexual nature, otherwise sexual gratification should have proved an effective cure for it.

Is the pleasure derived from our higher activities an illusion?

Freud admits that we derive a joy and a pleasure from our higher activities. This pleasure is sometimes much greater than the pleasure derived from the satisfaction of those desires of which these activities are alleged to be illusory substitutes. The question arises why should our natural instinctive desires become at all transformed into a shape entirely different from their original character-and why should they yield us any pleasure at all when they have thus changed their nature? How is it that the higher activities, that is, the activities of which the object is the search for Beauty, Goodness and Truth, alone, in exclusion to all others, are capable of taking the place of the renounced instinctive desires and of giving us a satisfaction enough to serve as a substitute for the abandoned satisfaction of our instincts? There must be some reason for it inherent in our nature. The fact does not seem to have been sufficiently realized that nothing (unless it is an abnormal and diseased activity which can be surely distinguished from a normal and healthy activity of the higher type like art, philosophy or science), can please or satisfy us if it does not meet a direct demand of our nature, and that it can please or satisfy us only to the extent to which it meets that demand. We cannot sublimate our desire for food into a desire for reading or playing permanently. Our higher activities no doubt satisfy a natural, independent and direct desire for Beauty, a desire which is surging like a stormy ocean in the unconscious mind and which is often misrepresented by the ego as sexual or other desires. They are not the sublimated versions of our sexual desires but they are rather the original, normal desires of the self, which like all our natural desires press for satisfaction and give pleasure when satisfied. The pleasure derived from their satisfaction is so comprehensive that we forget our lower desires. Unfortunately, Freud has reversed the reality. He regards the normal and real desires of the unconscious as unreal and the desires which are the abnormal mistaken representations by the ego of the real desires of the unconscious e.g., the exaggerated sexual desires, are considered by him as real.

The phenomenon of "sublimation" in the sense of a transformation of desires does not exist. What happens in the so-called "sublimation" is not that our lower desires are converted or

transformed into higher desires, as if by a feat of magic, but it is that we begin to satisfy our higher desires in such a way that, on account of the satisfaction derived from them, we are able to neglect or ignore the lower desires successfully. We know that our instincts are fashioned out of the urge of self. They are tendencies which exist already in the nature of consciousness. Consequently when we manage to satisfy the urge of consciousness properly, that is, when moral action or worship or the pursuit of art, knowledge or science becomes a source of real pleasure to us, our instinctive desires get an alternative satisfaction and their own strength is reduced to a minimum. They are no longer a source of trouble to us and, if we choose, we can neglect them easily, of course, some of them more easily than others, depending, in some degree, upon the character and shape of the higher activity in which we are engaged. Neglect makes these instinctive desires still weaker till ultimately they appear to have ceased to exist. Because every instinctive tendency has a second life in the urge of self, we secure by a full satisfaction of this urge, a substitute satisfaction for the abandoned satisfaction of the instinct. The desires prompting our higher activities are always there but we neglect them, owing to an error and try (never successfully) to get all the joy and pleasure that their satisfaction can bring us, from the satisfaction of our lower instinctive desires. In the case of so-called "sublimation" the lower desires are brought well under control because the urge of self is having its proper satisfaction.

The assumption that Beauty and not sex is the urge of the unconscious, explains, therefore, the satisfaction derived from higher activities and their capacity to relieve the repression and bring peace to the mind. What is more, it removes all the divergence and incompatibility between the id, the super-ego and the reality on account of which Freud had imagined the lot of man to be so miserable. On this view we understand, moreover, that man is thoroughly good by nature. He need not be miserable or suffer from nervous diseases if he rightly understands his unconscious urge. The demand of the id not the satisfaction its strong untamed sexual passions. It has no such passions. Its only passion, which is of course, very strong, is the love of the Truly Beautiful.

The ego represents the outside world to the id for the satisfaction of its desires. The id demands the satisfaction of its desires but being out of contact with the outside world it does not know how these desires can be fulfilled. The ego interprets these desires and tries to satisfy them as best as it can. It is the agent of the id and looks around for beauty and tries to achieve it for the satisfaction of the id. The task which the id entrusts to the ego is very great and difficult since it has only a vague knowledge of what the id really wants. The ego tries its best to perform this service as ably and as efficiently as it can. It makes the wisest conjectures and estimates of its desires that it can. This function of the ego is the super-ego. The conjectures of the ego are the ideals. The continuous, strenuous efforts of the ego in this direction have created the whole of our history and all the knowledge that we have. The ego is always busy in searching for the object that is most satisfactory to the id. The reason is that for this service to the id it expects a great reward which is the enjoyment of friendship and terms of peace with the id and this is its greatest desire. In addition to that, it expects its own enlargement and extension and a share in the power of the id which is very great. Should the ego perform its service correctly it will get happiness and power in return for it.

The only knowledge of the object desired by the id with which the ego starts on its great search is that this object will satisfy the id perfectly and that it is something great and beautiful. With such a scanty knowledge the ego is bound to err frequently and its first error is that which Freud calls the Oedipus complex; the ego takes the parents for the model of all excellence and beauty. The error works well for a number of years, but as the ego develops its knowledge, the parents seem to it to be less and less satisfactory to the id. Then the ego recommends other objects to the id. Frequently it identifies with Beauty objects which are really lacking in the qualities of Beauty and which consequently do not satisfy the strong passions of the id in the long run. The urge of the id is very strong and therefore, the id feels extremely disappointed and discontented when the super-ego identifies itself with wrong ideals which do not relieve the urge of the id and do not give it a permanent happiness. Every time that the ego makes a fresh

choice, however erroneous it may be, it sincerely believes that it has after all discovered what must make the id happy. id, not knowing the exact nature of the object so recommended by the ego, takes it (in its blindness) for its own desire and makes friends with the ego. Thereupon both of them go on happily with each other and advance a long way in the direction of their common ideal, till contact and intimacy with the ideal reveal to the ego and id the qualities of Beauty that it is lacking. The id discovers that the object recommended to it by the ego was unsatisfactory to its nature and there is a split between the ego and the id whiich we call a shock, a worry or a nervous dis-order. A shock or a worry is a condition of the id's non-cooperation with the ego in its search after the object that it had recommended. The ego there-upon tries to recommend another object immediately, if it can, but frequently the new object is not addequate or else the id is not free to love or appreciate its beauty-becuase it has not been able to disengage itself (its love) from the object that had caused the disappointment and therefore the nervous dis-order continues. It is a sort of a revenge on the part of the id against the ego for misrepresenting Beauty and misusing a part of the energy of the id. A mental conflict arises when there is the absence of harmony between the ego and the id. Particular incidents which cause the disappointment of the id are, so to say, remembered by it in the form of repressions or complexes as grievances against the ego as if the id feels that it has been betrayed by the ego and left in the lurch. This makes the ego miserable as the personality is divided.

The id and the ego together constitute the whole consciousness or self of man. The super-ego is merely a function of the ego by means of which it holds up ideals and norms of behaviour. The super-ego would have been a needless discrimination except for the fact that a separate name draws attention to an important function of the ego. The ego performs this function by virtue of the push it receives from the id towards beauty. The real force of which the ego and the super-ego are the products is the id. The ideals are the ego's interpretations of the object desired by the id. They are the ego's ideas of the highest beauty which it forms from time to time. The self is thorough-

ly good by nature and wants to push itself towards the Truly Beautiful with perfect internal harmony which is broken only on account of the errors of the ego. All the miseries of man and all the evil in the world are due to the sincerely committed mistakes of the ego in translating the desires of the id.

When a tension arises between the ego and the id it can be removed, before it produces its worst results in the form of nervous diseases, if the person has an immediate recourse to a sincere repentance, and prayers and devotions to the Divine Self. That will be only a case of the ego returning to Beauty, the real desire of the id. This restores the id to peace and contentment and makes the ego independent of the super-ego, that is, independent of its own misrepresentations of the id's desires. Sincere prayers are not possible without faith, or what is the same thing, without a vision or knowledge of Beauty, which is a matter of development. Regular habits of devotions and prayers are therefore a safeguard against possible attacks of nervous diseases as well as a cure for them. The id is too ready to make peace with the ego as soon as it finds that it is serving it aright, as if it is generous and quickly accepts the repentance and the entreaties of the ego. Its grievances disappear as soon as the ego mends its ways and begins to seek beauty. The ego and the id become friends as their quarrel is reconciled. The conflict disappears and the self (that is the ego plus id) is able to move forward towards Beauty, the common goal of its two parts. When it does so the 1d gets greater and greater expression till the whole of it becomes the ego. The unconscious mind rises into the conscious and, thereby, the satisfaction and the power of the conscious mind are enhanced immensely. This process known as the highest liberation or evolution of the self, leads to the greatest happiness known to man.

Freud admits the value of prayers and devotions in altering the relation between the various regions of the mind and says that psycho-analysis attempts to achieve much the same. He writes:—

"It can be easily imagined too that certain practices of the mystics may succeed in upsetting the normal relations

between the different regions of the mind, so that, for example, the perceptual system becomes able to grasp relations in the deeper layers of the ego and in the id which would otherwise be inaccessible to it. Whether such a procedure can put one in possession of ultimate truths from which all good will flow can be safely doubted. All the same we must admit that the therapeutic efforts of psycho-analysis have chosen much the same method of approach for their object is to strengthen the ego, to make it more independent of the super-ego, to widen its field of vision and so to extend its organisation that it can take over new portions of the id. Where id was there shall ego be".

We have said enough so far to be able to assert against the writer that the clue to the 'ultimate truths from which all good will flow' does lie in the power which the practices of the mystics possess to alter the normal relations between the different regions of the mind and that he is not at all safe in doubting or under-rating the importance of his observation. If we follow up the clue it must certainly lead us to the conclusion that the real desire of the id is Beauty and not sexuality. This fact, when known, will make a huge difference in our knowledge of human nature and enable us to solve many intricate problems of human life which have so far baffled all solutions.

Prayers and devotions not only prevent nervous diseases but also possess a genuine therapeutic value for their treatment and psycho-analysis, although very valuable as a method of discovering the buried impulses and bringing them to light, does not constitute the whole treatment. The method of psycho-analysis has to be revised in the light of the truth that the unconscious urge is for Beauty. It has to be supplemented by prayers and devotions as a necessary part of the treatment based on the true and natural relationship between the ego and the id. The success of psycho-analysis all by itself in effecting a cure is doubtful unless it is employed by an expert psychotherapist. But, even if it succeeds, its cure must be temporary because it does not fortify the patient against future attacks

and does not remove the real cause of the trouble swhich is the choice of wrong ideals, unsatisfactory to the id. No physician can ignore the fact that prevention is always better than cure. In the case of nervous disorders prevention can be secured not by psycho-analysis but by regular habits of prayers.

Unless the ego chooses beauty for its ideal, it is sure to make the id miserable again. The ultimate deliverance of the id depends upon the right choice of the ego, whenever it is made. The "less ideal situation" mentioned by Freud in a quotation given above in which "the rider is obliged to guide his horse in the direction in which it itself wants to go" is not the result of what the horse (id) wants to do but of what the rider (ego) does, owing to an error. The rider and the horse, always want to go in the same direction, the one leading to their common destination, but the rider commits frequent mistakes and misquides itself as well as the horse. Such mistakes. when discovered, create shocks and nervous diseases. If the ego succeeds in making the right choice, it gives satisfaction to the id and draws the id's libido on to itself "The id becomes the ego and the ego is installed where id was". The individual becomes a highly dynamic personality possessing powers not known to other people. The prayers detach the ego from the influence of wrong ideals and thereby give it relief and also pacify the id. This also explains why certain mystics are able to give information of future events at particular occasions. As Freud says the "laws of space and time do not operate on the id". When, therefore, the ego becomes the id, it rises above space and time, so that the present and the future, and the distant and the near become alike to it.

The fundamental cause of a nervous trouble is the choice and the love of a wrong ideal. The cure achieved through psycho-analysis is also ultimately due to the patient having changed his ideal. It is claimed that the mere recall of the repressed desire effects the cure. It is quite intelligible. The patient forgets the painful experience because he wants to forget it on account of its painfulness with the result that a portion of the energy of love in the unconscious is locked up in the thwarted and forgotton impluse. It is not available for a new ideal although the patient would very much like to love a new ideal

in order to start life afresh and give up every thing that caused the trouble. As soon as the forgotten experience is recalled, the patient knows what was the wrong with him. He compares his previous ideal with the present one and gives up the previous ideal as unsatisfactory and troublesome with the result that the locked up energy is at once liberated and made available for the new ideal. The wholeness of the mind is restored. The suggestion and consolation of the physician play an important part in the treatment because they help the patient to change his ideal or to start on a new road. What we need for the prevention of future nervous troubles is to have an ideal which we can love completely and continuously and which we never require to change. It is to the change of ideal that Freud refers when he says that psycho-analysis attempts to make the ego more independent of the super-ego and to widen its field of vision. Absolute independence of the super-ego is impossible for the ego. The super-ego merely presents another ideal instead of the one that had caused the trouble and that is the sense in which the ego's field of vision is widened.

It is well-known that in very many cases a patient is made worse by psycho-analysis. The reason is that psycho-analysis can succeed only if the patient's ideal has changed between his illness and treatment. If he cannot be made free from the impulses causing the trouble or, which is the same thing, if his ideal is not raised higher, bringing the complex to light is certain to make the patient worse. This fact indeed corroborates the view that the real cause of the cure does not consist so much in the discovery of the conflict as in the changing or raising of the ideal. When the complex is brought to light the portion of the self's love which was attached to the lower ideal is directly attached to the higher one, with which the self has now learnt to identify itself. Thus all the emotions are placed at the service of the self which, therefore, begins to function as a whole once more. We see the result of it in the form of an increased efficiency of the individual. because he is enabled to give the whole of his love to his ideal. The skill of the psycho-analyst consists in recalling the forgotten circumstances which led to the conflict. The cure is due to the developed self-knowledge of the patient helped by the influence of the physician suggesting verbally or by his mere presence and

the atmosphere around him that he is no longer swayed by the impulse that had caused the injury. Neurosis is only an extreme form of our common worries or anxieties. The ultimate cure of all such troubles consists in raising the ideal in the scale of beauty. Repentance and prayers and devotions to the Divine Self are the most effective methods of raising the ideal.

The id may be compared to a blind king whom the circumstances have thrown far away from his kingdom. He wants to return to his country but, unable to see his way back, he has hired a servant (the ego) to help him on the condition that should he succeed in guiding him back to his kingdom rightly, he will share the royal authority with him. From the spot where he his there are innumerable roads leading in different directions all appearing to be equally beautiful but there is only one road which leads right up to the king's country. Every other road is closed at some distance from the starting point or else leads into the territory of deadly enemies or dangerous forests. The servant makes conjectures and leads the king into one road after another but every time both have to return disappointed and disillusioned. Every time that the servant chooses a new wrong road, he does so with all the care and wisdom that he commands and makes perfectly sure that this time he is not mistaken. Therefore, every time both the king and the servant walk happily on the selected road with full confidence that they are approaching nearer and nearer to their destination. The road appears to the servant to possess all the signs of the right road about which the king has supplied a vague sort of information to him. The servant interprets this information in the signs of the road and finds it to be perfectly applicable to them. The only sign that the wrong road happens to be lacking is continuity which they soon discover to their lot. In the absence of continuity all the other signs also prove to be mere illusions.

The right road is that of Beauty. The ego's knowledge of the signs is the super-ego. The troublesome journey backwards after the disvovery of each error is the worry, nervousness or conflict. What psycho-analysis does is to help a quick journey back-wards and to put the ego and the id on a new road but it has no means of making sure that the new road chosen by them

now is the correct one. It cannot prevent future errors and therefore future attacks of nervous diseases.

## THE VIEW OF ADLER

According to Adler the motivating power of all human activity is the instinct of self-assertion which takes the farm of a desire to compensate for a sense of personal inferiority. The ideals of an individual are the goals which he sets before himself in order to assert himself over others. He is of the opion that

"The key to human psychology is the desire to compensate for an unconscious feeling of inferiority. The individual comes into the world weak, insignificant and helpless. Ridiculously ill-equipped in the struggle against nature, he is completely dependent upon his elders for warmth, food and shelter. Moreover, they dominate him psychologically, impressing him with a sense of their superior powers, their knowledge of the world and their freedom to live as they please. For every thing he must turn to them and the dependence thereby engendered imbues him from his earliest year with a sense of personal inferiority. To compensate for this inferiority the child tries to impress himself on his environment. He endeavours to assert himself and become the centre of interest and win the praises of his fellows".

The question arises: Is this desire for self-assertion due to external causes or to the internal nature of the child? If the fact is that the child is accustomed to seeing only superior people around him from the very beginning why is it that he does not reconcile himself to an inferior position and take it as a matter of course and as the only thing that is natural?

Obviously, the child cannot want to assert himself and seek what he considers to be a greatness and a superiority unless it is a part of his nature to regard certain things as great, superior and worthy of effort and achievement as well as to strive for the achievement of those things. It is this part of human nature that we have described above as the urge for Beauty.

And then what is the child's object in gaining this superiority and power. According to Adler his object is that he may win the admiration and praise of his fellow-men and become the centre of their interest which means that with him and with others' the superiority or power that he wants to achieve is something which is praiseworthy, admirable and worthy of being the object of attention and interest. As such the power that the child wants to have is clearly another name for Beauty and the urge of self-assertion in the child is nothing but the urge for Beauty, Beauty, according to our definition, is that something which is the object of self's love, praise and admiration. Power is Beauty, because we love it. Conversely, Beauty is power because it calls forth love and thereby rules and dominates the lover. We have already seen that Beauty is not one quality but a system of qualities which includes power. Power is not a separate kind of Beauty. Beauty has no kinds; it is one and indivisible. Power is a quality of Beauty as well as the whole of Beauty; it includes all the qualities of Beauty. Every quality of Beauty is the whole of beauty and includes all its other qualities. If any quality of Beauty does not contain all its other qualities, it is not that quality at all. A man who has achieved only one quality of Beauty and not the others, cannot get a complete satisfaction in the long run. A powerful man will ultimately have a sense of inferiority, however powerful he may be, if he does not use his power for the achievement of Beauty, Goodness and Truth. Power for this reason is not the ability to be cruel. Power is an ultimate weakness if it is divorced from Truth and Goodness. Similarly, Truth and Goodness have no meaning without Power. No quality of Beauty remains itself when it is excluded from the rest of its qualities. Reality is always pure. A mixture of the real and unreal is unreal. No part of Beauty can be really beautiful unless it possesses all its qualities. We cannot be ultimately satisfied by owning some qualities of Beauty and neglecting others. The urge of our consciousness is for the whole of Beauty and we continue to feel inferior ultimately as long as the whole of it is not satisfied.

Beauty or Conciousness is Power and it is a power which asserts itslef for the realization of its own purposes. On the Divine side the whole course of evolution is a record of this selfassertion. On the human side also it is asserting itself for the realization of the purposes of the individual selves which we have called the ideals. On the human side power will be real power if it is serving the Perfect Ideal. If the ideal is imperfect the power that serves it is also imperfect and unreal because it is unable to achieve perfection. It will only achieve imperfection, defect and ugliness to the extent to which the ideal is imperfect, defective or ugly. It will spend itself in vain, defeat its object, and thus bring about its own ruin. It will be a weakness and not Power. Power is power only to extent to which it is able to achieve Beauty or Perfection. Power is indeed worse than weakness if it cannot be utilized for the achievement of Beauty. In view of these facts it is perfectly true to say that there can be no Power without Beauty and no Beauty without Power.

Since Power is meant for the achievement of the ideal and is measured by its capacity to achieve the ideal, to achieve Power is to achieve the ideal. We frequently mistake power for the prospects or the possibilities of weilding power. But actual power is that which has been actually expended in the achievement of the ideal, It is power only to the extent to which it has actually achieved the ideal. Power, therefore, includes the ideal, it includes Beauty. Power and Beauty are two aspects of one and the same thing. They go hand in hand; in fact they cannot be distinguished from each other. Power itself is the ideal; it is Beauty. Power has no meaning without Beauty and Beauty remains ineffective and meaningless without Power, because then we do not feel its attraction; it has no influence or effect on us. Beauty is Beauty only to the extent to which it is Power. If it does not exert its power on us, if it does not dominate us, rule us or if it does not urge us to action for its achievement it does not attract us and, therefore, it is not Beauty at all.

We want Power for the achievement of our ideal, whatever the ideal may be. Power elates us and gives us a sense of superiority because it is a message that at last we have achieved our ideal and have become as intimate with Beauty as we desired. Because Beauty is unlimited we never imagine that we have enough of Power or enough of Beauty. We want Power for more Power and Beauty for more Beauty. Our desire for Beauty or Power is insatiable because when we have achieved one ideal another rises up before our eyes and thus we go on achieving more Power and more Beauty always.

Power is meant for the ideal and because our ideals are different our ideas of power are also different.

Our desire for power is really a desire for Beauty. We feel inferior and powerless only when we are unable to achieve our ideal. Just consider the various ways in which we assert ourselves for power and superiority and see whether what we really want to achieve by our effort is power or beauty. We have a sense of power and superiority when we win the love or approval of a person possessing admirable qualities, because thereby we feel that we have become sharers in his beauty. To secure the approval and love of society is a very powerful ideal with most people. They want power or position to win this approval. Again, we have a sense of superiority and power when we act morally because we introduce beauty into our actions. We feel superior when we indulge in a truly creative activity like Art and Science because thereby we express beauty or discover beauty. In short all activities in which we seek beauty give us, if successful, a sense of power and superiority. We attain power by seeking beauty and we feel inferior whenever we fail in the search for beauty whatever form it may take because Beauty alone is power. Freud is right when he says that the sense of guilt and the sense of inferiority are exceedingly difficult to distinguish. We feel quilty when we are unable to display our power and we feel inferior when we are unable to reach the object that we consider beautiful. Beauty and Power are, therefore, one and the same. In short the reasoning of Adler leads us even more clearly than that of Freud to the conclusion that Beauty alone is the urge of life. The fact that this hypothesis is a common formula by means of which we can reconcile the two conflicting thories of psycho-analysis is a further assurance of its correctness.

## THE VIEW OF KARL MARX

Karl Marx maintains that all the activities of man are the outcome of his urge for economic needs and that ideals (for which he has used an alternative term, concousness) are no more than distorted representations of this urge. He writes in his preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy:—

"The general result at which I arrived and which once won served me as a guiding thread of my studies can be briefly formulated as follows:

In the social production of their subsistence men enter into determined and necessary relations with each other which are independent of their wills, production relations which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum of their production relations forms the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which a juridical or political structure arises and to which definite forms of "consciousness" correspond. The mode of production of the material subsistence conditions the social. political and spiritual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men which determines their social existence but on the other hand it is the social existence of men which determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into a contradiction with the existing production relations or what is merely a juridical expression for the same thing the property relations within which they have operated before. From being forms of development of the productive forces, these relations turn into fetters upon their development. Then comes an epoch of social revolution. With the change in the economic foundations the whole immense superstructure is slowly or rapidly transformed. In studying such a transformation one must always distinguish between the material transformation in the economic conditions which can be established with the exactitude of natural science and the juridical, political, religious, artistic or philosophic, in

short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. As little as one judges what an individual is by what he thinks of himself, so little can one judge such an epoch of transformation by its consciousness; one must rather explain this consciousness by the contradiction in the material life—the conflict at hand between the social forms of production and the relations in which production is carried on."

Engels, the friend of Marx and the co-creator of his ideas, expresses the same thought more clearly and concisely as follows;-

"Marx discovered the simple fact (heretofore hidden beneath ideological overgrowths) that human beings must have food, drink, clothing and shelter first of all before they can interest themselves in Politics, Science, Art, Religion and the like. This implies that the production of the immediately requisite material means of subsistence and therewith the existing phase of development of a nation or an epoch constitute the foundations upon which the state institutions, the legal outlooks, the artistic and even the religious ideas are built up. It implies that these latter must be explained out of the former, whereas the former have usually been explained out of the latter."

The idea contained in the above extracts is the very soul of the philosophy of Marx since it has served him according to his own confession as "a guiding thread of his studies."

But this idea has no rational justification whatsoever. It gives rise to a number of questions to which no reasonable answer is possible. For example;

(1) Why does the human individual in spite of normal, mental health distort his economic needs into the shape of moral creeds or ideals which have nothing to do with his original economic desires? When an individual is hungry he says that he needs bread. But when he needs to change the existing economic conditions of society and to bring about new economic condi-

tions, why should he not say it openly and why should his understanding become clouded enough to make him forget what he really needs? Why should he fight for the economic change that he desires to bring about unconsciously, indirectly and crookedly in the name of a moral or spiritual ideal and not consciously, directly and straightforwardly for his economic needs when he is only an economic being and not a moral or spiritual being and there is nothing to bar him from doing so. When all the desires of man are of an economic nature, why should he be at all actuated by some desires which are spiritual and moral even apparently and unconsciously? Writes Engels;

"Ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, it is true, but with a false consciousness. The real motive-forces impelling him remain unknown to him. Hence he imagines false and seeming motive forces. As all action is mediated by thought it appears to him that it is based on thought."

But this statement is not an argument, it is only a series of similar assertions. The question is what evidence is there to show that the consciousness of a man who is striving for a moral ideal consciously is false? If no man ever knows or has the means to know that his consciousness of his ideal or creed is false consciousness, how could Marx and Engels know that the consciousness of every man who strives for a creed or an ideal is false and how do they know that their own consciousness of their creed of Marxism is not false? There must be some reason for us to suppose that the real economic motives impelling a man remain concealed from him and that he wrongly imagines some moral and spiritual motives instead of them. Otherwise, we can assume that the moral and spiritual motives of a man are his real motives and his economic motives are subservient to them, especially, when it is a matter of common experience that a man becomes ready to give up his economic motives for the sake of his moral or spiritual motives. Engels does not tell us how he comes to the conclusion that action which appears to a man to be mediated by a moral ideal is not really "based" upon that ideal. What is there to prevent us from believing that the action of Marx and Engels as practical Communists was not really

based on their own creed? Evidently Engels has used the word "thought" in the above extract to imply a creed or an ideal.

- (2) Why do our religious or moral ideals and ideologies, even if they are determined by the economic factor and even if they are unconscious, false and distorted reflections of economic conditions, develop around the abstract ideas of Beauty, Goodness and Truth alone? Why is it that they partake of these very qualities alone in one form or another more or less? Why are they approaching these very qualities more and more as our knowledge of ourselves is growing. These qualities understood to the best of our knowledge, are our common desire whenever we are struggling for a social change whether as French Revolutionaries or as American soldiers in the war of Independence or as the peasants of England headed by Wat Tyler and Jack Straw or as the Communists of Lenin or as the crusaders of Richard or as the Protestants of Luther or as the followers of Colet, Erasmus and more, the leaders of the Renaissance. Even when trying to remove economic maladjustments we express our eagerness for Democracy, Truth, Equality, Fraternity, Liberty, Justice, Morality and such like notions. It is really his desire for these qualities for the sake of which man becomes ready to make tremendous sacrifices including the sacrifice of his life. Whenever man awakes to this desire he discovers it to be far stronger than his desire for food or the desire for life itself. Marx himself acted as an unwitting servant of this desire when he created his revolutionary philosophy infused with a fervour for Justice and Freedom or when he summoned the labourers of the world to action. Throughout his philosophy he has emphasised Justice, Equality and Freedom, abstract slogans which are appropriate to a man of religion. What is it then that bars us from coming to the conclusion that the desire for Beauty, Goodness and Truth and the qualities implied in them is an independent charactertisc of human consciousness? How can the fact that we have to express this desire in moulding actual economic, social, intellectual or political conditions of our life cast a doubt on its independent character?
  - (3) If it is our ideals which serve our fundamental economic

desires and biological impulses with their object of the maintenance of life and not these desires and impulses which serve us for the realization of our ideals, then how is it that people so often become ready to sacrifice their economic needs and biological urges, nay, even their lives for the sake of their ideals?

(4) Reason, which is man's capacity for discovering truth and to which we owe all the knowledge of Science and Philosophy that we have at present, is a part of the "contents of consciousness". According to Marx, its activity is the result of economic desires and not the result of a desire for truth itself. This view is naked irrationalism. It means that when man thinks he can reason independently of economic conditions around him, he is suffering from a delusion and that reason cannot at all discover truth. Why do the Marxians present their philosophy as truth when truth cannot be discovered? How can the philosophy of Marx be true if it is itself the unconscious and distorted reflection of economic conditions?

The Marxians base their philosophy on reason. But if man's reason is obliged to take the direction which is dictated to it by the prevailing economic conditions, then it can have no worth or value of its own and cannot guide us to the discovery of Truth. Then the philosophy of Marx, in so far as it appeals to reason, itself cannot be true. In that case the Marxians have no justification for propagating their philosophy. They are not logical in practice when they spend money on Communist propaganda in capitalist countries. Propaganda is an appeal to reason and is justified only on the assumption that when capitalist countries are converted to ideas of Communism they will bring about a Communist revolution.

The idea of Marx looks plausible and deceives a superficial observer because:—

(1) The urge of hunger is compelling in its nature and comes into existence in the life of the individual as well as in the life of the race long before ideals assume a clear-cut shape and become distinguishable from the instinctive desires.

- (2) People satisfy their hunger and other instinctive desires before they satisfy the immediate and the direct requirements of their ideals because they have to live first of all in the very interest of their ideals.
- (3) In the earlier stages of an individual's self-knowledge his ideal is not of an elevated character and his urge for ideals runs into the channel of his desire for the satisfaction (and even the ever-satisfaction) of his basic economic needs. And even when an individual's ideal is very high in the scale of Beauty, he has generally to satisfy his economic needs as an end subservent to the ideal. Thus the satisfaction of these needs always forms a part of his ideal and colours visibly the manner in which he strives for the realization of his ideal in all its parts and with all its requirements.
- (4) The maladjustment of economic conditions in a society is due to the rule of a wrong ideal. When we become conscous of this maladjustment we become conscious also of those elements of imperfection or incorrectness in the ruling ideal which bring it about. Then we become dissatisfied with the ideal and there is a political revolution the object of which is to establish the rule of an ideal more perfect and more in accordance with our nature in the light of the experience gained. In the new ideal we avoid those elements of ugliness or imperfection in the previous ideal of which we had become conscious on account of the maladjustments which it had produced.

But, evidently, it will be wrong to argue on the basis of these facts that it is our economic needs that grow into the form of our ideals. The human activity is a mixture of two desires—the desire for the ideal and the desire for the satisfaction of the instincts and the fundamental economic needs resulting from them. But it is always the latter desire which subserves the former. The subordinate desire cannot be the fundamental cause of human activity although it has a natural, internal compulsion of its own and exists before the uling desire becomes clearly defined.

There is no doubt that the urge of hunger is compelling in

itself, but we can dominate and we do actually dominate its compulsion whenever necessary. We turn to the satisfaction, of hunger first of all only when the ideal demands it, but when the demand of the ideal is otherwise, hunger becomes our last and the least consideration. Whenever people's ideals are threatened they are prepared to oppose the compulsion of hunger, eat less and make sacrifices of all sorts and even starve themselves to death if it may be necessary for the sake of their ideals. This shows that in the case of the human being the more fundamental and the more ultimate need is the ideal and not hunger. We satisfy our economic needs as means to an end and the end is always the ideal. This remains true in spite of the fact that sometimes the desire for economic superiority itself becomes our ideal. In such a case we are unable to control our desire for wealth because we have no higher, altruistic motives; we are greedy. An ideal is only the ultimate end of our actions. There are innumerable immediate ends which we must achieve before we reach the ultimate end. Each immediate end is essential for the attainment of the final end. It is subservient to the ideal, but when the ideal cannot be achieved without it, it assumes an importance equal to the importance of the ideal itself. Then we attend to it before everything else. It appears to us as if we care for it more than we care for the ideal. As a matter of fact when we are exerting ourselves to achieve an end of this kind we are doing so only for the sake of our ideal. Such is the case with our economic needs. They assume the importance of the ideal when as a help to the ideal they are threatened, but they lose all importance when attending to them means the neglect of the ideal. Then we satisfy the needs of the ideal at their expense; we oppose and counteract the compulsion of economic needs for the sake of the ideal.

It is fortunate that our instinctive desires have an internal biological compulsion of their own. Since their satisfaction is essential for the maintenance of life we would have satisfied them even if there were no such compulsion attached to them. But in spite of this compulsion we do not satisfy them for their own sake but for the sake of our ideals and the proof is that we ignore them whenever the demand of the ideal makes it necessary. We oppose every economic need and every instinc-

tive compulsion, sacrifice everything, including our lives, when our ideals demand this, whether the ideals are wrong or righl, noble or ignoble, selfish or unselfish.

The desire for accumulating wealth wherever it exists is not due to the urge of man to maintain his life. The basic economic needs essential for the maintenance of life are capable of being completely satisfied. When a man accumulates wealth even after he is assured that his basic economic requirements cannot suffer, it is not due to his economic urge but to his misdirecting the urge for ideals towards his econimic desires. In such a case the accumulation of wealth itself becomes his idea of Beauty—his ideal.

There is no doubt, too, that in the history of life the urge of hunger came into existence before the urge of ideals. Ideals are peculiar to man. The instinct of hunger on the other hand has existed ever since the first animal came into existence. In the history of the indiviual human being, too, the urge of hunger exists before ideals assume a clear-cut shape distinguishable from the instinctive desires.

But the existence of the urge of hunger prior to the urge of ideals should indicate the lower and subservient character of the former. Evolution must be always leading towards something better and higher. The process of evolution has its analogy in the growth of a tree. As we move forward we reach what is more valuable and more worthy of preservation; we achieve something for which the lower achievements may be sacrificed, if necessary, or which they may be made to subserve. Although the flower, the fruit and the seed grow last of all in a tree, yet they form the highest and the most valuable products of the tree and the whole growth of the tree is subservient to the purpose of acquiring these products. Just as the urge of instincts in the animal world ruled the laws of matter, so the urge of ideals in the human world rules the laws of instincts. An urge that life develops later in the process of evolution must be the higher and the ruling urge. This is not merely a theory, but we actually see the fact of it-daily in our experience. People frequently rule and sacrifice their instinctive desires for the sake of their ideals.

A hungry man often requires food before he can attend to Religion or Philosophy. But this does not mean that it is a general law of human psychology that our economic needs matter to us more than our ideals, or that the latter are the product of reason is that there are some occasions the former. The when we do not turn to the satisfaction of hunger and other compelling needs of our body first of all and when we become ready to sacrifice them completely for the sake of our ideals. It follows that when we do satisfy our economic needs before everything else we must be doing so consciously or unconsciously for the sake of our ideals and as an end subservient to them so that we may live and realize them. We ignore the force of the ideals although it is always dominating us even in the satisfaction of our economic needs and the reason is that it is rarely that this force runs counter to these needs. But if we are to understand the real natural relationship of the ideal with hunger and other basic economic desires and to formulate a general law of our nature on the basis of it, we must take into consideration those rare cases also in which the needs of the ideal come into conflict with man's economic desires and man ignores his economic desires for the sake of his ideals. For example, we must take into consideration the man who fasts continuously or eats once a day or submits to other such ascetic practices in spite of opulence to please his Creator; or the man who becomes a martyr for his religion or his country or his nation; or the Prophet who preaches devotion to one God to a warlike, idolatrous people at the risk of his life and cannot be bribed into silence by any amount of riches or worldly power; or the prince who leaves the luxury of his palace for a life of extreme hardships in search of nothing but truth. No reasonable explanation of such facts is possible on the Marxist view of human nature.

A Marxist may say that a man who sacrifices his life willingly for his nation or country does so not because his ideal is a force independent of the economic factor but because he believes that his nation, if not he himself, will benefit economically. But this reasoning is extremely fallacious. It does not help us to explain his ideal as an outcome of his desire for food since he foregoes for himself not only food but also his life for the main-

tenance of which food was required by him. Starting originally with the motive of feeding himself better in order to maintain his life, how can he end with destroying himself in order to feed others in a better way? It was more consistent with his original motive to eat less and continue to live himself than to die in order that others may eat more. The fact that he becomes ready to die shows that the desire which enables him to lay down his life is for something which is far more precious to him than mere eating and living on his own part or on the part of those for whom he is alleged to die. The fact that the society benefited economically after the death of the patriot does not prove that he acted for the ake of an economic gain when we know it for certain that he himself had actually spurned such a gain. His action as a member of society cannot but be due to his motives as an individual. The joint action of individuals must obey those very laws of human nature which hold good for each human being separately. A society is nothing but a group o individuals and the action of the soceity is nothing but the sumtotal of the actions of its individual members. This implies that even when an individual is acting in the society and for the society he can act only on account of motives and desires that are his own and for the sake of a benefit that accrues to him personally. Obviously, the patriot dies for the sake of an idea for the sake of a psychological or spiritual benefit and not for any material or economic gain as a Marxist may say. His motive in sacrificing his life is no other than his love for the ideal which dominates all his other loves and desires, even his desire to live on. The benefit that comes to him is the sutisfaction, entirely different in character from the satisfaction we derive from the instincts, of having obeyed his ideal. In the absence of this satisfaction he would have considered himself to be a criminal and would have felt very miserable. The economic gain to the society, if it does come at all, is an incidental result of the nature of the ideal for which he sacrifices himself. He loves his ideal for its own sake and because it is the highest good, the highest beauty known to him. There are innumerable cases in which an individual becomes ready to make all sorts of sacrifices for an ideal of which the nature is such that there is no possibility of any economic gain to anybody as a result of his sacrifices for that ideal

In the earlier stages of our life as individuals as well as in the primitive stages of our history as a race our ideals are not sufficiently advanced and correspond to our instinctive desires so much that they cannot be easily distinguished from them. As long as the level of our self-knowledge is very low, the uge for the ideals and the urge of instincts correspond to each other. The impulse for the ideal finds an expression in the desires of the instincts because nothing more attractive than these desires is known to us. At this stage, therefore, the economic urge is the only urge that is apparent and there are no religious or philosophical creeds determining human action. In fact at this stage the economic urge is more conspicuous in man than it is in the animal because the impulse for the ideal adds to the force of the instinctive desires making them stronger than they really are.

Unlike the animal which sits down quietly when its hunger is satisfied, we, at the lower stages of our self-knowledge, quarrel continuously with each other for a greater and greater satisfaction of these desires for their own sake. This is evidently due to the extra force imparted to them by man's urge for the ideal. For this reason we are apt to overrate the importance of the economic urge and to regard it as the fundamental or the all-important urge in the life of the individual and the race. This has led Marx into the erroneous view of the economic determination of history. As a matter of fact the coincidence of the urge of ideals and the urge of instincts pertains to a particular stage of our development. As our self-knowledge grows beyond that stage the urge of ideals becomes more and more distinguishable from our economic desires. Our ideals begin to rule our basic economic desires, and employ them as an instrument in their own service very efficiently. They rise from a lower to a bigher perfection. They approach nearer and nearer to the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth, which constitute the object of the innate desire of our consciousness. Because our ideals have a source independent of our animal instincts, their development and evolution also follows a law of its own.

According to Marx there are particular religious, philoso-

phical or political creeds or ideals corresponding to every phase of production. But it passes one's comprehension why a phase of production should be accompanied by any philosophical, religious or political creed at all. According to him a political or social revolution is the result of a change in the mode of production or the relations of production, brought about under the influence of new productive forces. When the mode of production changes, the creed also changes along with it. This is a misunderstanding of the whole process of a political or social revolution. The ideals or creeds do not change with the modes of production. What changes first is not the mode of production but the creed or the ideal. When the creed changes, its effects must spread not to the mode of production of a soceity only but to its entire life, for it is the ideal or the creed that controls the whole life of the individual and the society.

Now, why does the ideal change at all? The only view that gives a reasonable, clear and convincing explanation of all the facts is that the ideal changes on account of man's desire for a higher Beauty or Porfedction. It changes because it is discovered to be unsatisfactory, imperfect or lacking in some of the qualities of Beauty on account of the unsatisfactory social conditions that it has created. And the conditions that it has created are found to be unsatisfactory because they, as the product of an imperfect ideal, fail to satisfy the requirements of the urge of self. For example, they reflect some forms of injustice, tyranny, slavery etc., which are qualities opposed to Beauty, Goodness and Truth. The fact that man's desire for Beauty, Goodness and Truth has to express itself in the conditions of his life cannot at all prevent this desire from having an independent character.

All political and social revolutions are due to man's urge for ideals and not to his economic desires. It is this urge that makes us feel what is right and what is wrong, what is desirable and what is undersirable in social conditions. It is this desire that calls attention to the conditions that need to be changed. In its absence we would be contented with anything that happens to be our lot and would act only when compelled by our psycho-

physical dispositions which we possess in common with the lower animals. It gives meaning to conditions whether they are economic or otherwise against which we rebel in the case of social revolutions. The conditions are known as unsatisfactory because of our desire for Beauty and because they are brought about by ideals which are lacking in Beauty and which happen to have gained in power and established their rule.

An ideal is discovered as wrong in the course of action. If it is wrong it makes us act in such a way that we involve ourselves in difficulties, that is, action in obedience to a wrong ideal creates conditions which are unsatisfactory to us. Unsatisfactory conditions whether they are economic, moral, physical or intellectual established by a ruling wrong ideal make us conscious of the unsatisfactory nature of the ideal causing them. The more intolerable the conditions that a wrong ideal brings about the quicker is our realization of the elements of ugliness that the ideal contains. As soon as we become fully conscious of the aspects of imperfection in an ideal, owing to the unsatisfactory conditions brought about by it we proceed to change it, resorting to action as vigorous as possible. This action is aimed at, and results in, a social revolution. So long as we act halfheartedly our consciousness of ugliness in the ideal is incomplete. Having overthrown the rule of the old ideal, which is discovered by us to be wrong, we establish the rule of a new one in which we avoid the elements of ugliness which the old ideal contained. But in the absence of a sufficient knowledge of of the qualities of Beauty and the way in which those qualities can be expressed in our practical social life, while we avoid the known elements of imperfection in the new ideal, we generally introduce some other unknown elements of imperfection into it from which we suffer later on. Under the rule of the Right Ideal leading to a full, practical expression of the qualities of Beauty, there would be no economic maladjustments or other unsatisfactory conditions and there would be no social revolutions and no changes of social formations.

Of course, our ideals remain closely related to our economic needs in this sense that the manner in which we satisfy these needs is one of the ways in which our love for the ideal

expresses itself. The ideal has to rule our economic desires in order to realise itself. Just because we strive for the ideal for its own sake, we cannot help affecting the manner in which we satisfy our economic desires on account of it. This manner is sometimes desirable and sometimes undesirable depending upon the standard of perfection that our ideal has achieved and the approach that it has been able to make to the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth. When it is undesirable, our urge for the ideals tests it and discovers it as such. Then we feel the need to change the ideal that is responsible for it. The change takes place away from those aspects of ugliness and towards those aspects of Beauty of which we have become conscious.

Whenever there is inequality in the distribution of wealth, it is known easily. Very often it is tolerated or rather taken as a matter of course, although it reflects undesirable social conditions. The mere existence of undesirable social conditions or even the existence of the knowledge that they exist is not enough to bring about a change. We have to become conscious of the fact they are undesirable. This consciousness must have its source evidently in some internal standard of what is desirable and what is undesirable, what is wrong and what is right and not in some standard of what is more and what is less economically or monetarily. The consciousness of more or less existed already, but all by itself it was helpless and unable to achieve anything. Of these two kinds of consciousness it is the former consciousness that induces action and not the latter. We act only when the consciousness of what is "desirable" or "right" comes to us although the economic conditions demanding social change may have been known to us to have existed long before the dawn of this consciousness. It is a proof that our action starts fundamentally in the service of this consciousness, this idea and not in the service of any economic gain. This is also proved by the fact that our action intended to bring about a change comes to a stop when the economic gain has reached a definite limit, which limit is again determined by what is "desirable" or "right." If our fundamental object had been to gain economically, then, having once started to act for the achievement of this object, we should have continued to act and to gain economically to any extent. We stop at a certain limit

because we fight essentially for what is right and not for what is more useful economically or what is greater as a mathematical quantity in money. Before opposing a system we judge it as wrong and condemn it. The source of this judgment is a criterion in our nature which takes the form of our innate desire for Beauty, Goodness and Truth. We have to depend upon this criterion alone when we have to invite a class or group of men to action. Marx and Engels too had to depend upon it when they wrote their manifesto. This criterion takes the form of an urge which constitutes a sort of a power-house that supplies the energy we require for all our actions.

The fact that ideals (which include philosophical creeds) determine the social existence of men, stares the Communist philosophers in their face and they feel that they cannot ignore it, although they must also believe in the contrary dictum of Marx, which is the very foundation of Marxism, that the social existence of men determines their ideals. They are, therefore, confused and their confusion often results in illogical and conflicting statements. Marx says definitely that men are "determined by a definite development of their productive forces and that production relations are independent of their wills." But the writers of "A Text-Book of Marxist Philosophy" say;—

"Man is conditioned but not determined by social structure and the stage of economic development."

## Again they write;-

"But the Russian knows that a man's creed matters, that it may be a positive force behind exploitation and parasitism and that you cannot decroy the social disease if you do not accompany your political and industrial measures with the refutation of capitalist philosophy and propagation of an alternative....... They know the fallacies of the system they repudiate and they have a system of their own to be the master light of all their seeing."

"This will occasion surprise in those who have always understood that the first principle of Soviet philosophy is

the economic determination of ideas. But although no creed comes into existence as a mere development of thought and out of all relation to social needs yet, once a creed is born, it has a force of its own. If it is believed it will help to perpetuate the social system to which it belongs, if it is over-thrown, one of the butteresses of that system will be taken away Therefore, the Russian is inclined to believe with Chesterton that the practical and important thing about a man is his view of the Universe."

"We think that for a landlady considering a lodger it is important to know his income but still more important to know his philosophy. We think that for a General about to fight an enemy it is important to know the enemy's numbers but still more important to know the enemy's philosophy."

"There has been no great movement in history that was not also a philosophical movement. The time of big theories was the time of big results."

"It is indeed *impossible* to keep the mind free from philosophy. The man who says he is no philosopher is merely a bad philosopher."

There could be hardly a plainer confession of the reality that it is the creeds that determine the economic life of the society.

The admission that it is impossible to keep the mind free from a creed or philosophy, that a man's creed may be a positive force behind exploitation, that the social disease cannot be eradicated unless the creed is destroyed, that a creed has an activity and a force of its own, that the practical and important thing about a man is his philosophy, that big theories are the causes rather than the results of big events, is nothing if not a contradiction of the Marxist principle of the economic determination of creeds.

The statement that "no creeds come into existence as a mere development of thought and out of all relation to social needs"

which is made side by side with all these emphatic pronouncements of the importance of creeds in determining social conditions, proves nothing to the contrary when we know why and up to what extent the birth of a new creed is connected with the conditions of the society. These conditions are tested as wrong after a prolonged contact with them because they fail to satisfy our urge for Beauty, Goodness and Truth, which is our internal criterion of right and wrong. When the conditions are discovered to be wrong we come to know that the creed or the ideal determining them is also wrong. Therefore, in order to secure a fuller satisfaction of our urge for Beauty, Goodness and Truth, we change the creed, and when the creed is changed new social conditions required by it and consistent withit, come into existence. The fact that we seek a new, a better and a more perfect ideal in order to change the existing social conditions which we have judged as wrong, is rather a proof that it is the ideal or the creed that determines the social conditions and not the social conditions that determine the creed. The new creed comes into existence in order to take the place of the old, wrong creed, which had determined the old, wrong conditions and the new creed is itself expected to determine the new conditions, which we judge as right. In each case it is the creed that we believe to be the determining cause of social conditions. If, on the other hand, the social conditions had been the determining cause of the creed, then we should have tried to change the conditions directly without bothering about the creed. But the fact (admitted by the Communist philosophers) that it is impossible to change the conditions without changing the creed, is a proof that the creed determines and creates them. We change only the creed because we are convinced that the social conditions are a part of it and that when it is changed the change of conditions will come automatically as a result of it.

The Marxians contradict themselves when they try to eradicate the creeds of others and to propagate their own creed instead. This is a proof of their inward conviction that creeds do determine economic conditions. If ideals had been the result of economic conditions, the Marxists would not have needed to educate mankind out of religion? Religious ideas cannot matter for they do not cause events; they cannot have any effect on the

economic conditions that the Marxist desires to establish. It is the economic conditions, on the other hand, that produce either religious or materialistic beliefs. Therefore, all that we need to do is to sit down and wait for the appropriate economic conditions to come or to try to bring them about, being careful at the same time not to think that we are bringing about the conditions by any planned ideas of our own.

Marx thinks that the consciousness of men which includes Art is the *result* of change in the economic conditions or the phases production. But if we examine the nature of Art we find that Art is really the *cause* of changes in the economic conditions.

Why do the phases of production change at all? They change evidently on account of a continuous extension, multiplication and complication of our wants. Men produce wealth because they need wealth and they produce it at every stage of their evolution in a way which best fits their needs at that stage. Now it is clear that our wants extend, multiply and become complicated on account of our desire to live more and more beautifully and artistically, i.e., on account of our desire for a particular variety of Art. For what is Art but the expression of beauty in an external, objective medium?

When we express beauty in brick, stone, voice, sound, colour, word or movement, we call it the art of architecture, sculpture, singing, music, painting, poetry and dancing respectively. When we express beauty in the manner of living that is the manner in which we satisfy our basic economic needs like food, shelter, clothing etc., we have another variety of Art, the Art of living which is usually known as Civilization. Man's consciousness or his innate desire for Beauty which gives him superiority over the lower animals, induces him to express beauty in everything that he does. He not only wants to live, as the animal wants, but he also wants to live beautifully and artistically. Therefore, he has gradually learnt to introduce more and more of beauty into the manner in which he satisfies his primary economic needs. It is this that has led to such a huge extension, multiplication and complication of the original human wants, to man's efforts to

produce and reproduce the means of their satisfaction and to the consequent evolution of what Marx loves to call the "phases" or the "modes" of production. The phases or the modes of production would not have grown at all unless our wants had grown.

All the wealth that we produce is not required by us for our "material existence," that is for the satisfaction of our basic economic needs, which secure for us the preservation of our life and race. Our essential economic requirements are not really as extensive and complicated as we have made them on account of our desire for beauty. We share our fundamental economic needs with our ancestors, the cavemen of old. The modern man eats, drinks, clothes and shelters himself and the caveman used to indulge in the same activities. That these needs of the caveman were satisfied by him fully and adequately can be judged from the fact that he was able to live on, prosper and have an offspring which is the human race of to-day. The modern civilized man too can satisfy these basic needs of his fully and adequately by living like the caveman, but actually the manner in which he satisfies them is vastly different from that of the caveman. The difference is created only by our desire for beauty which has been finding ever greater and greater expression in the manner of our living through the ages.

We need a house to give us shelter from disagreeable conditions of weather. Any firm building with a roof and walls, even a cave, can suffice for this purpose. But we construct the house so as to make it look beautiful and imposing from outside. Our desire for beauty in the manner in which we should satisfy this need has created a complicated Science and an Art of Architecture. Such is the case with the rest of our basic economic needs and with all our other needs that arise in the actual process of their artistic satisfaction. Each basic economic need is brief and simple and can be satisfied in a simple manner but we make it extensive and complicated on account of our desire to introduce beauty in the mode of its satisfaction.

The art of living, which we designate by the name of Civilization, has been indulged in by all human beings more or less at

all times but it has reached its highest standard so far in the life of the modern man. When you study the living of a modern man of average means you are impressed with him as an artist of a type. There is beauty in the cut, quality and combination of colours of his dress. There is beauty in the design and shape of his residential house, its furniture, equipment and decoration. There is beauty in the appearance and arrangement of his chairs, tables, books, carpets, sofas, wall-pictures and other articles in, his rooms. There is beauty also in the manner in which he talks, walks, eats, drinks, travels, plays and behaves generally. In order to introduce beauty into the manner of living he requires not only material objects but also personal excellence, polish, education and training. His taste or his desire for beauty which we find reflected in his material possessions is in fact guided by his knowledge, education and training. As our knowledge grows we are able to live a more and more refined and artistic life and the growth of our knowledge is again the result of the activity of an aspect of our consciousness which is intuition aided by reason. To live a civilized and decent life is an art and belongs to the same category as the painting of a beautiful picture or the production of a beautiful symphony. Like every other variety of Art, it is due to our desire for beauty. In the effort to express beauty in the manner of living we extend our needs and make them more and more complicated. We express beauty not only in the articles that we produce but also in the manner in which we produce them. The extension and complication of our needs on account of our urge for Beauty, both as producers and consumers, accounts for the changing phases of production.

The Economists tell us that we multiply our needs on account of our desire for variety, desire for distinction or desire for comfort; but when we examine these motives closely they turn out to have their source in our desire for beauty. We love variety in our dress, food and other requirements because of our desire for beauty which is insatiable. Whenever we attribute charm to an object or feel an attraction for it we do so on account of our innate desire for beauty. But nothing is permanently attractive to us except an ideal of the highest Beauty and Perfection. Therefore a continued contact with the object reveals the fact that after all it is not as charming as we thought it to be. Its beauty proves

to be deficient because it does not go with us the whole length of our desire; it does not grow with our desire and, therefore, does not satisfy the whole of it. Then we feel the monotony of associating with it; we become tired of it and look for beauty in something else; that is we desire variety. The love of variety is thus really due to the love of beauty. We desire a different object to associate with in the hope that it will be more satisfactory to our insatiable desire for beauty.

Again, when we desire variety for the sake of social distinction, it is also due to our desire for beauty. Social distinction is obtained by conveying an impression of beauty and winning the approval or admiration of society which is really the society's response to beauty. We win social distinction by displaying beauty in our dress, in our material possessions, in our abilities, our character and our way of living generally. Our sense of social distinction is synonymous with the sense of approval of persons we love or admire, that is, of persons to whom we attribute beauty or perfection. It is secured by expressing beauty in ourselves which is also a way of loving beauty in others. Thus the desire for distinction is also at bottom a desire for beauty.

A refined method of satisfying a need is desired by us initially not on account of the comfort that attends it but on account of the desire for beauty that it satisfies. For we see that people sometimes undergo an unproportionate discomfort in order to secure the comfort that results from a new, artistic combination of the material means of satisfying a need. The increase of comfort is a proof only of the increased harmony we succeed in establishing between our needs and the means of satisfying them, and harmony is nothing but beauty. It is true that after some time when, on the one hand, the use of the article becomes monotonous and, on the other, we become used to comfort, we think more of the comfort that it brings than the desire for beauty that it satisfies. Then we imagine that it is less beautiful than it should be and we wish to have it refined still further.

It is the same innate desire for beauty, the same artistic sense, so conspicuous, developed and trained in the modern man which

impelled the caveman to come out of his cave and build a hut of twigs to live in. The possibilities of a new way of seeking shelter more comfortable than the first was suggested to him by this desire.

Necessity is no doubt the mother of invention but we have to consider why it is that we continue to feel one necessity after another and go on inventing without a stop. It is no doubt on account of our desire for the achievement of ever greater and greater perfection and beauty in the manner of our living. Thus it is really the desire for Beauty that is the mother of invention. The standard of that art which we call civilization, is improving and our life is increasing in Beauty in one of its aspects as fresh ideas are enabling us to add to our wants.

We should make a sharp distinction between the necessity that we feel of satisfying the economic needs for which we feel a biological compulsion and the necessity that we feel for satisfying those needs of a spiritual origin which grow around them on account of our desire for a refined living. The former are our fundamental instinctive needs as animals and the latter constitute the superfluous additions that we make to them on account of our desire for Beauty as human beings. The latter overgrow around the nucleus of the former which are of a biological nature. There is a level up to which we must satisfy our economic needs in order to live on. As our income grows we are able to satisfy more and more of our additional wants and live more and more artistically. With the growth of knowledge (the result of our desire for Truth) we are able to produce the means of life more and more easily, in larger quantities and at less and less cost and effort. We refine not only the articles that we produce but also the methods and the instruments by which we produce them. The instruments themselves become articles of need and require other instruments for their production. In this way the instruments of production go on improving and our wants go on complicating and refining more and more. Education and training become essential for such production and add to the list of our wants arising out of that aspect of our desire for Beauty which expresses itself in artistic living.

In his eagerness to apply at all costs the Hegelian principle of contradiction and movement of the idea, to changes of economic conditions, Marx has given an absurd and fantastic view of the nature and the mutual relationship of his "productive forces" and "production relations." The reality of what Marx denotes as "the productive forces" is nothing but man himself acting on and responding to matter or environment in accordance with the urges of his own nature. It is not men who are "determined by a definite development of their productive forces," as Marx imagines, but it is the development of productive forces which is determined by men by their desires and activities. Marx is wrong when he says, "what individuals are depends upon the material conditions of their production." It is really the individuals who alter the material conditions of production to suit themselves, their nature and their desires.

As a matter of fact, there is no more contradiction between "productive forces" and "production relations" than there is between the two states of a man who first of all opens a tap to have a bath and then discovers that he has to adjust his position to receive the flowing water on his body or of a man who switches on the light in his room to read a book and then finds that he must (at the cost of some inconvenience to himself) open the book and adopt a suitable position to read it. In his search for Beauty man is always adjusting himself to himself. This is true of the human individual as well as of the human society and we are familiar with the close analogy between an individual and a group. As there is a consciousness of the human individual so there is a consciousness of the human society, and the urge of consciousness in each case is to seek more and more of Beauty. Some of the limbs of the individual create a change in the environment which the individual desires and his other limbs or rather the individual as a whole adjusts himself to this change. By this adjustment the individual goes in for the full benefit of the change that he had himself initiated. In the case of the human society some men initiate the change which is really desired by the society as a whole and other individuals or rather the society as a whole adjusts itself to this change. By this adjustment the society, like the individual, goes in for the full benefit of the change that it had itself initiated. Marx denotes this adjustment as the change of "production relations" to suit "productive forces." The new productive forces and the new production relations are both the creation of society; both originate in the same unconscious and yet powerful urge of the human society to realize more of Beauty in everything. Every change of environment, every new development of productive forces that man brings about or accepts, is for the sake of a greater satisfaction of his urge for Beauty. When the society has brought about and adjusted itself to one change we have one set of production relations and when it has brought about and adjusted itself to the next, we have another set of such relations. The change of society from one mode of production to another comes as a result of the general will of the society. Some men may no doubt find it difficult to adjust themselves to a change brought about by their more imaginative and enterprising brothers, but, because the change happens to be more satisfactory to the nature of man, as a seeker of Beauty in everything, the society as a whole welcomes it and these men cannot resist it. The new production relations are not independent of the will of society as a whole although they may be independent of the will of some individuals temporarily.

Marx had said that men are "determined by a definite development of their productive forces" and that production relations are "independent of their wills." But it seems that subsequent Communist philosophy has altered such statements of his with a view to bringing them nearer to facts. "Marx," say the writers of a Text Book of Marxist Philosophy, "is conditioned but not determined by social structure and the stage of economic development" (P. 21). Again they write, "Man is partly determined by his environment. But his relation to his environment is not a static one. In the first place, the environment itself is as much the creation of man as man is the creation of environment. Interaction is continuous. The changes wrought by man react on man himself and then man proceeds to yet further changes."

But this statement is again wrong if it is intended to mean that environment can change human beings in spite of them. When a change of environment is unfavourable to man and comes in spite of him, he tries to resist it, oppose it and minimize its ad-

verse effects as much as he can; he tries to change the environment again instead of changing himself. Man is continuously bringing about or accepting changes of environment that suit his desires and opposing and rejecting changes that do not suit him. He changes the environment but the desires of his own nature have a definite unchangeable character and it is these desires which make man what he is. We can realize and satisfy these desires more and more and better and better but we cannot change them. Whenever it appears to us that man has changed on account of the change of environment, what has really happened is that either the change of environment was favourable to him and he has learnt to exploit it for a fuller satisfaction of his unchangeable desires or it was unfavourable to him and he has learnt to resist successfully its interference with the satisfaction of these desires. In neither case has man changed himself fundamentally. Man's relation to his environment is certainly not static, but it is so because his desire for Beauty is insatiable and he is himself dynamic and progressive.

To be brief, the gradual increase in our wants, together with the means of satisfying them and the consequent changes in the modes of production are due to our desire to express Beauty more and more in the manner of living, to live a more and more artistic life. Since artistic ideas, developing as they do gradually in standard with the growth of our knowledge have to be included in the term "consciousness" used by Marx, it follows that a large part of our "social existence" and "material life" which according to Marx determines our "consciousness," is itself determined by our "consciousness." Man as distinguished from a mere animal is his "consciousness" or his desire for Beauty in the form of art of all kinds including the art of civilization and in the form of morals, religion, philosophy and science. Take away consciousness from man and nothing remains of him except the animal. He will still eat, drink, seek shelter and satisfy his other instinctive needs to the last limits of necessity no doubt, but that is exactly what the animal also does. He will not only have no religion, no politics and no philosophy but will also be unable to produced or reproduce anything. All production and reproduction peculiar to man whatever the phase through which it is passing and whatever the mode in which it is carried

on is due to his "consciousness" or his desire for Beauty which includes his taste for art in all its varieties.

The basic error of Marx that it is the economic life of men that determines their "consciousness" in addition to being incompatible with facts of human nature, implies that matter is the sole reality of the world. But recent advancements in the domain of Physics and Biology have led scientists to question seriously the validity of this hypothesis. These advancements have implications which point to mind rather than matter as the Final Reality of the Universe. The growing scientific knowledge of this century is thus depriving Marxism of its foundations. Marxists no doubt still attempt to reinterpret the philosophy of their master with a view to reconciling it with the implications of modern Physics, but their attempts, which are concentrated mainly on belittling the significance of these discoveries, are hardly successful.

THE RESERVE THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE NATURE OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

The process of education being the process of the expression and satisfaction of the urge for educational growth, it must take place according to the laws or characteristics of this urge. It is, therefore, extremely important for an educator, as a person concerned with understanding, guiding and directing this process, to know as many characteristics of this urge and to know them as thoroughly, as possible. Evidently, the more he understands this urge the better will he be able to provide for its proper expression and satisfaction and consequently for the proper educational growth of his pupils. It is true that the urge for educational growth, like the urge for biological growth, is a natural urge which operates and finds its own satisfaction under normal conditions, automatically. But unless the educator knows its qualities and characteristics and the laws that govern its operation, he may not be giving it the normal conditions of its satisfaction.

If a physical culturist desires to assure the proper growth of the body all that he needs to do is to allow the urge for biological growth in the body to have its full expression and satisfaction. But he cannot do so unless he has a thorough understanding of the laws of this urge and the conditions under which it can have or cannot have, its full satisfaction. If he has acquired that understanding, he will succeed in creating the conditions (e.g., good food, fresh air, light, exercise, cleanliness) that aid and assist and removing the conditions (e.g., bad food and absence of fresh air, light, exercise and cleanliness) that oppose and obstruct, the satisfaction of this urge.

Similarly, it is true that if an educationist wants to assure the proper growth of the human personality, all that he needs to do is to allow the urge for educational growth in the human being to have its full expression and satisfaction. But he cannot do so unless h has a thorough understanding of the laws governing this urge and the conditions under which it can have or cannot have its full satisfaction. Only in case he has acquired that

understanding can he succeed in creating the conditions (e.g., the love of the Perfect Ideal, and the morals, knowledge and artistic activity relevant to it) that aid and assist and removing the conditions (e.g., the love of an imperfect ideal and the morals, knowledge and artistic activity relevant to it) that oppose and obstruct the proper expression and satisfaction of this urge.

We have already known some of the most fundamental characteristics of the urge for educational growth as a result of our discussion of the previous chapters. We have known

- (1) That it is an urge of the human self and not of the human body;
- (2) That it is neither a product of the instincts nor their servant;
- (3) That, on the contrary, it is an independent urge of human nature which rules and controls all the instincts for its own expression and satisfaction;
- (4) That it is an urge to realize an ideal or an idea to which a person attributes the qualities of the highest beauty, goodness and truth and
- (5) That for this reason it is also an urge for beauty, goodness and truth which rules and controls a person's desire for moral action, desire for knowledge and desire for art;
- (6) That it is the urge of the human unconscious for which Freud has used the term libido;
- (7) That it can be perfectly satisfied only by an ideal which really possesses all the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth up to the highest degree of perfection and that that ideal is the Self-consciousness of the Universe or God;
- (8) That its expression cannot be resisted so that if an in-

dividual is unable to express it in the right direction or in the love of the Perfect Ideal, he is forced by his nature to express it in a wrong direction and in the love of some imperfect ideal with the result that his educational growth becomes wrong and misdirected.

We shall now discuss some more characteristics of this urge, the knowledge of which is essential for a proper understanding of the educational process.

Since the ultimate nature and the fundamental characteristics of life remain the same, no matter whether it is growing at the psychological or the biological plane, we can expect that the characteristics of the urge for psychological growth will be similar to those of biological growth, the only difference being that which is necessitated by the particular level of existence to which a class of growth belongs. All the characteristics of psychological growth with which, of course, an educationist is concerned, must have their root in the very nature of life. Psychology is a higher kind of Biology and biological laws are really psychological laws working on a lower plane of life. Hence, in order to acquire a better and a clearer understanding of a characteristic of the urge for psychological growth known as a result of our study of it made independently and in its own right and capacity, we shall also study, whenever it is possible, how the fundamental tendency of life which gives rise to it, operates at the biological level giving rise to a corresponding characteristic of the urge for biological growth.

(9) The ideal of an individual in the direction of which his urge for growth educational seeks expression, is an idea the beauty, goodness and truth of which is personally felt, realized or experienced by him to be higher than that of any other idea know to him, irrespective of the fact whether it has really any qualities of beauty, goodness and truth in it or not. This idea serves him, therefore, as an internal criterion for differentiating between what is beautiful and what is ugly, what is right and what is wrong what is good and what is bad, what is praiseworthy and what is detestable, what is true and what is false. The lover of an ideal knows, on account of this internal criterion of his what he should

do and what he should not do in order to asure the realization of his love and the achievement of his ideal. Thus he derives from his ideal a moral code of dos and don'ts and he follows this moral code willingly and easily urged by his love for the ideal. To him no moral law except the moral law of his own ideal has any worth or value of its own. This moral law controls all the activities of his life whether social, economic, political educational, legal, military, inintellectual or artistic and thereby enables him to grow educationally in the direction of his ideal.

At the biological level of growth also an animal knows instinctively what it should do and what it should not do in order to maintain its life and growth. It has a definite set of involuntary habits and inflexible instincts peculiar to its species which dominate the whole of its life and enable it to maintain its life and growth in the direction of its form as a member of a particular species.

- (10) Whether a person's ideal will be to any extent really good or bad, beautiful or ugly, true or false, high or low, depends upon the standard of his knowledge *i.e.* upon his *feeling, experience or realization* of what is a good, beautiful or true idea. Since the knowledge of individuals is of various standards, they are bound to make different judgements as to what idea is really good, beautiful and true and, therefore, worthy of their love and devotion. This explains why their ideals become different.
- (11) The ideal of an individual is not merely an object of mental apprehension or an idea of a mere theoretical or academic importance. It is an idea which is actually controlling or dominating his activities. It is not an inert idea, but a dynamic idea, an idea in action. It is an idea the love of which an individual feels sufficiently to be induced to accept it as the sole determining force of his practical life. It embodies his effective view of the purpose and destination of human life and of the nature of man and the universe, which he thinks has any real significence for him and, therefore, any significance in the world at all. It is a view of man and universe which may or may not be right according to other people but which attracts him, in which he can actually believe and according to which he can actually believe

(12) Just as disease destroys the health of the body and weakens it physically so what the self regards as a vice, a slip or an error, in view of the moral requirements of its ideal, hampers the self's development in the direction of that ideal, destroys its satisfaction, happiness and joy as the lover of that ideal and weakens it morally from the point of view of that ideal.

When the body is strong and healthy and properly growing according to the potentialities of the species of animals to which it belongs, it is able to resist or conquer disease. The result is that it grows further as far as its potentialities as a member of that species can allow it to grow. Similarly, when the self is strong and healthy and growing properly according to the potentialities of the ideal that it loves, it is able to resist and conquer what it looks upon as vice according to the moral standards of that ideal. The result is that it grows further as far as its potentialities as the lover of that ideal can allow it to grow.

- (13) When an individual makes an effort to realize his ideal in his external practical life in all its aspects and to regulate his entire activity in obedience to its moral code, his ideal ramifies into a large number of different ideas covering these aspects of his activity. Since all these ideas are derived from a single idea—the ideal—they constitute a system which is known as an ideology. An ideology is a system of ideas developing around an ideal in the course of its application to the various aspects of natural human activity.
- (14) An ideal never remains a single idea. It grows always into a system of ideas or an ideology. Every ideal is a potential ideology and is always actualized into one. Thus Christ, Allah, Baha-ullah, Economic Equality, Political Equality, The German Race, The French Language and Culture, the Hindu Religion and Culture, the British Nation, are examples of ideals which have developed into the ideologies of Christianity, Islam, Bahaism, Communism, Democracy, German Nationalism, French Nationalism, Indian Nationalism and English Nationalism, respectively.
- (15) As an ideal grows into an ideology, so the lover of an ideal grows into an ideological form or personality, Since an individual

who loves an ideal knows what is true and what is false what is good and what is bad what is ugly and what is beautiful, in view of the standards prescribed by that ideal, his self or personality develops, in due course of time, as a result of his effort to realize his ideal in practical life, into a particular form consisting of a particular type of knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, views and opinions, motives and standards, ideas and purposes, desires and inclinations, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations which are latent and potential in the nature of his ideal. The urge for an ideal is thus an urge to develop into a particular ideological form required by the ideal. As we cannot think of the urge for biological growth or the vital force without thinking of a biologican form or an organism which it creates and into which it operates so we cannot think of the urge for educational growth without thinking of an ideological form or a personality which it creates and into which it operates. The growth of an ideal into an ideological form is similar to the growth of a seed into a tree having a particular physical form consisting of its particular shape and size and the qualities of its leaves, branches, fruit, flowers, bark etc. latent or potential in that seed or the growth of a germ-cell into an animal having a particular biological form consisting of the particular shape, size, organs and features latent and potential in that germ-cell.

(16) Every lover of an ideology has an urge to create other lovers of the same ideology out of his offspring or other young persons who come under his influence, by educating them to love and serve the idiology that he loves and serves and to acquire for this purpose the knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, motives, standards, ideas and opinions, likes and dislikes, desires and inclinations and hopes and aspirations which he has himself acquired. This process of education, which is really a process of psychological procreation, becomes possible each time as a result of the union of two personalities one of which plays the role of the teacher and the other that of the learner. The result is that, in due course of time, there appears a large community of the lovers of the same ideology who resemble each other as well as the first lover of the ideology in their ideological form. Since they love a common ideology, have the same purpose in life and need each other in order to make a collective and powerful effort for the realization of that purpose, they feel attracted towards each other and come to live in the form of a community which, quite naturally, develops an organization and becomes a state. An ideological community that comes into existence in this way continues to endure from generation to generation for centuries. The reason is that every generation of the community passes on, before it passes away itself, its own ideological form to the next generation on account of the irresistible urge of every member of the community for ideological procreation or education.

The urge for psychological procreation is due to a tendency of life which is expressed at the biological level of growth by the urge of an organism to reproduce other organisms resembling itself in form, features, organs, habits and instincts. This process of biological procreation becomes possible each time as a result of the union of two individuals one of whom is a male and other a female. The result is that in due course of time there appears a large community of the members of the same species who resemble each other and their first progenitor in their physical form, features, organs, habits and instincts. Since they have a common mode of life, they exhibit a tendency to live in the form of a herd or group. The species that comes into existence in this way continues to live from generation to generation for long. The reason is that every generation of the species passes on, before it passes away itself, its own biological form to the next generation on account of the irresistible urge of every member of the species for biological procreation.

Thus the characteristic of life which creates a species at the biological plane of life creates an ideological community at its ideological plane.

The psychological law by which one generation of an ideological community passes on its ideological form to the next generation and enables the community to endure is as rigid and inexorable as the biological law by which one generation of a species passes on its biological form to the next generation and thus enables the species to continue its existence.

(17) Every specimen of an ideological form of life, every individual of a type of human personality, needs for his growth a particular educational or ideological environment which consists of the care and attention of his elders particularly the parents and teachers with a view to seeing that he grows educationally in the direction of their own ideal, the protection that is available to him from the educational influence of hostile or alien ideologies and the possibility of acquiring a particular quality of knowledge, skills, habits and attitudes which is suited to his ideal.

At the biological level of growth too, every specimen of a biological form of life, every individual of a type or species of animals, needs for its growth a particular biological environment which consists of the care and attention of the parents, protection from the aggression of hostile or alien species and a particular variety of food, climate and terrain which is suited to that species.

- (18) Since the ideal of an individual is an idea of the highest beauty, goodness and truth known to him and serves him as a criterion for testing what is true and what is false, he derives from it what he believes to be the true answer to every question that can be asked about the nature of man and the universe. An ideal is, therefore, in its potentialities, not merely a scheme of practical life but also a philosophy of the universe which its lovers believe to be the only one that is really consisten, with all the known and established facts of existence. If the true facts of existence are not found to be relevant to an ideology, which is invariably the case when an ideology is not based on an ideal that is perfectly true, its lovers endeavour to misinterpret and misrepresent those facts to make them look compatible with their ideology or else ignore them as un-import ant. An ideology tends to be interpretted sooner or later as a philosophy of life. It is a different matter that this philosophy may not be systematised by an expert philosopher or no expert philosopher may find it possible to systematise it on account of its latent defects or contradictions.
- (19) Every ideology has a theoretical and a corresponding practical aspect. Thus every ideology has its own theories of Politics. Ethics, Economics, Law, Education and Art and also

its own practical systems of Politics, Ethics, Economics, Law, Education and Art corresponding to these theories.

(20) As the form of an organism has a course of development from its earliest state to the state of its maturity or physical completeness potential in its germ-cell so the external practical form of an ideology has a course of development from its earliest state to the state of its legal or institutional maturity potential in the ideal on which it is based.

Since an ideology is the application of an ideal to the various aspects of natural human activity, it is evident that it will be a full-grown ideology only if it is an application of the ideal to all these aspects namely the ethical, political, economic, legal, educational, social, religious and military aspects of human life. If it is not an application of the ideal to all aspects of natural human activity or if the ideal on which it is based ignores certain aspects of this activity deliberately, it is incomplete and undeveloped. As no organism can grow beyond the potentialities of its germ-cell so no ideology can grow beyond the potentialities of the ideal on which it is based.

(21) An incomplete or undeveloped ideology is forced to borrow from some other ideal the ideas which its own ideal is not able to provide, with the ultimate result that the lending ideal gradually displaces the original ideal entirely as the basis of the ideology.

Since an ideal is the only motivating force of human activity it is meant to control and dominate the entire life of the individual, and the community. But if an ideal does not do so and leaves a portion of the natural activity of the individual and the community to be controlled and dominated by another ideal, it modifies itself and accepts other ideas which are foreign to its nature as a part of itself. To that extent, therefore, it ceases to be itself. An ideology can be perfect only if its (f) essence and (2) form are both perfect. The assence of an ideology is its psychological core or the idea or the ideal on which it is based. The form of an ideology is the application of its ideal to the various aspects of natural human activity. This means that an ideology will be

perfect only if it is an application of the Perfect Ideal to all the important aspects, namely, the religious, moral, economic, legal ethical, educational, political and military aspects of natural human activity.

(22) The urge for psychological growth in an individual is a single, indivisible urge, having only one direction and one destination of the process of its satisfaction. In this respect also it is similar to the urge for biological growth in an organism which is also a single indivisible urge having only one direction and one destination of the process of its satisfaction. This means that man is so made that he cannot love more than one ideal at a time.

A child is under the influence of several conflicting ideas at the same time. His activity is governed sometimes by one idea and at other times by another. But gradually, as he advances in age and experience, these ideas come into comparison with each other and he begins to know better and better what idea is to him the most satisfactory of all. The result is that ultimately he discards all ideas except one and that idea becomes his ideal and unifies his personality.

If there is a person who thinks that he can love or is loving two ideals at the sametime e.g. the ideals of Christianity and Nationalism, his misunderstanding will be removed the moment he is faced with a situation in which the demands of the two ideals come into a conflict with each other. He will discover that he has to ignore the demands of one of them for the sake of those of the other and that although he thought he was loving both the ideals simultaneously and equally yet the fact was that with him one of them was subservient to the other. When a person is actually loving two or three ideals at the same time it only means that his knowledge of himself and of his ideals is so poor that the practical requirements of none of these ideals are clear to him. The personality of such a person is underdeveloped and divided. He is on the cultural level of a child or a savage.

When a religion or a philosophical creed is not the political ideal of an individual it is really an idea which is sub-serving his political ideal and not determining any of his activities itself.

A state consisting of a number of heterogeneous communities of different religions and cultures may appear some times to be following more than one ideology. But as a matter of fact, if the state is really a unified whole, the ideology that determines the activities of the members of these apparently conflicting communities as citizens of this state is only one and that is the ideology that controls their political life. Other ideologies followed by them only sub-serve their political ideology. That is why their requirements are ignored or so interpretted as to make them harmonize with their common political ideology whenever necessary. Since such ideologies are generally incomplete, they surrender to the domination of the common political ideology of the state. Since the ideological differences of the subordinate communities are tolerated by their common political ideology they are not alien to it but a part of it.

It is not at all essential that all members of an ideological community having a uniform ideology may have perfectly identical views and opinions on all matters from the very beginning of their career as an ideological community. If they come to have a common ideology which accommodates certain differences of opinion, then those differences, so long as they are accommodated by their common ideology, form a part of that ideology and do not affect its uniformity. The common ideal of a community is that idea which determines their common activities and unites them as a community and that is their political ideal. In spite of this, it is true that the members of every ideological community come to have more and more identical views and opinions on all matters as they know and understand more and more the theoretical and practical implications and requirements of their common ideal and this process continues as long as their ideal is able to command their love and devotion.

(23) The education of its own younger generation is not the only channel through which the educational urge of an ideological community seeks expression and satisfaction. The community as a whole in its capacity as an organization or state, makes an effort to educate as far as it is open to it, the younger generations of other communities, to feel and experience the

beauty of its ideal. The ideal of a community is an idea to which it ascribes the highest beauty and perfection possible. The community serves the ideal in order to objectify and externalize all its latent beauty, perfection, power and splendour. The community, therefore, desires, as a group of the representatives of that ideal, unlimited power and expansion for itself. It likes all human beings to believe in the beauty, goodness and truth of its ideal and to think and act in the way it thinks and acts itself, so that they may participate in, or at least facilitate, its efforts to actualize the potential greatness of its ideal. Hence the community seeks to have as many as possible total or at least partial converts or slaves to its ideology out of other communities. For this purpose it sets up a system of external education, known generally as publicity or informational services, by which it aims at winning over to its own side as many converts from the followers of other ideologies as it can. Radio, press and publications, cultural missions, aids and gifts are the main instruments of external education. As this is the attitude of every ideological community, cross currents of ideological education continue to flow from one community to another (like the cross breeding of species in the biological ages) and take the shape of an intellectual war of ideologies. In this intellectual warfare, economically and militarily powerful communities have the better of the weaker communities for obvious reasons. As there was a perpetual war of species going on in the biological ages, so there is a continuous war of ideologies going in this ideological age.

(24) To the extent an ideological community allows itself to be influenced by the ideological education of another ideology to that extent it ceases to be itself, becomes weaker and prone to be influenced all the more by such education. Gradually, the material of external education enters into their systems of internal education, adds more and more to its influence in that system, till it is able to dominate it completely, thus completing the intellectual conversion or ideological surrender of the community to the alien ideology for all practical purposes. A complete ideological conquest of a community is invariably preceded, or followed by its political conquest. An ideological community which desires to remain itself and continue its existence, has on

only to assure that its internal education is really designed to make its rising generation to love the ideology of the community but also that this love is in no way impaired or diminished owing to the external education of an alien ideology or a number of alien ideologies. As the growth of the body needs to be protected and made immune from the harmful effects of the germs of all diseases so the growth of the human self needs to be protected and made immune from the harmful effects of all alien ideas.

- (25) Wherever there is a state, there must be an ideology as its basis. Ideology is the only force that unifies and welds the members of a community into a state. Ideological communities at the human stage of evolution take the place of species at the animal stage of evolution. A socially advanced species (e.g. bees and ants) can achieve an organization as perfect as that of a single organism. Similarly a socially advanced community or state which has an efficient educational system designed to grow the love of its members for their own ideology to the level of its highest perfection can achieve a unity or an organization as perfect as that of a single individual.
- (26) A highly organized ideological community is a psychological organism and is subject to laws which are similar to the laws of Biology. Like an organism it has an internal urge which is the love of the ideal and an external form which consists of its laws, institutions and traditions. Like an organism it has the will to live and to grow indefinitely, needs food which consists of all educative influences which can grow the love of the ideal, has a purpose which is the practical realization of the ideal, meets with resistance in its efforts to achieve that purpose, exerts itself to overcome resistance, increases and enlarges its powers through exertion and becomes weak when it fails to exert itself or gives up effort. As an organism needs a particular biological environment for its continued existence so an ideological community needs a particular educational environment for its continued existence. As an organism was subject to sudden improvements of its form during the biological ages, as a result of what is known by the biologists today as "mutations" so an ideological community is subject to sudden improvements of its form during this ideological age as a result of "ideological muta-

tions" which we call "revolutions". As an organism dies owing to internal disease so an ideological community dies owing to the elements of imperfection in its ideal.

The life of an organism is dominated by its urge to live as an organism, that of an ideological community by its urge to love its ideology. As an organism has an organ—the heart—which is the centre of its life and supplies the fluid of life to feed and nourish all its parts, so an ideological community has an organization—the educational system of the community—which is the centre of its love and supplies the ideas that feed and nourish the love of the ideology in the hearts of all its members. As an organism can annihilate another organism by destroying the functions of its life-centre so an ideological community can annihilate another ideological community by destroying the functions of its educational system. Thus when the conquerors of World War II occupied Germany, Japan and Italy, they hastened to annihilate the ideologies of Nazi-ism, Mikado-ism and Fascism by destroying the educational systems of these countries.

Again, just as an organism gains in health and strength when there is a perfect coordination of its parts and their functions, so an ideological community gains in strength and efficiency when it is able to achieve a perfect unity of purpose among its members. Like an organism it is attracted by objects, individuals and communities that help it or support its life and growth as the lover of its ideology and is repelled by objects, individuals and communities that have the contrary effect. As the activity of an organism is directed by its brain, so the activity of an ideological group is directed by its accepted leader.

(27) As the subsequent members of a species repeat the biological form of its first progenitor so the subsequent members of an ideological community repeat the ideological form of the founder of the community.

That an ideology, like a species, has an unconquerable tendency to persist in the form in which was left by its founder, is due to a fundamental characteristic of life. Whatever form life takes in its nascent condition—whatever the apparent causes and conditions that may have enabled it to take that form-becomes fixed for ever. This is as much true of the form and institutions of a newly emerging ideology as it is of the form and features of a newly born organism or a newly emerging species. As there is a law of biological heredity which protects the original form and features of a species by an arrangement within the organic form itself, so there is a law of ideological heredity which protects the original laws and institutions of an ideology by an arrangement within the ideological form itself. Heredity whether biological or ideological is essential to evolution. Its object is to preserve the past achievements of life and to prepare the ground or which further achievements can be built up. It assures that change takes place only in the direction of the next higher stage of evolution and without involving the loss of any of the achievements of life secured in the past.

The explanation of the characteristics of the urge for educational growth given above shows that for every important psychological phenomenon at the human level of evolution there is a corresponding biological phenomenon at the animal stage of evolution. Thus

1.	Ideological growth	corresponds to	Biological growth.
2.	An ideological form of life or a personality considered as the lover of an ideology.		A biological form of life or an organism of a particular type.
3.	Education or psychological propagation of lovers of the same ideology.	" "	Procreation of organisms of the same type.
4.	An ideological com- munity.	u - u	A species.

An intellectual or spiritual revolution. A mutation.

 The first revolution- corresponds to ary exampler and educator of an ideology. The first mutational specimen or progenitor of a species.

7. A perfect ideological community.

" A perfect species.

 An ideological form or personality consisting of habits and attitudes. A physical form or organism consisting of characters, form and features.

9. Ideological heredity

Biological heredity.

In view of the characteristics of the urge for educational growth enumerated so far, we can designate it by any of the following names:—

- 1. The urge for educational growth.
- 2. The urge for an ideal.
- 3. The urge for beauty, goodness and truth.
- 4. The urge of the human self or self-consciousness.
- 5. The urge of the unconscious mind or libido.
- 6. The urge for ideological growth.
- 7. The urge for psychological growth.

We may now study the manner in which the process of eductional growth actually takes place.

The urge for biological growth works in an organism in a characteristic manner. It has first of all an end so far as the individual organism is concerned and that end is to make it grow into the particular biological form of the species to which it belongs. It begins to operate in the organism with a powerful biological pressure from the moment it is born as an embryo and its operation leads to the growth of the organism in a definite direction fixed and circumscribed by its potentialities which take

the form of certain qualities and characters inherent in the form of its species. The growth of the organism reaches its maximum only when these potentialities are perfectly actualized and these qualities and characters are perfectly displayed.

As soon as a plant has first sprouted from the earth a botonist, or even a man of common sense, can tell us what is going to be the direction of its natural and un-interrupted growth, what kind of stem, leaves, branches and flowers the tree is going to have and finally, when its growth has reached its perfection what will be the shape size, colour and other qualities of its seed. A sapling of a tree can grow into that tree—and bring on leaves, flowers and fruit characteristic of that tree-and no other. Similar is the case with a newly born animal. If we know its species we can know in advance the direction and manner of its growth and the qualities and characters it will develop when its growth has become perfect. A kitten or a puppy can never develop into a lion or a tiger, no matter how much we may endeavour to bring it up with that end it view. Nature does not permit organisms whether plants or animals to grow in any direction and every direction that we choose. They can grow only towards that perfection which is latent in their nature. There can be no such thing as biological pragmatism, that is to say, controlling the growth of organisms so as to make them develop into forms which we consider useful for our purposes.

The urge for psychological growth or the urge for growth as education also works in a human being in a characteristic manner. It has also an end so far as the individual human being is concerned and that is to make him grow into the particular ideological form of the community to which he belongs. It also begins to operate in the child from the moment he is born. It is true that the conscious mind of the new-born baby is not yet developed but his unconscious mind is most ready to receive an effect from another mind expressing its will in words, movements or thoughts. The unconscious mind of the child at this stage is like a clean slate on which any thing good or bad may be written. His strong urge for growth into an ideological form yearning for expression in his unconscious mind has not yet found an outlet in the love of any ideal. Hence persons who

are physically close to him influence his unconscious mind in favour of their ideas directly by their mere thoughts, words and movements. Although the impressions resulting from this influence may appear to be transitory in the beginning as the reflections of persons moving in front of a mirror which appear and disappear without leaving any mark on the mirror, yet, if repeated, they tend to become permanent. The human mind is a mirror that retains something, however little, of every impression even after the influence that has created it is withdrawn.

Soon, however, the conscious mind of the child develops sufficiently to enable him to understand, however roughly and vaguely it may be, the ideas of his parents about the world of men and things around him and about the nature of man and the universe generally. It is at this stage that his conscious education begins and the foundation is really laid and the seed is actually sown for all his subsequent ideological growth which we desscribe as education. The parents, as if by their ideological contact with the child as their submissive follower, fertilize his virgin self, ready to believe and love any ideology, by an ideological sperm which begins to grow in his self as an ideological germ-cell, just as a female is fertilized by the sperm of a male which begins to grow in the womb of the female as an embryo of a single cell. The direction of the future ideological growth of the child is determined by this ideological germ-cell which continues to get, owing to the efforts of his parents (who not only take proper care of the child as long as he is under their supervision but also choose the right kind of school for him when he leaves their supervision) a favourable ideological environment and therefore continues to grow according to its potentialities which are different for every ideology.

The ideological environment of the individual will be said to be favourable if it affords him a proper supply of the knowledge of the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth as his parents understand and interpret them. It consists of the educational care and attention of his parents, the availability of the knowledge of good and bad, right and wrong, true and false, praiseiworthy and detestable, according to their ideology, the possibility of living in a society of individuals who believe in the same ideo-

logy, safety from the educational influence and ideas of other ideologies and all other factors calculated to have an educational influence favourable to that ideology.

In the case of biological growth, an embryo has no source of food and nourishment except the mother and has to depend for its biological growth on the blood of the mother supplied to it through the placental chord. When it is born as a baby it is still entirely dependent upon the milk of her breasts for its nourishment.

Similarly, in the case of ideological growth, a child has no source of ideological education in the earlier stages of his development except his mother. He has to depend for such education entirely upon her. But as soon as the child begins to recognize his father both father and mother taken by the child almost as two physical forms of a single individual, begin to play their part in his educational development. The parents not only mind his proper biological growth but also see to it that he develops what they think is a proper distinction between right and wrong, good and bad, true and false, praiseworthy or detestable. In other words, they see to it that his idea of beauty, goodness and truth grows to be the same as their own. They are forced to do so on account of the inner pressure of love for their own ideal which controls all their activities including the activity intended to bring up their child in a suitable manner. They cannot wish anybody, much less their own child, to have a wrong idea of beauty, goodness and truth and they are convinced that every idea of beauty, goodness and truth other than their own is wrong. Similarly, the child too wants to conform, as strictly as he can, to his parents' idea of beauty, goodness and truth. The reason is that he too feels a strong internal ideological pressure to do so.

The child feels within him a powerful urge to love an idea of the highest beauty, goodness and truth known to him and, in the circumstances in which he is placed, he feels, realizes and experiences that there is no person more beautiful or admirable than his parents. For they love him nourish him and take care of him and they have the power and the goodness to do so. They

are superior to anything that he can see around himself. What they like, therefore, is beautiful and what they hate is ugly, what they do is right, what they avoid doing is wrong, what they say is true, what they do not say is false. To him they are the fountain-head of all beauty, goodness and truth. Hence he loves them with all the force of his urge for beauty. He is happy when he wins their love or approval and miserable when he loses it. It is this joy of winning the approval of his parents coupled with the fear of losing it, that constitutes an ideological pressure on the child to conform strictly to their idea of beauty, goodness and truth in every thing that he believes and does. Under this pressure he begins to like and love what they like and love and to hate and dislike what they hate and dislike. The more the parents love the child the more lovable they are to him and the more he loves them the greater is the ideological pressure upon him to grow into the ideological form of his parents.

When the parents say to the child "Don't do this" and "Do this" they give him a moral code derived from their own ideal and, since the child cannot but obey them on account of an internal pressure, he immediately comes to have a practical idea, an idea-in-action of beauty, goodness and truth which is the same as that of his parents, however vague and indefinite it may be to him in the beginning. This idea of beauty is the first ideal of the child represented in the concrete by his parents.

It is a well known law of Biology that it is always life that begets life. The corresponding law of Psychology is that it is always love that begets love. Love is in fact life itself operating at the psychological plane of existence. As a candle lights another candle so the flame of love in the heart of an individual kindles a flame of the same love in the heart of another individual. As there can never be an organism in the world that does not have its parents, so there can never be the lover of an ideal who does not take his love from another lover of the same ideal. The child can take the love of his ideal only from the person or persons whom he loves. The love of an idea in one's self creates the love of the same idea in another self by a process of ideological procreation, as an organism creates another organism of

the same form by a process of biological procreation. As the procreators or parents of an organism take care of it till it has grown up, so the procreators of the lover of an ideal take care of his love till it has sufficiently developed. The parents of the young animal love it and the young animal loves its parents. Hence they take care of it and as a consequence it grows. Similarly the human parents love their child and the child loves them and the more the child and his parents love each other the more the child grows to know and love the ideal of his parents.

It follows that if the teacher to whose care the child is entrusted later on, is to succeed in his effort as an educator, he must develop an intense love for the child so that the child returns that love to the teacher as a person who knows, believes and does particular things and as a consequence grows educationally on his pattern. The process of education is no other than the process of the transmission of the love of a particular ideal—the love of certain ideas, facts, forms, skills, habits, attitudes, motives, opinions, inclinations, likes and dislikes hopes and aspirations consistent with that ideal—from one soul to another. Evidently unless the two souls love each other—i.e. unless one of them gives love and the other receives it—this process of the transmission of love cannot take place.

The love and care of the parents do not leave the child at any stage of his ideological growth. When the time comes for him to go to school—because after some time the parents are not able to provide him with all the conditions of ideological growth that he needs—they choose for him a school that suits him in view of its teachers, books, curriculum, games and general ideological atmosphere and they are guided in this choice by the same desire to see him grow into what is according to them the best ideological form *i.e.* the one that is their own, which was the guiding principle of the child's earlier education under their own supervision. They send him to school only in the hope that his school education will be ideologically a continuation of his education conducted by them earlier at home and not a departure from it. And this hope is perfectly justified because they are never alone in their ideological beliefs. They are always the members of a community of like-minded individuals—

individuals who believe in the same ideology—and this community has a political organization which looks to the proper satisfaction of their common ideological requirements. The schools set up by such a community cannot but provide an education which is suitable to their ideology. Hence, strictly speaking, there is no question of the parents choosing, in view of their own ideological requirements and those of the child, a school out of the schools set up by their community, all of which provide for the growth of children into the common ideological form of the community. The question of choice arises only when the parents have a preference for certain denominations, methods of teaching, branches of knowledge, professions or skills within the requirements of their ideology and there are schools to accommodate it.

As the child grows in years and has the opportunity to come into contact with his teachers, headmasters, professors and principals and other educational officers and to know the thoughts and views of the elders and leaders of the community through the newspapers, public speeches, radio programmes, films, books and journals produced in the country he finds that all of them emphasise by their ideas and opinions the same moral code, the same distinction between right and wrong, true and false, beautiful and ugly, commendable and detestable which was emphasised earlier by his parents. Hence in order to win the approval of the community and to succeed in life as well as to avoid the censure of the community and his own failure in life as a consequence of that censure, as also to justify the hope and confidence which his parents had reposed in him earlier he unconsciously begins to love the ideas and opinions that they love and hate the ideas and opinions that they hate.

Thus under an irresistible ideological pressure, operating as an inexorable law of ideological heredity, the child comes to display the likes and dislikes and the mental and moral peculiarities and prejudices of his parents and their community. His ideological urge, which began to flow in the channel of the ideology of his parents and of the entire community in childhood, continues to flow (driven by a powerful ideological force working unconsciously and imperceptibly

within and without his person) in this channel throughout his life. When the group considers that he has become educationally mature all that has happened is that he has come to love the common ideology of the group according to their standards and to have acquired all the stock of knowledge and all the habits, and attitudes, motives and skills, standards and purposes, hopes and aspirations, likes and dislikes, views and opinions, desires and inclinations which the group thinks, are needed by the ideology and are necessary in order to love, serve and realize it in a proper manner.

Thus, as the urge of biological growth in the organism operates in the direction of a particular end determined by the biological environment of the organism-and that is to make it grow into the particular biological form of its species-so the urge of ideological growth in the human self operates in the direction of a particular end determined by the ideological environment of the individual-and that is to make him grow into the particular ideological form of his community. The growth of the self takes place in a definite direction and towards a definite ideological form given in the potentialities of the parents' ideal and these potentialities actualize themselves in the form of certain qualities, attributes, habits, mental and moral attitudes, skills, laws, customs and institutions, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations, desires and inclinations relevant to this ideal. The ideological growth of the child reaches its maximum only when these potentialities are perfectly actualized and these qualities and attributes are perfectly displayed in him.

Thus the urge for ideological growth in the child is an urge for the actualization of his potentialities and the unfoldment of his self as the lover of an ideal which he has made his own as a result of the influence of his parents. This ideal gives the child a criterion for determining what is admirable and what is detestable, what is true and what is false, what is right and what is wrong, what is beautiful and what is ugly in the education that he receives afterwards and the parents and the community to which they belong, make an effort to keep this criterion operative. The result is that the child creates and shapes his spiritual, intellectual, moral and

aesthetic experiences suitably in accordance with this criterion. He goes on accepting and absorbing into his developing ideological form what is consistent with his ideal and, therefore, what he thinks is admirable, true, right and beautiful and rejecting what is inconsistent with it and therefore what he thinks is detestable, false, wrong and ugly, just as the protoplasm of an organism goes on creating out of its food and absorbing, while shaping suitably, the chemical constituents that it needs for the construction of its ancestral form and rejecting the others.

All aspects of the urge for educational growth play their part in the development of the child into the ideological form of his parents, no matter what their ideal may be. The urge of the organism for biological growth cannot achieve its full expression and satisfaction unless all its parts are functioning fully and freely. Similarly, the urge of the human self for psychological growth cannot achieve its full expression and satisfaction unless all its parts are functioning fully and freely. We have already known that there are four aspects of the urge for educational growth;—

- The urge for an ideal or the urge to love, admire, adore and worship an ideal. When we express it the result is a religious or spiritual experience. It may be designated alternatively as the spiritual urge.
- (2) The urge for knowledge or the urge to know beauty in the form of truth i.e., true facts about the nature of man and the universe understood in the light of the ideal. When we express it the result is an intellectual experience. It may be named alternatively as the intellectual urge.
- (3) The urge for morality or the urge to act rightly and morally in every day life in view of the requirements of the ideal. When we express or satisfy it the result is a moral experience. We may call it otherwise as the moral urge of man.
- (4) The urge for art or the urge to admire and create beautiful forms and appearances consistent with the qualities of

the ideal. When we express or satisfy it the result is an aesthetic experience. It may be called also the aesthetic urge of man.

One of the most prominent properties of life is its hormic tendency or purposive activity the result of which is growth in some direction. But life could not grow unless it had in addition to its hormic tendency a mnemic tendency or the ability to preserve what it is able to achieve as a result of its purposive activity. This mnemic tendency of life operates side by side with its hormic tendency and both of these tendencies play their part in its growth, and this is true irrespective of the fact whether the growth is biological or psychological.

The urge for biological growth in the organism needs for its satisfaction a food of particular chemical constituents and vitamins which are much the same for plants and animals. These are ultimately digested and assimilated by the protoplasm, which is the actual living substance in both plants and animals, for its own nutrition and growth. The organism whether a plant or an animal begins as an embryo of a single cell and gradually builds the matter that it assimilates in the form of food into its bodily form which corresponds to that of its parents. The growth is associated with metabolism consisting of constructive (anabolic) and destructive (katabolic) changes in both plants and animals. The former lead to the formation of various nutritive substances and to the growth of the protoplasm and the latter to their breakdown and the disintegration of the protoplasm. The protoplasm assimilates the nutritive substance formed in the process of metabolism according to its needs determined by the ancestral form of the organism and increases in bulk. It absorbs from its food all that is necessary for the development of this form and rejects the rest. The increased protoplasm fits automatically into this form as if it remembers in what shape it is to grow and acts accordingly. This cannot be explained except on the assumption that the protoplasm is conscious and receives, remembers and follows consciously the impressions of its experiences which have actually influenced its growth in the course of its history and have therefore, become fixed and rooted in its consciousness. It develops as a result of the accumulation of such impressions

one above the other a set of biological attitudes, skills, habits and known facts which take the shape of instincts and physic-logical functions such as the maintenance of blood temperature, respiration, biochemistry of metabolism and the industry of harmones and vitamins, physical growth and the action of vital organs.

The same principle works in the growth of the human personality.

When an organism develops in the direction of its mature physical form it is the living, active protoplasm that mediates between the two and grows. When a self that loves an ideal develops towards its mature ideological form it is the living, active love that mediates between the two and grows.

An ideal is an idea of beauty and beauty is something that calls forth love. The self's relation to its ideal being that of love. the growth of self towards its ideal consists of the growth of its love for the ideal. The food that the self needs for its growth (i.e., for the growth of its love) consists of the qualities of the ideal which the self has come to choose and invest with all the beauty that it desires. It hungers for beauty and feeds for the satisfaction of this hunger on the beauty of its ideal. The self helps itself to its food when it contemplates, admires, adores, and enjoys the beauty of its ideal, when it acquires the knowledge of what it thinks are true facts about the nature of man and the universe understood in the light of its ideal or when it acts rightly and morally in everyday life in view of the needs of its ideal or when it admires or creates a beautiful form or appearance consistent with the qualities of its ideal. Thus the activity by which it satisfies its hunger for beauty and grows in love is either spiritual or intellectual or moral or aesthetic.

The growth of love is not without a form. As love grows it incarnates itself internally in the knowledge, attitudes, habits and skills of the individual. Every experience of the self is an expression or an act of love, as it is the self's reaction to a situation made freely and voluntarily by it as the lover of an ideal so as to serve and satisfy the requirements of the ideal whether they

are spiritual, intellectual, moral or aesthetic. Every situation has for the self a meaning which is imparted to it by its ideal, by its love. It is looked at by the self from the point of view of its love and coloured by the colour of its love. That is why the same situation has a different meaning for persons of different ideals. As the protoplasm takes out of its food and absorbs suitably the material elements that are necessary for its development into the ancestral biological form of the organism and rejects the rest so the self takes out of every situation and assimilates suitably the psychological elements by way of the meanings of the situation that are necessary for its development into the ideological form that is potential in its ideal and rejects the rest.

Every experience of the self, as a reaction to a situation whether its nature is spiritual, intellectual, moral or aesthetic, creates, therefore, an impression on the self in the form of a complex which alters the self's disposition or attitude permanently in favour of the ideal controlling the reaction. The result is that the self is able to react again to the same situation (or to any other similar situation arising in future) more easily than it would have been possible for it to react to it without this alteration. As such experiences recur and accumulate the mnemic properties of the self operate to preserve them in the form of knowledge, attitudes, standards, values, purposes, dispositions, habits and skills, likes and dislikes, desires and inclinations, hopes and aspirations consistent with the ideal, which enable the self to act more easily and more efficiently in the service of the ideal on all future occasions. This is how the self of an individual grows into the ideological form of his parents.

This conclusion is of an immense importance to the educator. For it means that unless the love of an ideal expresses itself in action and takes the form of knowledge, attitudes, habits and skills consistent with the ideal, it cannot determine action and the love of another ideal which has actually succeeded in expressing itself in action and thereby incarnating itself in the knowledge, habits, attitudes and skills of the individual will determine action instead. Mere contemplation, admiration and adoration of an ideal's beauty are not enough for the develop-

ment of self unless the love gained temporarily by these methods is preserved and allowed to accumulate and it cannot be preserved and accumulated unless it is stored up in the form of knowledge, habits, attitudes and skills by means of constant action.

As the protoplasm of an organism develops automatically into the biological form of its parents under favourable conditions of growth, so the love of a human individual develops automatically into the ideological form of his earliest teachers (who are almost invariably his parents) if conditions favourable to its growth are present. What the educator cannot emphasise too much is the fact that if the love of one ideal is not allowed by an individual to organize his knowledge, to direct his moral judgements and to inspire his aesthetic and spiritual activity the love of some other ideal will perform these functions and if this other ideal is not an ideal of the highest beauty, goodness and truth the personality of the individual will develop in a wrong direction. The individual will not be educated but miseducated.

In the case of an organism the hormic and mnemic tendencies of life lead to the growth of the protoplasm according to the potentialities of the organism as a member of a particular species. In the case of the human self they lead to the growth of love according to the potentialities of the self as the lover of a particular ideal and the member of a particular ideological community. An organism is what it is on account of the protoplasm that grows and takes shape and becomes fixed in the process of its growth in the bodily form and features of the animal. A human being is what he is on account of his love-for his ideal-which grows and takes shape and becomes established in the process of its growth in the knowledge, attitudes, habits, motives and skills of the human being relevant to his ideal. Biological growth is accompanied by metabolic processes which are both constructive and destructive. Psychological growth is similarly accompanied by educative processes which are both constructive and destructive. They are constructive because they create at every new stage of the growth of love some new aspects of the self's knowledge, skills, habits and attitudes which are consistent with that stage and which are, therefore, needed and favoured by the

self and also destructive because they abandon, ignore, throw into disuse and thus destroy, some old ones not consistent with that stage and, therefore, not needed by the self any longer. Whenever the self changes its ideal in the course of its development towards the full ideological form of that ideal, it develops neither into one ideological form nor into the other. It is like a hybrid animal which is neither completely in the form of one parent nor in that of the other.

Love incarnates itself in the process of its growth as a result of the self's experiences not only internally in the knowledge attitudes, habits, passions, motives, likes and dislikes, views and opinions, hopes and aspirations, values and skills of an individual but also externally in the social, economic, legal, religious, moral, intellectual, artistic, material and technological conditions and relations that he creates as a result of his activities. The internal growth of love is always externalized and objectified in the conditions and relations of the individual. These conditions and relations reflect the nature of the individual's ideal as well as the direction of the development of his self. The sum total of the conditions and relations created by each member of an ideological community is the result of the activity of the community as a whole in the pursuit of its ideal. It is the external and objective form of its ideal and reflects the nature and qualities of the ideal.

The roads, bridges, telegraphs, telephones, postal services, hospitals, railways, automobiles, ships, skyscrapers, commercial firms, factories, agricultural farms, schools, colleges, universities, laboratories, art galleries, courts, theatres, cinema houses, hotels, bars, club houses, stadiums, air, land and naval forces, armaments, artificial moons and planets, aeroplanes and rockets, informational services, secretariats, academies, printing presses, books, newspapers, etc. which may have been created by a community are ideas latent in the nature and qualities of its ideal, which have become objectified and externalized through the efforts of the community because the community loves its ideal. Such objectified and externalized ideas may look similar in the case of different communities but really they

are as different in their nature, object and function in the case of different communities as the ideologies that create them.

If we know the nationality and ideology of the parents of a child, we can easily say beforehand what is the type of individual into which he is going to develop as a result of his education. Nature has so arranged matters that unless the young individual comes to be removed from his normal ideological environment early enough in life and before he has grown up ideologically to any extent, his ideological growth must follow the type of his parents. The parents of an individual give him not only his physical form but also his ideological form or pattern of personality which they in their turn have received from their own parents. It is in this way that the love of the ideology is transmitted from goneration to generation in an ideological community. It is in this way that an ideological group whether the ideal on which it is based is good or bad right or wrong, perfect or imperfect, continues to live for centuries. In the absence of this arrangement of nature, there would have been no uniformity of ideas and opinions and no likemindedness in human beings living in the form of a community and there would have been no stable social groups or communities and consequently no political organizations or states.

The law of biological heredity operating in the animal world assures the continued life of every species. On account of the operation of this law a species is able to maintain its physical form consisting of its features, characters and organs from generation to generation, as long as it lives. Similarly, the law of ideological heredity operating in the social world of human beings assures the continued existence of every ideological community. On account of the operation of this law a community is able to maintain its ideological form consisting of its own stock of knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, motives, interests, views and opinions, standards and purposes, desires and inclinations, customs, laws and institutions, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations (which it derives from its ideal) from generation to generation permanently as long as it lives.

As soon as the urge for biological growth has brought about

the maximum development of an organism and actualized all its biological potentialities as a member of a species, it takes, while still functioning for the maintenance of the organism, the form of an urge for procreation. Instead of growing the organism further, which is generally not possible, it turns to create and grow other organisms of the same type. Hence at this stage the orga-. nism seeks a mate and begins to reproduce other organisms like itself by a process in which both the male and the female play their part active in the case of the former and reactive and passive in the case of the latter. As a consequence a biological type of life never remains a single organism but always becomes a community of similar organisms-similar in their form, features, organs, habits and instincts-known as a species. A species has a tendency to live an organized life of some sort. Different species have different levels of the development of their social instincts. Every new organism that comes into existence as a result of the process of procreation, repeats the process of growth and procreation which characterized its parents earlier and in this way the race of the species continues.

Similarly, as soon as the urge for educational or ideological growth has brought about the maximum development of a personality and actualized all its psychological potentialities as the lover of an ideology and the member of an ideological group, it takes, while still functioning for the maintenance of the ideological existence of the personality, the form of an urge for propagation. Instead of growing the personality further, which is generally not possible, it turns to create and grow other personalities of the same type. At this stage, therefore, the individual becomes interested in educating others. He feels that he has become one of the elders and leaders of the community and feels the urge to instruct and guide the members of the younger generation so that they may also achieve the perfection that he has himself achieved. This may be described as the stage of his ideological puberty when he seeks ideological mating and reproduction. At this stage the individual seeks a receptive self like that of a child and endeavours to create out of it a personality like himself. In this process of ideological procreation both the educator and the educand play their part, active in the case of the former and reactive and passive in the case of the

latter. That is why an ideological form of life or a personality of a type, never remains a single personality but always becomes a large community of similar personalities—similar in their knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, likes and dislikes, views and opinions etc.—known as an ideological community.

An individual's urge for ideological procreation described above finds a scope for its fullest satisfaction when he has his own children to bring up and he repeats with respect to them the process which started when, in his own infancy, his parents began to guide and instruct him as to what was right and what was wrong for him to believe or do. In a way, he reproduces in his children the seed or the germ of the ideological form to which he himself belongs and this seed or germ goes on developing in them through his educational care and attention as it had developed in him through the educational care and attention of his parents in the past. This activity by which the elders of a community make its rising generation to develop into new lovers of their own ideology goes on in the community as a whole and helps to perpetuate it as an ideological community. The process of education is no other than this activity. We may, therefore, define education as a process by which the elders of a community make the members of its younger generation to love and serve, as perfectly as possible, the commonideology of the community and to acquire for this purpose all the knowledge and skills, habits and attitudes, desires and inclinations, interests and ideas, attachments and aversions, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations, manners and morals, ends and purposes, views and opinions and beliefs and standards which are consistent with this ideology.

Prof. W. R. Niblett who also believes in education as a process of growth seems to be alluding vaguely to the facts which this definition embodies when he writes in his book *Education and Modern Mind*.

"It (education) is a continuation of the process of growing into a full human being which took place physically in the nine months before we were born. But now it is the cul-

ture of the society which is the womb and the spirit not the body which is gestated".

Professor Clarke makes a similar observation (Year Book of Education, 1936, p. 249) when he writes:—

"For whatever else education may mean, it must mean primarily the self-perpetuation of an accepted culture—a culture which is the life of a determined society".

The definition of education given above naturally implies that education cannot be understood apart from an ideology and cannot be undertaken outside an ideological community. As we cannot think of biological procreation without thinking of a particular race of species in which it is taking place or is intended to take place, so we cannot think of education without thinking of a particular ideology or ideological community which it is serving or is intended to serve. Either an educator will not educate at all or he will educate for a particular ideology and for the likes and dislikes, the beliefs and opinions, the knowledge and skills and the habits and attitudes of a particular ideological community. The word education, therefore, can have no meaning as long as we do not qualify it by mentioning the ideology or the ideological community it is meant to serve. For example, we should say "Russian education", "American education", "Indian education", "English education" each of which is a distinct variety of education designed to serve Russian Communism, American Democracy, Indian Nationalism and English Nationalism respectively. Unless an educator is a revolutionary who feels the urge to become the founder of a new ideology and a new ideological community, there must be already in existence an ideology and an ideological community to which he may be able to refer before he can undertake his educational endeavour. But even in the case of a revolutionary educator the ideology which forms the basis of his education has a previous existence as a creed followed by him.

Every ideology has its own system of education which is designed to foster the love of that ideology in tirrations of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the name of the community of its lovers and to creat the name of the name

special type of knowledge, skills, habits and attitudes which is relevant to that ideology and which they need in order to be able to love and serve the ideology wholeheartedly. Every ideology has, moreover, its own philosophers of education who, by their reasoning, justify their own ideology as the only true and sound basis of education and every ideology has its own practical educators who exert themselves to put into practice the educational thought of its philosophers. It is clear, therefore, that the educational system of one ideological community can never serve properly the educational needs of another community. An ideological community cannot import the educational theory and practice of another ideological community without educating itself in a direction which is wrong from the point of view of its own ideology. Dr. J. B. Conant, the American author of Education and Liberty (Harvard University Press, 1953) writes:-

"I do not believe that educational practices are an exportable commodity......At times in our own history, attempts to import a British or European concept have done more harm than good".

The educational importance of the fact that every community has its own system of education has been now generally realized and its realization has brought into existence a new educational subject known as "Comparative Education". Sir Michael Sadler wrote in his How Far Can We learn Anything of Practical Value from the Study of Foreign Systems of Education published as far back as 1900.

"In studying foreign systems of education we should not forget that the things outside the schools matter even more than the things inside the schools and govern and interpret the things inside. We cannot wander at pleasure among the educational systems of the world like a child strolling through a garden and pick off a flower from one bush and some leaves from another and then expect that if we stick what we gathered into the soil at home, we shall have a living plant. A national system of education is a living thing. It has in it some of the secret workings of

national life. It reflects, while seeking to remedy, the failings of national character. By instinct it often lays special emphasis on those parts of training which the national character particularly needs".

The purpose of Comparative Education was stated by I. L. Kandal thirty three years later in his Studies in Comparative Education which became a recognized text book in many Universities of England and America.

"The chief value of a comparative approach to educational problems lies in an analysis of the causes which have produced them, in a comparison of the difference between the various systems and the reasons underlying them, and finally, in a study of the solutions attempted. In other words, the comparative approach demands first an appreciation of the intangible, impalpable, spiritual and cultural forces which underlie an educational system; the factors and forces outside the school matter even more than what goes on inside it".

Kandal wrote again in his monograph Comparative Education published in 1936 in the American Review of Educational Research as follows:—

"The purpose of Comparative Education, as of comparative law, comparative literature or comparative anatomy, is to discover the differences in the forces and causes that produce differences in educational systems."

Unfortunately, however, the writers on Comparative Education have hitherto confined themselves to describing the differences in the educational systems of different communities and have paid no attention to the "forces and causes" that produce these differences with a view to discovering the principles, underlying all variations, which may guide the educator to know which of the systems of education that exist at present or may exist in future, must be regarded as perfectly educative and from this point of view the subject of Comparative Education has been hitherto in its infancy.

On the view of education maintained in this book the "forces and causes" which have produced a variety of educational systems and which according to the writers quoted above lie mostly outside the schools, are the same as those which have produced a variety of socio-political communities. Briefly, they consist of the laws of human nature under which a human individual is bound to have an idea of beauty, goodness and truth and to make it the ideal of his life or the controlling force of all his activities. Individuals loving the same ideal live together, develop an ideology, acquire an organization on the basis of that ideology and become a socio-political community or a state. The educational system of a socio-political community emerges in the service of its ideology which, being the practical application of an idea of beauty, goodness and truth, is the fountain-head of all those "intangible, impalpable, spiritual and cultural forces" to which Kandal has made a reference as the basis of an educational system. Since human individuals have different ideas of beauty, goodness and truth on account of the differences of their educational environments, they come to have different ideologies and split up into different ideological or socio-political communities each having its own educational system designed instinctively to serve its ideology.

The educational system of a community is a branch in the tree of its ideology and is rooted in its ideal or its idea of beauty, goodness and truth. It cannot be torn away from that tree without withering away and becoming useless. This explains why, as Sir Michael says, "we cannot wander at pleasure among the educational systems of the world like a child strolling through a garden and pick off a flower from one bush and some leaves from another and then expect that if we stick what we gathered, into the soil at home we shall have a living plant". "The secret workings of national life" in the words of the writer, which an educational system represents, are determined strictly by the ideal of the nation and as such the character of the nation must remain imperfect to the extent to which its ideal is imperfect and to that extent its educational system too must reflect "the failings of the national character" which Michael has mentioned. This view naturally implies that a perfectly educative system of

education can be only that which is designed to serve, as perfectly as possible, a perfect ideology based on a perfect ideal.

The question discussed by educationists like Sir Percy Nunn and others whether education should or should not be based on a particular ideal of life does not arise at all. Since the urge for educational growth in man is no other than his urge for an ideal all educational development in him is the development of a capacity to love and serve his ideal.

Similarly, the question whether indoctrination or teaching particular beliefs and opinions is good or bad for the learner is irrelevant. Since every system of education which provides for the educational growth of a human individual at home or school, is meant to create in him a particular type of knowledge, skills, habits and attitudes relevant to a particular ideology all education is indoctrination. The mere fact that a child is born into a particular ideological community settles for him the beliefs and opinions that he will have as a result of his education and these beliefs and opinions can be no other than those of the elders of the community in their essence,

The so-called academic freedom of the learner can exist nowhere in a school or college which is maintained by an ideological community. The teacher may claim that he presents to his students all sides of a problem dispassionately and leaves them to think independently and come to their own conclusions. But really his nature, as a human being, makes it impossible for him to do so. What he really does, while presenting to his students all views on a problem, is to emphasise, consciously or unconsciously, one particular view of the problem-that which is his own, as the lover of a particular ideology which is invariably the ideology of the community to which he belongs-more than all others. As a member of an ideological community, he has been educated to love the ideology of the community. He cannot rebel against that ideology without running the risk of being hated and disgraced by the community and losing his career. As such he must incline towards one particular view of every problem—that which is consistent with his own ideology—out of a number of views that may be presented to him.

The teacher's ideal is a part of himself and he cannot run away from himself when he is playing the role of a teacher. His presentation of all problems to his students is bound to be coloured by his own views as the lover of that ideal. What he regards as his dispassionateness is a dispassionateness of a particular brand which is in keeping with his ideal. He can leave his students to think independently but only in favour of his own views derived from his own ideal and in order to come to conclusions which are identical with his own. Indeed, if they favour other views or come to other conclusions, their views and conclusions will not be according to him, the result of independent thinking. He is convinced that whenever an individual is able to think independently, and dispassionately and in an atmosphere of academic freedom, he must come to conclusions and form opinions which are identical to his own. For he can never believe that his own opinions are prejudiced or one-sided, although as a matter of fact he never formed his own opinions in an atmosphere of freedom. He is not dispassionate himself, how can his presentation of any views be ever dispassionate.

If the teacher is really capable of presenting the pros and cons of a controversial issue to his students dispassionately and impartially, it can only mean that he has not come to any decision about it himself and is suffering from a kind of intellectual paralysis with respect to that issue. Decision in favour of one view or another and preference for one opinion or another is natural and unavoidable. As the teacher cannot be impartial in his thinking on account of his nature, so his pupils too cannot be impartial in their thinking on account of their nature. They easily know the opinion of the teacher about every controversial issue and readily make it their own. Thinking behind the four walls of a university can never take place in a vacuum. It always occurs in the intellectual atmosphere of an ideology and goes to build up the passion for that ideology. The educator who does not care to know whether the ideology, the love of which this atmosphere is nourishing, is good or bad, high or low, true or false, being misled by willo the wisp of academic freedom, is hardly worthy of his job.

Every ideological community has its own view of what ideas or beliefs academic freedom must lead to. A communist society believes that if the students of a university enjoy real academic freedom and do not come under the influence of capatalist teachers, they must hate all bourgeoise philosophers as wrong. A democratic society, on the other hand, believes that if university students are free to think for themselves and come to their own conclusions they must condemn the communist philosophy as incorrect. As such who can say what academic freedom really is? Academic freedom is simply not possible in an ideological institution.

The growing generation of a community can be given option by their elders only, if at all, in the matter of opinions which they believe to be of no consequence to the life of the community as the lover of a particular ideology and a particular idea of beauty, goodness and truth. Even those who profess the creed of democracy or freedom are no exception to this rule. Is it not a fact that their schools and colleges indoctrinate the students in the creed of democracy or freedom? Why, do they not give their teachers and students the freedom to become Communists? They cannot do so. It is obviously impossible for the elders of a community which really believes in an ideology to tell its growing generation that perhaps they would be happier without it and that they should be constantly weighing in their mind the possibility of changing their ideology for a better one. When even the ideal of freedom is not free to examine itself critically and to entertain the hypothesis that it may be worthless, what other ideal can be? Academic freedom of learners in a school or college set up by an ideological community is therefore, a myth, a self-deception and an illusion.

All ideological communities whether totalitarian or democratic teach a monolithic culture in their schools and calleges. It is true that opposing views are also considered but only to be refuted and mowed down, directly or indirectly. That is why the ultimate result of education in every community is the strengthening of the students' faith in the ideology of the community. Education being ideological procreation, it is not less impossible for the educated members of the new generation of an ideological community to deviate from the common ideological form of the community, than it is impossible for the grown up members of the new generation of a species to deviate from the common physical form of the species.

Indoctrination is not only inevitable, it is also necessary. It enables the student to have a short cut to the stock of knowledge, skills, habits, manners, morals and attitudes which an ideological community has evolved in the service of its ideology at the great cost of time and suffering. The student cannot be made to pass once again through the whole long record of the successes and failures of the community and to re-discover all these ideological patterns afresh. Idoctrination is the only way in which the school can preserve the ideological *i.e.* intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic, heritage of the community.

It is said that progress occurs through individuals who depart from the conventional ways of thinking and acting and that it is only free criticism and inquiry which can make such a departure possible. But it is not realised that, in as much as criticism and inquiry need a point of view or a frame of reference, they can never be free. We cannot doubt the validity of an opinion without being certain of the validity of another opinion in the form of a criterion in the light of which we doubt it. The moment we reject a view we affirm another. As a matter of fact criticism and inquiry, even when they are the outcome of an honest and sincere thinking, can take place only within the limits prescribed by the ideology which creates and sustains the community. The fundamental beliefs of the community which are derived from the ideal are never questioned. Criticism and inquiry are meant to discover the unknown implications of these beliefs, to explain them, to elucidate them, to elaborate them, to philosophize them, to rationalize them and to find out better and more effective methods of translating them into action. In short, they are meant for the full actualization of the potentialities of the ideal and the complete realization of its hidden possibilities in the worlds of thought and action. Even the criticism and inquiry of Dewey in the field of educational philosophy could not, in spite of his deep commitment to the ideas of democracy and freedom in education, be independent of the ideology of the community to which he belongs. The book that he has written on educational philosophy as a result of his "free" inquiry and criticism is entitled Democracy and Education and the pith of its argument is, that the best social ideal from the point of education is Democracy. This conclusion—which we have already examined critically and found to be lacking in intellectual justification—is not the outcome of a desire for self-praise, but the result of an honest and sincere thinking determined unconsciously by the ideology of the community to which Dewey belongs. Dewey himself writes;—

"We rarely recognize the extent to which our conscious estimates of what is worthwhile and what is not are due to the standards of which we are not conscious at all. But in general it may be said that things that we take for granted without inquiry or reflection are just the things which determine our conscious thinking and decide our conclusions. And these habitudes which lie below the level of reflection are just those which have have been formed in the constant give and take of relationship with others."

This means that, according to Dewey, it is the unconscous beliefs and opinions which an individual acquires under the direct
influence of other members of his community and the validity
of which he takes for granted without inquiry or reflection, in
other words, it is the common ideology of the community to
which he belongs and, not any free criticism or inquiry on his
part, which determines his conscious thinking and decides his
conclusious.

Every departure from the conventional ways of thinking and acting which is imagined to lead to the progress of a community—unless it is a revolution resulting in the emergence of a new community with a new ideology—occurs strictly within the sphere of the requirements of its ideology and depends upon a full understanding of these requirements. The possibility of this departure cannot, therefore, decrease but must rather increase as a result of indoctrination. Every such departure which comes

into conflict with the ideology of the community is neither tolerated by the community nor dared by any of its members. The
reason is that the community believes that its progress can take
place only in one direction and that is the direction of the complete actualization of the potentialities of its ideal. The progress
of a community is like the growth of a sapling into a mature tree.
Every new growth of the sapling is a free departure from its past
but leads to a definite future in which all the potentialities of the
sapling are actualized. The sapling grows freely but its freedom
is circumscribed by the potentialities of its nature.

A freedom of thought and action which transcends the current ideological beliefs of a community can be found only in a revolutionary who has the vision of a new ideal and a new ideology and makes an effort to create a new ideological community of his followers. If such a community comes into existence it will, of course, set up new schools and colleges of its own, but these schools and colleges will again serve a particular ideology—that of the successful revolutionary—and will be, therefore, equally devoid of academic freedom.

Since we are bound by our nature to love some ideology always, the results and conclusions of our criticism and inquiry, which can only take the form of our intellectual, moral, spiritual or aesthetic judgements, can never be impartial in the sense of being independent of our ideological convictions. Our ideological convictions determine our judgements, to a large extent, unconsciously but surely. Our judgements resulting in this way from our partiality of one brand or another may however, be sometimes right and at other times wrong. For reasons already explained, they will be right only when they are the cutcome of a pure, sincere and wholehearted love of the Right Ideal. In such a case they will be truly and perfectly consistent with the intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic demands and requirements of the Rigt Ideal and there will be no tinge of any wrong love in the unconscious motives of their formation. On the other hand, they will be wrong when they are the outcome of the love of some wrong ideal. What matters, therefore, for the educator who desires his pupil to form his judgements correctly is not to assure that they are formed without any ideological bias, which is impossible, but to assure that they are formed entirely under the ideological bias of a single ideology, the one that is perfect. For, it is only in such a case that his judgements can be safe from the misdirecting influence of wrong ideologies and consequently from logical contradictions; it is only in such a case that they can become valid according to all the known standards of validity.

Unfortunately, much of the confusion in modern educational philosophy, specially the educational philosophy of which Dewey is the founder, is caused by the lack of a proper understanding of the words "progress" and "change". It is said that "Progress implies change. Change implies novelty. And novelty lays claim to being genuine rather than the revelation of an antecedently complete reality". "Since nothing can be accepted as final in a world ruled by flux" children must be taught "not so much what to think, as how to solve problems which this flux presented". They must "regard conclusions from their problem-solving as tentative and subject to amendment in the light of future events". Education is concieved as "the constant reconstruction of experience because in a continuously evolving world experience is always more or less in need of revision".

Much of the content of these statements has no rational basis.

In the first place, change that means progress brought about by human beings in the human world, does not necessarily imply "genuine novelty" as signifying novelty that cannot be predicted, foreseen or imagined, at least in its broad features. A community exists for the actualisation of all the mental, moral, spiritual and aesthetic potentialities of its ideal. It is like a growing organism and its growth takes the shape of the objectification or externalization of the mental, moral and material possibilities hidden in the nature of its ideal. The progress of a community is no other than this growth. All its problems for the solution of which its educators can ever want to train its rising generation are presented by its desire to check and oppose the forces that are likely to obstruct this growth and to create and assist the forces that are likely to support it. Whenever there occurs inside or outside the community a change which is beyond its control, the community reacts to it out of this desire and modifies it to suit this

desire. This desire is indeed the driving force of all the activities of the community and the flux in the human world is no other than the flow of these activities. An event occurring in nature can have no significance unless we react to it and modify it to suit our ends and purposes, all of which we derive from our ideal. The flux in the human world does not determine human beings. It is on the other hand itself determined by them. It does not present problems but is itself the process by which the problems are solved.

A community cannot do anything which is not required by its ideal and cannot help doing anything which is required by its ideal. To tell an ideological community, therefore, that "nothing can be accepted as final" in this world "ruled by flux" is to ignore the nature of an ideological community which is already ruled by its ideal and which has accepted that ideal as the final end of its activites at least for the time being and as long as it does not abandon that ideal for another. But the moment it abandons that ideal, it becomes a new ideological community. And how can any problems be solved without thinking? If we do not think we cannot even realize that we are facing a problem which must be solved. Conclusions as plans of action can be tentative and subject to amendment, only in this sense that when new forces opposing or assisting the growth of the community come to light the community has to change its plan of action to oppose or assist these forces in order to assure its own continuous growth and in this process it has naturally to reconstruct and revise its experience.

Change follows a changeless pattern and leads to a fixed destination so frequently that it would be reasonable to conclude that change is always the revelation of something antecedently present in the nature of the changing object whether we know or do not know of its presence there. The seed of a tree passes through a long series of changes int he process of its growth but grows ultimately into the same mature tree with the same kind of leaves, branches, flowers, fruit and seed always. The germcell of an animal similarly passes through a long series of changes in the process of its development, but develops ultimately into the same full-grown animal having the same physical form and the

same characters always. In each of these cases the cycle of change is repeated again and again. The change within the cycle is not contingent but takes place in a definite direction and follows a definite plan the object of which is the complete actualization of the potentialities of the seed or the germ-cell. But the fact that the species also change has led some philosophers of education to suppose that ultimately change is not subordinate to the changeless. Thus Brubacher writes:—

"The startling philosophical inference from Darwin's work is the fact that species change. There is not only change within the cycle of growth but the cycle itself can change. If this is so then change is no longer to be subordinated to the changeless. Change is now an ultimate trait of reality".

This conclusion is, however, not justified.

The actual course which the process of universal evolution has followed so far leaves no doubt that the over all change in the Universe too is not precarious but takes place in a definite direction and follows a definite plan the object of which is the complete actualization of the potentialities of life. The material universe as we see it at present, did not come into existence suddenly. The physicists agree that its earliest form which was a huge effulgence of cosmic rays continued to change during millions of years of material evolution till its present form came into being. This change of the physical universe spread over a long period of time, was accompanied by the simultaneous development of the physical laws. It developed ultimately into a form that was most appropriate for the emergence, maintenance and development of life, and as a consequence life did emerge in the form of that unicellular animal which is known as the amoeba and which maintained itself and developed in such a way thatit proved to be an essential basis of all future evolution. Thus change in the material universe had a definite meaningful direction and followed a definite plan.

With the emergence of the amoeba the animal stage of evolution begins. The tiny amoeba was gifted (in order to be able to

maintain its life and race) not only with a desire for food but also with internal and external means for the satisfaction of that desire. It had the internal capacity to move about a little in search of food and food was ready for it in its external surroundings. As it satisfied its hunger by assimilating matter from the external world it grew and became mature and procreated other individuals of its kind. During the animal stage of evolution there were ordinary changes in the body of the animal which enabled it to develop from its condition as a germ-cell into the mature physical form of its ancestors. But there were also extraordinary changes which, as if by a miracle, carried an animal beyond the boundaries set by the physical form of its species and resulted in the emergence of a new species registering a considerable improvement upon the one out of which it was born. These changes, known by the biologists as mutations, were not too without a plan. They followed a larger plan, subserved by the plan according to which all new members of a species repeated the physical form of their parents.

The larger plan of change, governing mutations, is revealed most clearly by the facts of biological evolution. We have already seen that the biologists agree that man is the most perfect of all species, that in him biological evolution has reached the point of its highest culmination and that all evolution above this point has been and will be of a psychological nature. This means that the urge for biological growth which began to operate and press for satisfaction in the amoeba was really an urge for biological perfection i.e. an urge to grow into and maintain by procreation permanently, a form of life that is biologically perfect and that form was man. This one fact leads to conclusions about the nature of biological growth in the light of which one can picture easily how change has actually taken place at the biological stage of evolution. We conclude, for example, that the process of biological growth which continued through the ages from the emergence of the first living cell to the emergence of man was a process by which the urge for biological perfection gradually actualized its potentialities. Its object was the development of the earliest form of life into higher and higher forms leading ultimately to a form of the highest perfection. Man could not be superseded by another more perfect biological

form of life because he had already actualized the potentialities of the urge for biological perfection present in the first animal to the fullest extent.

With the emergence of man the tip of the evolutionary movement shifted from the biological to the psychological plane. The urge for growth in life having exhausted its biological possibilities in the human form could not operate any more on the biological level for the creation of new species and began to operate instead on the psychological level in the direction of its next objective. Man thus became not only the *most perfect* of all the biological forms of life but also the last of them that was really needed by life for the realization of its aspirations.

Amoeba was the earliest and the simplest form of the human being having the urge and the potentialities to develop into a full-fledged human being. It progressed in the direction of its final form, the perfect human form, in a straight line of growth on which there were innumerable halts or stages in the form of species. Since this straight line led actually to the perfect actualization of the potentialities of the urge for biological perfection, it was the right line, the main line or the central line of evolution. This line was unique not, as Julian Huxley tells us, "in the trivial sense of being a different course from that of any other organism but in the profounder sense of being the only path that could have achieved the essential characters of man". Every new stage on this line represented a new and improved form of the human being which though imperfect was yet a step nearer to the final or the perfect form in some respects. The brain and physical organs of this form were more highly developed than those of the earlier form. Every new form of life on this line possessed the fundamental instincts of hunger and procreation but its physical and cereberal improvement was attended simultaneously by the emergence of other instincts like curiosity, self-assertion and self-abasement etc. which enabled it to satisfy those fundamental instincts in a more complex and more efficient manner.

At every new stage on the main line of evolution there was a prolonged halt during which there was a continuous repetition

of the same form in a process by which every generation of the species procreated the next. This tendency of a form of life to halt and repeat its own ancestral shape at every new state of its development, known as the law of heredity, acted, therefore, as an obstruction in the way of the development of the form into a new higher form nearer to biological perfection than itself. The cause of this tendency of life was the pressure of its urge for perfection which was not only an urge to grow into a perfect form but also an urge to maintain that form permanently as the basis of all future evolution. When life has actually jumped to the level of its highest biological form, its natural tendency for the preservation of that form as the foundation of all future evolution, must take the shape of a process of continuous reproduction and procreation of the same form. But life cannot express this tendency of its nature when it has jumped to the level of a perfect species, unless it is able to express it every time that it is able to jump to the level of a higher species however imperfect. This accounts for the continuation of imperfect species during long periods of time in spite of the fact that none of them was itself the aim of evolution and evolution had to move forward towards its goal of biological perfection leaving each of them behind. Indeed all the tendencies of life which were made use of by imperfect biological forms of life emerging on the main line of evolution in the course of life's passage towards its destination were really meant for the use of the perfect biological form which was to appear when that destination was reached.

At every halt on the right line of evolution the imperfect human form continued to reproduce and procreate other individuals of its own type for generations. All these individuals had the same general type, but slight variations of their biological capacities and constitutions. The potentialities of the urge for growth into a new improved form continued to press for actualization in all of them but could not be actualized in the shape of any such form owing to the obstruction of the force of heredity which made every one of them to grow into their parental form only. When this obstruction had resisted the potentialities of the form for further growth in the direction of the perfect and the ultimate form too long, the force of these potentialities that is to say the vital force operating in the form which indeed carried

these potentialities with itself, gathered momentum and made an all out effort to break the resistance. The result was that it took a sudden leap forward in an individual which had the good fortune to possess a type of biological constitution and to encounter a quality of biological environment (food terrain, climate and other biological factors and stimuli) which happened to be particularly favourable for such a leap and in which, therefore, the urge for biological growth was able to operate with an extraordinary force. This individual, therefore, developed a new biological form which was a considerable improvement upon the general ancestral form of the community to which it was born. Hence it became the father of a new and a higher form of life, which was a step nearer to the final or the perfect form or the human form of life. It is this phenomena which is known by the biologists today as a mutation.

Since a mutation occurred at a time when the pressure of the potentialities of a form of life for development into a higher form, had been resisted too long and had militated too long against the rigidity of the ancestral form deriving from the forces of heredity, it happened frequently that when a mutation did take place, this rigidity had been already softened a little in the direction of the mutation in the case of quite a number of individuals in the community. But the mutation occurred fully and freely only in one them who alone became the father of a new form of life capable of evolving continuously upto the end.

In this way mutations continued to take place on the main or the right line of evolution one after the other and man continued to develop from stage to stage and form to form, till he reached the stage of his highest biological perfection. At no stage of his development man was the progeny of another non-human type of life, as some evolutionists have supposed, but. like the human embryo in the womb of the mother, he developed at every stage from his own lower and imperfect state to a higher and more perfect state of his own physical form.

When life had reached man the Perfect Biological Form it came to a permanent halt from the point of view of biological evolution and the mutations were discontinued on the main line of evolution. Thereafter the urge for biological growth in every generation of human beings could express itself only in the procreation and reproduction of the members of the next generation.

Every form of life appearing on the central line of biological evolution was potentially perfect though actually imperfect (except the last form which was actually perfect) and its actual imperfection became less and less as it approached its actual perfection. Every form that was left behind after each mutation on this line lingered on to perish gradually as it was no longer needed for the purposes of evolution. The urge for biological growth had already crossed it and passed on, using it as a stepping stone, to operate in the next higher form of the human being. But while the development of the human form of life was going on smoothly and successfully on the main line of evolution in this way some deviations or misdirections of the urge for biological growth were taking place constantly on this line, thus giving rise to other non-human forms of life which were irrelevant to the aspirations of life and which were therefore, not destined to become perfect.

Every form of life that emerged on the human line of evolution procreated, when time was ripe for a new mutation, some individuals who mutated in a wrong direction owing to their particular biological capacities and constitutions coming under the influence of a particular biological environment. Hence they were unable to carry forward with them all the potentialities of a future growth into the perfect form. As their growth became misdirected it was only natural for them to lose some of these potentialities for ever. The result was that although they continued to mutate in a wrong direction, owing to the pressure of whatever potentialities of evolution were left to them, and under the influence of a biological environment that was favourable to the actualization of these potentialities, they could never develop into a perfect biological form. Since they were not potentially perfect they could not become actually perfect.

Thus several branches of imperfect species of various levels and standards of imperfection shot off in different wrong directions from all points of halt on the main line of evolution and began to mutate in those directions, into new imperfect species and continued to do so as long as the environment was favourable and the potentialities that remained over with them after each mutation were not totally exhausted. This wrongly directed evolution continued even after the emergence of man as long as the potentialities or possibilities of progress of the various lines on which it was proceeding were not totally exhausted. All imperfect forms of life which were the product of such wrong evolution, like the unwanted imperfect forms of man left behind by the forward march of life on the main line of evolution, either became extinct in due course of time or lingered on without evolving waiting for extinction. Since all these biological forms were no more than incidental by-products of the evolution of man and were not meant to live permanently and in their own right, the properties of life which they exhibited e.g. the capacity of procreation and the capacity of new members for growth into the parental form, did not serve in their case the ultimate purpose for which they were meant.

Since the emergence of a new species took place always under the influence of a particular biological environment, that biological environment became indispensable to the continued existence of the species. This explains why every species needs even today a particular variety of food, climate and terrain, in exclusion to all other varieties of these conditions, in order to maintain its life and race. When true man had actually emerged he was still weak and defenceless as compared with many other species. But on account of his superior biological capacities as a perfect form of life he was destined to live and prosper and finally to dominate all imperfect species and this is what actually came about. The only change that manifested itself in the animal world after the emergence of man was the gradual multiplication of his numbers leading to his ultimate domination of the habitable globe.

This is how change manifested itself in the Universe during the biological ages as a result of the expression of the urge for biological perfection in the first animal. It was evidently a change that followed definite laws and worked out a definite plan. Mutations or changes of species do not at all signify that change is not subordinate to the changeless. They did not take place haphazardly and without any object. Their object was the complete actualization of the potentialities of the first organism for growth into a perfect organism. They came to a dead stop automatically as soon as this object was achieved because they could not continue further. They took place very frequently during the biological ages when the human form of life had not yet reached the stage of its perfection and when the pressure of the potentialities of the urge for biological perfection was therefore still very powerful. Gradually, as these enfolded potentialities unfolded themselves more and more and their pressure diminished, the mutations too became less and less frequent till they ceased entirely.

Now that the potentialities of the urge for biological perfection have exhausted themselves completely everywhere, it is as futile to expect that the evolution of species in the form of real mutations or in any other form, can take place anywhere, as it is to expect that the hands of a clock the spring of which has gradually wounded off will ever move again even a little. Experiments such as those carried out by DeVries, Tower, Morgan and Johannsen cannot but produce artificial mutations which are due to the plasticity allowed by nature to the individuals of each species to vary within certain limits which cannot be overstepped. As some species have more of this plasticity than others the characters of their offspring produced under certain artificial conditions e.g. cross breeding or selecting of mates etc. can be made to look like a natural mutation. Artificial mutations are mostly of a negative character registering the loss of some quality not found in the parent individuals. Even if their results are positive their occurrence is so rare and their scope is so limited that they can give us no idea of the degree of wealth and abundance in which mutations must have occurred during the biological ages.

The facts of biological evolution outlined above enable us to conclude that the change that is occurring in the Universe at the human stage of evolution at present must be similarly taking place according to a definite plan residing in the potentialities of the urge for ideological growth which is an urge for ideological perfection. Its ultimate object must be the emergence of a race of human individuals who are ideologically, that is to say, educationally, the most perfect.

## CHAPTER V

## CONDITIONS OF PERFECT EDUCATIONAL GROWTH

It follows from the definition of education given above that a system of education will be good or bad according as the ideology which it is serving or is intended to serve is good or bad, perfect of imperfect universal or narrow. This view is implied in some of the conclusions arrived at by Dewey as the following passages from his book *Democracy and Education* will show:—

"The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind. Since education is a social process and there are many kinds of societies a criterion for educational criticism and construction implies a particular social ideal".

"To say that education is a social function, securing direction and development in the immature through their participation in the life the group to which they belong is to say in effect that education will vary with the quality of life which prevails in the group".

All imperfect ideals are miseducative but all the them are not equally so. The nearer an imperfect ideal is to the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth the more educative it is but it can never be perfectly educative unless it is totally good, beautiful and true.

Supposing a highly advanced and organized community of indiscriminate and reckless pirates capable of using scientific methods and instruments for carrying out the ugly responsibilities of their way of life, is living safely and freely in an island. They will have a common ideal, piracy. They will attribute to this ideal all beauty, goodness and truth that according to them should matter to any body. That is why they will permit it to determine their activities and control their practical life as individuals and as an organized community. They will create an

ideology and evolve a mass of scientific knowledge, and a set of habits, skills and attitudes and desires and inclinations etc. on the basis of this ideal. They will have consequently a moral system, a political system, an industrial system, a commercial system, a financial system, a legal system, an educational system, and an intellectual system, that is to say, a philosophy of life (which will be, of course, the Philosophy of Piracy) based on this ideal. The elders of the community will educate their rising generation to follow very strictly the moral code prescribed by their ideal, and to acquire the knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, motives and purposes, like and dislikes, hopes and aspirations, standards and opinions which they have acquired themselves and which they think the new generation of the community needs in order to love and serve the common ideology of the community efficiently.

The young people will submit to the education of their elders in order to win their love and approval and save themselves from their hatred and disapproval and thereby to succeed and avoid a failure in life. The philosophy of life evolved by the community will be an attempt to give a rational explanation of piracy as an idea of total beauty, goodness and truth and to show that all true scientific facts are relevant only to this ideal. But since piracy cannot be an ideal of total beauty, goodness and truth, scientific facts will not be totally relevant to it. They will, therefore, reject and ignore as untrue certain facts which are really true and accept and emphasise as true certain other facts which are really not true, in order to make it appear that all true facts are relevant to their ideal. The reasoning of their philosophers will be, therefore, logically defective and erroneous and their philosophy will be inconsistent and incoherent. This philosophy will be, however, a subject of study in their schools and colleges and a scurce of inspiration for their young and old They will have a system of education like that of any other advanced community in the world. But although their education will be efficient and powerful as an instrument in the service of their ideology, it will be wrong and miseducative.

Now supposing there is a revolution in the community against indiscriminate piracy and, as a consequence, their ideal

undergoes a change and they decide to confine their practice as pirates to the ships of strong and aggressive nations only. Their Ideal will, in this way, come a little nearer to the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth, but if will be still very imperfect. The change will begin to be reflected immediately in all aspects of their life as individuals and as a community bringing each a little nearer to the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth. They will re-interpret the scientific facts known to them wherever necessary in order to make them relevant to their new ideal. They will have a new set of habits, skills, attitudes and emotions, likes and dislikes, motives and purposes, hops and aspirations, and standards and opinions to suit their new ideal.

They will, therefore, evolve a new moral system, a new political system, a new economic system, a new legal system and a new educational system which will be consistent with their new ideal. They will revise their intellectual system or their philosophy of life and give it a new name consistent with their new world-view. It will be an effort to give a rational explanation of discriminative piracy as an idea of total beauty, goodness and truth and to show that all true scientific facts are relevant only to this ideal. It will be a little more relevant to scientific facts but it will be still very far from being perfectly relevant to them. Their philosophy will be a little less illogical and erroneous, but it will be still full of logical discripancies and inconsistencies. The education of the community will be a little better but it will be still on the whole a form of miseducation resulting in the misdirection of the growth of human personality.

What is true of the education of this community of pirates is true of the education of every organized community which loves a narrow and imperfect ideal to the extent to which its ideal is narrow and imperfect.

But a system of education may not only be good or bad from the point of view of the ideology it is serving or is intended to serve but also efficient or inefficient irrespective of the ideology it is serving or is intended to serve. It may be meant to serve a good ideology and yet it may not be designed to serve

it efficiently and perfectly. In such a case it will not be able to achieve all its ends. Or, it may be meant to serve a bad ideology and yet it may be so designed as to be able to serve it efficiently and perfectly. In such a case it will be able to achieve all its ends but its ends will not be worthy or conductive to the full growth of the human personality. The point will be better explained by an illustration.

Supposing there are two communities contemporary to each other one of which is based on an imperfect and narrow ideal (say on the love of a race, a country, a colour, a nation, a language, a tribe or a caste) and the other is based on the Perfect Ideal. The community that is based on a narrow and imperfect ideal is one of a large number of similar communities but the community that is based on the perfect ideal is only one of its kind. The first community has "discovered" a set of scientific facts in the Three Sciences-Physics, Biology and Psychologyand evolved a set of skills, habits and attitudes (including laws, customs, institutions, motives, ends and purposes, hopes and aspirations, likes and dislikes etc) which it believes to be relevant to its ideology and worthy of being acquired by every one of its members in order to be able to serve his ideology and to -realize its possibilities and actualize its potentialities properly. The community makes it a point, therefore, to pass on this set of scientific facts, habits, skills and attitudes to its younger members, generation after generation, by means of education.

But it does not stay there. With the help of power conferred upon it by its existing achievements, it makes further effort and discovers or learns new scientific facts in the Three Sciences and evolves new and better habits, skills and attitudes which give the individual and the community a much greater power and efficiency to serve their ideology and actualize its potentialities. The community has, then, to include the new scientific facts, habits, skills and attitudes in the list of educational attainments it has to pass to its succeeding generations. This process continues with the result that the education of the community continues to grow in efficiency from generation to generation till it becomes as highly efficient as it can be in view of the stage of the advancement of the human race in the knowledge of scienti-

fic tacts and industrial, financial, commercial and educational arts and skills. It is perfectly efficient because it serves the purpose for which it is meant, that is, enabling, the individual and the community to love and serve their ideology as perfectly as possible and because it is efficient it does not permit the educational influences of other ideologies namely their stock of knowledge, habits, skills and attitudes to penetrate it without being adapted to the ideology which it is serving.

Such a community is generally considered to be highly advanced which only means that the efficiency of its education to serve its ideology has reached a very high stage of development. However, in spite of all its efficiency, the education of such a community is only a form of miseducation. It may enable them to invent skycrapers, jets, rockets, space ships atomic instruments, ballastic missiles, hydrogen bombs, sputniks and lunics in the service of their ideology but it cannot permit the individual to grow educationally in the right direction or to actualize all the potentialities of his personality as a human being.

The other community which is based on the Perfect Ideal has also evolved a set of educational qualifications consisting of a stock of knowledge of scientific facts in the Three Sciences habits; skills, attitudes (likes and dislikes, beliefs and opinions, motives and manners, ends and purposes, hopes and aspirations, laws, customs and institutions) of some standard or quality which it believes to be relevant to its ideology and worthy of being acquired by every one of its individual members in order to be able to serve its ideology, to realize its possibilities and to actualize its potentialities properly. The community, therefore, makes it a point to pass on this stock of scientific facts, habits, skill and attitudes to its young members generation after generation by means of education. It also makes a further effort to discover or learn new facts in the Three Sciences and to acquire new and better, habits, skills and attitudes which are consistent with its ideology and which give the individual and the community a greater power to serve the ideology.

But at a certain stage of its advancement it stops its efforts to discover or learn new scientific facts and acquire new and better

habits, skills and attitudes consistent with its ideology. The result is that the efficiency of its education to serve the ideology ceases to progress and before long there is a big gap between the level of this efficiency and the stage of growth of the knowledge of the human race in the Three Sciences and in the various arts and skills relating to commerce, industry, finance, engineering, surgery, medicine, education etc. Since this knowledge is evolved by imperfect ideologies it is interpretted wrongly and employed in a wrong manner in order to be of service to these ideologies. The only way in which the lovers of the Perfect Ideology can increase the efficiency of their education as an instrument in the service of their ideology to the maxmum limit that is possible is to re-interpret this knowledge in the light of their own ideology and to employ it in its service. If they fail to do so, their desire and their need to keep abreast of the times in their efficiency and power as a community which is able to live and subsist in a world of highly advanced and efficient ideological communities will force them to borrow the educational equipment of imperfect ideologies and graft it into their own educational system. The result will be that the coming generations of the community of the Perfect Ideology will acquire much of the knowledge, skills, habits and attitudes which are relevant to these wrong ideologies. Their educational system will not be serving their own ideology as efficiently and as perfectly as required. It will misdirect their urge for educational growth and miseducate them to a large extent. It will begin to produce individuals who are able to love and serve wholeheartedly neither their own perfect ideology nor any of the imperfect ideologies of other communities, individuals who can be described appropriately as educational or ideological hybrids.

The home education of this community will continue to serve the Perfect Ideology for some time, as usual, but since it will borrow its school and college education, particularly its text-books and teachers, from imperfect ideologies it will create a big ideological gap between its education at home and the education in its schools and colleges. The result will be that its educated individuals will come to believe in an ideology which is a compromise between the ideology of their parents and the ideology of their teachers and text-book writers. Their children

will consequently receive a home education which will not be in accordance with the Perfect Ideology like their own education at home earlier but in accordance with their new compromised ideology. In this way the home education of the community will drift ideologically nearer and nearer to its school and college education till the former will be ideologically in full accord with latter. In other words, if the community does nothing to stop this process, its ideology will gradually change in the direction of the iedology of the community from which it borrows its school and college education, till it will become completely identical with the latter. As a result of its gradual and imperceptible mass-conversion to another ideology, in this way, the community will ultimately disappear itself and leave behind out of its off-spring another ideological community to take its place.

Whenever an ideological community—no matter what its ideology may be-borrows the education of another ideological community to compensate for the inefficiency of its own education, without altering it suitably and adapting it completely to the needs of its own ideology, it commits, as if, a suicide by taking a slow poison and waits for its death. The process of the ideological conversion of a community can be stopped only where it takes place and by discarding the instruments that make it possible and we know that it takes place in the schools and colleges and that its instruments are the alien text-book and the alien teacher, alien, that is, to the ideology of the community. An ideological community that desires to live as that ideological community and to serve its own ideology and no other, must have its own teachers and its own text-books at every stage of the education of its growing generations. The march of prewar Germany from National Democracy to Hitlerism, of pre-war Itlay from National Democracy to Fascism of pre-war Russia from Czarism to Communism of post-war Japan from Mikadoism to National Democracy, of post-war Germany from Hitlerism to National Democracy and of post-war Italy from Fascism to National Democracy are examples in recent history of the mass-conversion of ideological communities achieved with the help of text-books and teachers specially prepared for the purpose.

The perfect educational growth of an individual will not be

possible unless the system of education which administers to his educational requirements is *perfectly educative* and it will not be perfectly educative unless it is designed

- (a) to serve a Perfect Ideology, and
- (b) to serve it as efficiently and as perfectly as possible.

A perfect system of education may, therefore, be defined as a system of education which enables a community to love the Perfect Ideal viz God, as whole-heartedly as possible, to order all aspects of their natural activity as human beings in accordance with the demands of that love, as efficiently as possible, and to acquire all the stock of knowledge, skills and arts, habits and attitudes, desires and inclinations, likes and dislikes, views and opinions, hopes and aspirations, beliefs and standards, ends and purposes which they need for this purpose on account of their relevance to the Perfect Ideal and which can be made available to them in view of the existing stage of the intellectual, moral, spiritual and asethetic advancement of the human race. This definition naturally implies that a system of education that is perfect at one stage of the progress of humanity in scientific knowledge, arts, skills and habitudes etc. will cease to be perfect at a higher stage of such progress unless it incorporates into itself all that is relevant to the Perfect Ideal and, therefore, all that is good, beautiful and true in the new stock of scientific knowledge. arts, skills and habitudes etc., achieved by the human race at this higher stage.

Let us now study the actual educational conditions which an educational expert who has a clear understanding of the nature and direction of the educational process and who succeeds in evolving a perfectly educative scheme of education designed to serve a perfect ideology, as perfectly as possible, has to create for the individual, why has he to create them and how do they lead to the perfect educational development of the individual? For this purpose we must study more thoroughly the nature and qualities of each of the four aspects of the urge for educational growth and the part played by each in the growth of an individual into the ideological form of his parents.

We have already known that each of them is meant to function independently and to be satisfied for its own sake. The nature of each of them is such that freedom is a condition for its proper functioning. Without freedom none of them remains itself and none of them is able to play the role for which it is meant. But each of them is able to maintain its freedom or independence only when the ideal of the learner is the true or natural ideal of his self, namely the Perfect Ideal. The other three urges of the human self are parts of its urge for the Perfect Ideal. Hence no one of them can be at its best and highest and no one of them can have a full and free expression unless it is functioning as a part of the love of the Perfect Ideal. In such a case they not only play their due role as servants of the ideal but also function fully and freely themselves.

On the other hand, when the ideal of an individual is imperfect and wrong, they are not able to function fully and freely. For in that case they are not only separated from their real companion, the Perfect Ideal, which alone can give them perfect freedom to function but also put in the company of an ideal the nature of which is incompatible with their own and which, therefore, encroaches upon their freedom for the realization of its ownwrong ends. It forces them to serve it in spite of the fact that it is not an ideal of total beauty, goodness and truth and they are, by their nature, not meant to serve it. Thus it thwarts their free activity and consequently their correct and complete expression and satisfaction. The result is that they are deviated from their natural course and misdirected into wrong channels.

In such a case the spiritual activity of the individual creates in him a feeling of beauty which is false and unjustified, his intellectual activity yields a type of knowledge which is not totally correct, his moral activity results in actions which are not really moral and right and his aesthetic activity leads him to admire and create forms and appearances which are not completely artistic and beautiful. The experiences of the lover of a wrong and imperfect ideal whether spiritual, intellectual, moral or aesthetic become modified and distorted in the very process of their emergence in such a way that they become consistent with his wrong ideal and fit into the organic whole of the particular ideological

form or type of personality—low, dwarfed and stunted to the extent the ideal itself is low and imperfect—that is latent in it and grows out of it.

If, on the other hand, the ideal of an individual is perfectly good, beautiful and true all his spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic activities will, ultimately, yield experiences which are truly spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic and if any of his experiences become modified in the process of their emergence, on account of the force of his love for the ideal, their modification takes such a direction that they are purified and purged of their false elements. This aspect of human nature reveals that the educator who wants to assure the perfect educational growth of his pupil should not only lay before him a definite ideal of life to strive after, but should also see to it that that ideal is the ideal of God and no other. This means that he should relate all the spiritual, intellectual, moral and aesthetic experiences of his pupil to the ideal of God; otherwise they will come to be related to some imperfect ideal and will cease to be educative experiences.

The tendency of the lover of an ideal—whether his ideal is perfect or imperfect—to modify his experiences in the very act of acquiring them in order to make them consistent with his ideal—to distort them and misinterpret them, if his ideal is wrong and imperfect and to correct them and purge them of their errors, if his ideal is right and perfect—is natural and unavoidable as it is the result of his ideological heredity and a part of the ideological constitution passed on to him by his parents and educators in the community.

It is, however, extremely important for an educator to remember that his pupil's urge for educational growth will not receive its full expression and satisfaction—even if he has laid the Perfect Ideal before him and done his best to relate all his intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic experiences to that ideal— if he does not emphasise, by the manner in which he directs his educational development, the following facts:-

1. That all the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth

belong only to the Perfect Ideal and to no other idea or object in the world, except by way of a reflection of these qualities of the Perfect Ideal. If a wall is illuminated by the rays of the Sun it is not the wall but the Sun that is really brilliant.

- 2. That to attribute any quality of the Perfect Ideal to any other idea or object in theory or practice, directly or indirectly, is to give a wrong direction to the growth of love and to make the Perfect Ideal wrong and imperfect. A full and free satisfaction of his pupil's urge for educational growth will depend, therefore, on the fact whether the pupil is or is not able to keep the idea of God absolutely pure and unique in its qualities and attributes.
- 3. That the love of every ideal demands for its satisfaction and needs for its growth an external practical expression. It, seeks therefore, to control and dominate every part or aspect of the external, practical life of the individual, whether political, ethical, moral, spiritual, intellectual, economic, aesthetic, educational, social, political or military. The Perfect Ideal is no exception to this rule,
- 4. That if any part or aspect of the life-activity of his pupil is not deliberately subordinated to the requirements of the Perfect Ideal, it will be controlled and dominated by some wrong and imperfect ideal and thus hamper the growth of his love for the Perfect Ideal and consequently his growth as education.
  - 5. That the educational growth of his pupil will be in direct proportion to the growth of his pupil's love considered both as an internal realization of Beauty and as its external objectification in his practical life. To the extent, therefore, to which his natural capacity for love will remain unattached to the Perfect Ideal, to that extent his growth as education will be deficient and incomplete. To that extent, also, his capacity for love and educational growth will be exposed to the danger of being

misdirected and misappropriated by wrong ideals.

## THE EXPRESSION AND SATISFACTION

In order to be able to direct properly the full expression and satisfaction of his pupil's urge for knowledge the educator must understand the nature of knowledge and the part played by the various capacitities of man viz sensation, perception, intuition and reason, in its development. Perception is the root out of which all knowledge grows. It is the first and the most immediate result of our urge for knowledge—the result of its operation at the level of sensory experience. The view that the urgefor educational growth is an urge for beauty and perfection as well as the sole motivating force of all human activity, implies that the process of learning, as a human activity—which of course, results always in the educational growth of an individual—must be a process of the search for beauty and perfection helped by the activity of our senses and our percepts must be pshychological objects to which we ascribe beauty or perfection of some quality or standard.

This implication of the view is supported by a recent development of Psychology known as the Gestalt Theory, first announced in 1912 in Germany by Max Wertheimer and supported later on by a number of psychologists the most notable of them being Wolfang Kohler and Kurt Koffka. According to this theory, perception is the result of an "insight" or "intiution" which enables the learner to know objects and situations only as organised and unified wholes segregated from their surrounings. Every sensory unit or whole acquires, later on, a name and becomes a symbol. It is the original segregation of circumscribed wholes which makes it possible for the sensory world to appear so utterly imbued with meaning to the adult, for, in its gradual entry into the sensory field, meaning follows the lines drawn by natural organisation. Every whole, in so far as it has the quality of wholeness is a good, beautiful and true whole.

Sensory organisation tends to move in one general direction rather than in other directions, always towards the state of pragnanz, towards the state of "good" gestalt, which is, therefore

a state of equilibrium. The organization is as good as the prevailing conditions allow. A "good" gestalt has such properties as regularity, simplicity, stability and so on. Similar items (e.g. similar in form or colour) or similar transitions (e.g. alike in the steps separating them) tend to form groups in perception. Again perceptional groups are formed according to the nearness of the parts. If several parallel lines are spaced unevenly on a page, those nearer together will tend to form groups against a background of empty space. Whatever favours organization or the beauty and perfection that resides in wholeness, favours learning, retention and recall. Patterning through proximity holds also with audition as in the grouping of successive clicks. Then the proximity is a temporal one. As it applies to memory the law of proximity becomes the law of recency. Old impressions are less well-recognized and recalled than new ones because the recent trace is nearer in time to the present active process. Closed areas form stable wholes by the fact of their closure and segregation and, therefore, more readily form figures in perception. Rewards influence learning favourably because, they close or complete a situation as an attractive whole of experience. A problematic situation is a part which becomes a whole when the solution is achieved. The whole which consists of the problem plus its solution is conceived as an object of beauty which is incomplete and a tension is set up towards its completion and the consequent achievement of its closure and realization of its beauty. This strain to complete or close is an aid to learning since to achieve completion or closure is satisfying. When the solution is found and the whole is completed, the equilibrium is established and the tension disappears.

Organization tends to appear not only in the direction of beautiful grouping (made beautiful by proximity, similarity, regularity, simplicity etc.) and beautiful closure but also in the direction of beautiful continuity. A straight line appears to continue as a straight line and a part circle appears as a circle and so on even though many other kinds of perceptual structuring would be possible. Closure and continuation are aspects of articulate organization. Conditions which facilitate perception also facilitate learning. Kohler demonstrated, for example, that the learning of paired figures was facilitated when

the figure fitted, that is, when the cue and response items formed a regular pair. Pairs fitting less well were harder to learn.

The gestalt psychologists apply the concept of the gestalt beyond the limits of sensory experience. The term includes, according to its functional definition, processes of learning, of recall, of striving, of emotional attitude, of thinking, acting and so forth.

The judgement or perception of a whole depends upon the psychological background of the perceving individual. Thus the same sensations may lead to different perceptions in different individuals at the same time or in the same individual at different times. Kurt Lewin (1890-1947) a member of the Berlin Gestalt group was right in concluding that every human individual lives in a different psychological environment which he denoted by the geometerical term of life-space. The conception of life-space signifies that two persons walking down the same street are going in different directions and the world in which they are walking are to them different worlds. A person who sits planning for tomorrow moves in a world very different from that in which he sits. A person's life-space is the space in which he lives psychologically as judged from his own view point. It includes each and every object, person or idea that he has anything to do with. It corresponds in many ways to the world about him, to the world of things, people and ideas, being his selection from these, but it becomes his world always in edited and distorted forms. Motion in life-space is marked by the selection of alternatives, the examining of possibilities, setting out towards goals, the experiencing of success or frustation or the like. It may or may not involve motion in the physical world.

If a person is moving towards an object of choice in the physical world, he is also moving in his life-space but the two motions are not identical. In life-space we represent the psychological significance for the person of the motion in physical space. When a person is attracted by an object, the object is said to have positive valence, an analogy with the valence between atoms in Chemistry. A human individual, by his nature, tends to move towards a region in life-space that has positive valence, that is, towards an attractive goal or into a region where stisfying acti-

vity is possible. In the vocabulary of Hull (1952) positive valence leads to adient activity. By contrast negative valence refers to an object or region in life-space from which the person is repelled. That is, objects and activities that a person avoids have negative valence and they lead to abient activity. The assigning of the valence to the object represented in life-space does not, of course, imply necessarily that the valence actually inheres in the object. It is only attributed to it rightly or wrongly. The object carrying valece is the object as perceived by the person. The same object will carry different valences for different people because each of them perceives it differently. The life-space of a person and its regions which attract and repe! him are determined by his ideal. That is why persons with different ideals assign different meanings to the same facts and delevop educationally in different directions.

## Ernest R. Hilgard writes;-

"Gestalt Psychology had its start and has achieved its greatest success in the field of perception. Its demonstrations of the role of background and organization upon phenomenally perceived processes are so convincing that only an unusually stubborn opponent will discredit the achievement".

The Gestalt Theory is opposed to the basic position of Thorn-dike, which is known as connectionism. To the connectionist learning consists essentially in the attaching or connecting of a response R to a stimulus S which did not originally call forth that response. The explanation of the learning process is, according to this view, the explanation of how this connection is established, or how it may be facilitated. Learning is the organizazation of independent units of behaviour and the entire concept is often referred to as psychological atomism. To the gestaltist, on the contrary, there is no building up process to be explained or facilitated. The organization is already given in the act of perception. Perception and learning consist in the discovery of the relations already existent among the elements of a perceived whole of experience. The gestalt theory attacks the "bundle hypothesis" sensation theory—the theory that a percept is made up of sensations, like elements bound together

by association. The mental faculty which makes possible the knowledge of a whole called a percept is intuition. This faculty is no other than the urge of our self consciousness for beauty operating at its lowest level, the level of sensory experience—a level at which its operation is possible to a degree even in the animals. Since the cereberal equipment of the animals is not fully developed their consciousness or urge for beauty is chained and is not free to see and appreciate the beauty of ideas. We express this alternatively by saying that they are not self-conscious.

Everything in this Universe which we can know with the help of our senses or know at all is a whole or at least we can know it only as a whole. If it cannot become a whole we cannot know it either, and it is entirely meaningless for us. It is the property of a whole that it is meaningful. Its meaningfulness is a kind of beauty or perfection which it possesses because of its wholeness. A whole is not merely an aggregate of its parts but an organization or a pattern which is always more than the sum total of its parts, and which cannot be adequately explained by its parts. If is like an organism which is not merely an aggregate of a numbr of limbs and organs or like a picture the beauty of which does not depend upon its parts but on the total impression created by it as a mysterious result of the combination of its parts. A number of smaller wholes figure as some of the parts of a bigger whole and a number of bigger wholes figure as some of the parts of a still bigger whole and so on till we reach the biggest of all wholes, the Universe itself. Every adult is confronted with this whole which includes his own being and endeavours to understand its meaning immediately. That is why it is true to say that every individual is a philosopher of a sort and no one can do without philosophy. An individual has a keen desire not only to know at once the meaning of the Universe as a whole but also to order his practical life strictly in occordance with his idea of the Universe.

Prof. John Dewey writes;-

"Whenever philosophy has been taken seriously, it has always been assumed that it signified achieving a wisdom that would influence the conduct of life". (Democracy and Education p. 378).

Aldous Huxley has said;-

"Men live in accordance with their philosophy of life, their conception of the world. This is true even of the most thoughtless. It is impossible to live without a metaphysic. The choice that is given us is not between some kind of metaphysic and no metaphysic; it is always between a good metaphysic and a bad metaphysic a metaphysic that corresponds reasonably closely with observed and inferred reality and one that does not," (Ends and Means p. 252).

The root of an individual's keen desire to know the meaning of the Universe is an irresistible urge of his nature to discover and love an idea of the highest beauty, goodness and truth. He hopes to derive this idea from the meaning of the whole that is the Universe and, therefore, endeavours to know this whole. In this endeavour he is helped by his parents and teachers who have already an idea of the meaning of this whole acquired from their own parents and teachers and from their community as a whole. This idea which is the ideal of his community is determined by the original psychological cr educational environment of the community. Different communities have different ideas of the whole that is the Universe because of the differences of the educational influences under which they have come into existence. The meaning of all wholes within the biggest of all wholes, the Universe, is determined for the individual and the community by the meaning of the biggest of all wholes; it is determined, that is to say, by their common ideal

If an individual comes to have a correct idea of the meaning of the whole that is the Universe under the educational influence of his parents and teachers his thoughts as well, as his deeds are rightly directed. If follows that the quality of an individual's education must depend upon the quality of his idea of the meaning of the universe and that it is, therefore, one of the most fundamental duties of an educator to assure that his pupil's idea of the meaning of the Universe is of the most perfect validity. If

the educator does not provide him with a perfectly correct idea of the meaning of the Universe he will (since he is confronted with the Universe and is obliged to impart some meaning to it at once) come to have an idea of it which is wrong and thus his thoughts and actions will be directed into a wrong channel and he will become a miseducated individual.

It is generally supposed that we know directly with the help of our senses as well as with the help of our reason and that a scientist depends for his conclusions mostly on observation or on the evidence of his senses and a philosopher relies mostly on reason. As a matter of fact the knowledge of an object or an idea is always in the form of a belief in the wholeness of a whole and the entire knowledge of an individual is a system of such beliefs. Neither our senses nor our rason can know wholes by themselves. They only help our intuition to know wholes. There is no doubt that our intuition sometimes errs; yet whenever we know a whole correctly and without any error, it is our intuition that becomes the instrument of this knowledge.

At the other end of the spacious room in which I am sitting I see a chair close to and against the background of a pink wall. But this apparent vision of the chair is a judgement of my intuition and not my observation. What I am aware of as a result of my sight is a set of colours and shades which would have been utterly meaningless without the activity of my intuition. If I say that I see with my own eyes that there is a chair in front of me the statement would be wrong. But if I say that what I am seeing with my eyes enables me to believe that it is a chair the statement would be correct. My belief that it is a chair can be incorrect. It may not, for example, be a chair at all but only a painting on the pink wall. Although I have examined carefully the whole which I have come to believe is a chair and have applied my faculty of reason to understand the mutual relationship of some of the smaller wholes which make up this whole and my intuition has come to the conclusion that it can be only a chair and not a painting, yet the possibility exists that my conclusion, which is no more than a belief, may be wrong.

When I see what I believe to be a chair, I do not see the whole

chair in any case, but a part of its surface which is in front of me. What I regard as the surface of the chair, too, is a sensation of a certain colour or shade and not the surface of the chair at all. My conclusion that it is the surface of a chair and, later on, that it is a complete chair and not merely a part of its surface, is something subjective; it is an internal, feeling, belief or faith depending upon my previous knowledge. If my previous knowledge is different my conclusion may be different. I make what is a part into a whole as a result of the activity of my imagination spurred by my previous convictions, in order to have a satisfactory experience. There can be nothing meaningful in this world which is totally ojective.

The function of reason is to find out the relationship of the various wholes discovered by intuition in order to enable intuition to discover a bigger unknown whole consistent with these wholes and of which these wholes are parts or to discover smaller wholes which are consistent with and form parts of a bigger known whole. The former process is known as synthesis and the latter as analysis. To discover the relationship of wholes reason moves from one whole to another and then to another and so on thus enabling intuition to synthesise or analyse wholes in its search for new wholes. As soon as intuition has discovered a new whole the activity of reason stops and that of intuition begins.

Reason can examine the relations of wholes which are already known but cannot know a new whole itself. Knowing, feeling and experiencing the wholeness, the beauty or the perfection of a whole, as a whole, is not the function of reason, but the function of intuition the function of our urge for beauty and perfection or the function of our feeling or love. Reason leads the way to the destination of self but does not reach the destination itself. Because reason goes with us a part of the way we forget when we reach the end of our path that it had left us long ago.

The self may be compared to a man with bandaged eyes left to grope his way towards a particular room in a big house already familiar to him to some extent. As he feels with his hands the walls, the rooms, the enclosures of passages and other such marks in the course of his walk, he can picture to himself com-

pletely the part of the house he has rached at any time. His hands enable him to see only a part of his surroundings, that part which he actually embraces in darkness but the complete guidance is supplied to him by his imagination which recalls the full picture of every part of the house that he visits. Reason is to us like the groping hands of the man revealing to him only certain marks of his passage and intuition, feeling or faith like his imagination by means of which he is able to picture the whole of his surroundings. Just as the cause of the bandaged man's helpful imagination is his previous familiarity with the house, so the cause of our intuition or direct judgement is our innate desire for beauty and perfection.

Reason helps intuition to grasp a whole while it discerns only a part of this whole itself. It acts as a servant of intuition always whether it is rationalizing the impulse for the ideal (which it does quite sincerely) or whether it is assisting this impulse to reach its end or whether it is guiding it towards a higher beauty or a higher ideal. The cause of our intuition which looks around for wholes is our innate desire for beauty which can be only felt. This desire attracts us towards and impels us to strive for the realization of the beauty of an object or an idea that appears to us to be a whole or to complete a whole and repels us from an object or an idea that does not appear to us to be a whole or to fit into or complete a whole.

The whole to which we are attracted derives its wholeness or beauty from our knoweidge of our ideal. Our effort is directed to bridging the gap between the situation and the goal which together constitute a pattern or a whole which is created by the ideal. That is why what is a whole to one man is not a whole to another man or to the same man under a different set of circumstances. The same object may be hated by us under one set of circumstances and loved by us under a different set of circumstances because when the circumstances change the meaning of the object which is a part of the object may change and the object, therefore, may not remain the same. Objects or ideas acquire a halo of beauty from our changing ideals or from our innate desire for beauty interpretted to the best or our knowledge from time to time. It is the beauty of the ideal that

is reflected in the object or the idea we love or admire as the light of the Sun is reflected in the Moon. The animal too has an urge for beauty, an intuition or an insight, but in the animal this urge, this intuition or insight is circumscribed by the fixed and automatic demands of his instincts.

Reason can give us no knowledge without intuition or feeling. We can know only what we feel. Even the statement two plus two is equal to four is a feeling. This statement is a truth, a harmony or a beauty which we can only feel. We know it as a truth only when we are able to contemplate or feel its hrmony or beauty as a whole. This contemplation or feeling is itself outside the scope of reason although reason may guide us to it. All mathematical or scientific knowledge is a series of such felt harmonies, beauties or wholes.

If a piece of knowledge as a whole may be measured by the number 100 then even if reason enables us to see ninety eight parts of it, it must leave out 2 parts to be supplied by feeling, to complete the whole that we call knowledge. The remaining two parts are extremely important because without them the activity of reason would be useless and would bring us no knowledge whatsoever. The reason is that the word knowledge is to be used for something that can be represented by the number 100, and not for something that may be represented by the number 98. What reason leaves to feeling or rather what feeling takes from reason is sometimes more and sometimes less. In the case of philosophy and speculative sciences reason does not come so close to feeling although it gives a spur or push to it or attempts to justify it. In the case of art feeling is left almost entirely to itself.

Most of our knowledge of men and things which is the basis of our actions and which is of a vital importance to us in our daily life is anything but mathematical or scientific in the ordinary sense. It is based on direct vision or intuition. It is a kind of knowledge in which feeling plays the principle role. It is impossible for a man who insists on, what is ordinarily known a., mathematical or scientific knowledge in everything to live on this earth even for a single day. In the case of a knowledge that

is based on feeling mainly we may require a lengthy and difficult process of reasoning for one man and a very short and simple one for another man in order to convince each of the same truth. The reasons that suffice for one man in proof of the same reality may not suffice for another man who may go on doubting it. This is so because knowledge s settled by feeling or sensitiveness and not by reason. A man who is gifted with a good deal of sensitveness or the faculty of direct vision may believe in a truth even if reason proves ten percent of it and a man who lacks the faculty of direct vision or sensitiveness may not believe in the same truth even if reason proves ninety percent of it.

While reason can give us no knowledge without the final judgement of intuition, intuition may give us knowledge without calling in the aid of reason. There are occasions when we acquire knowledge with the help of feeling alone and make no use of reason whatsoever for example, when we know a picture or a symphony to be admirable and beautiful wthout arguing or proving its beauty.

Every whole of our intellectual experience is discovered by the searching activity of feeling spurred and guided by reason and after the discovery is made what we remember as the basis of action or further reasoning is feeling and not the reasoning that brought it about. When we are reasoning we are dealing with the relations of wholes in order to discover a bigger whole in which these wholes appear as parts. The bigger wholes discovered in this way may be dealt with by reason at a future occasion from the point of view of their relation within another still bigger whole and no on.

As soon as a scientist has collected a number of so-called "observed" facts (which are really arrived at by his intuition) as a result of his experiments he feels that in order to explain them, that is, in order to unify them and organize them into a whole he needs a hypothesis, a belief, a theory, an intuitional idea or an assumption. He, therefore, invents such an assumption. If this assumption which is imported from the metaphysical world really explains these facts or organizes them into a unity then this assumption too, as long as it is able to explain them

soundly is considered by him to be as dependable a scientific fact as any other which he regards as a directly observed reality although this fact may have never been "observed" by him in the ordinary sense or the word. The reason is that in such a case no other assumption can explain and order these facts and thereby take its place. In other words, the scientist really believes in the existence of something invisible because of its visible signs, manifestations or results and attributes to it the validity of a scientific fact.

This attitude is not peculiar to the scientist. Every one of us not only believes in what is unseen but also acts according to this belief in his daily ife. When I say "The Sun will rise tomorrow" or "My friend is a good man", I declare my belief in something which is not observed. The whole of our practical life is based on such assumptions. Metaphysic is thus the soul of our practical life and we cannot live even for a single moment without it. Every fact which we accept as true is, in the beginning, no more than an assumption, but as new facts in support of it come to light, the assumption is given the status of a real fact. If, on the other hand, new facts that are discovered from time to time do not support the assumption we give it up as untrue.

A scientist cannot look upon a hypothesis which is a reasonable explanation of his "observed facts" as less important than these facts in any way. Although this hypothesis is only in the form of a belief or faith having a metaphysical origin, he cannot say that while his "observed facts" are scientific facts the hypothesis that explains them adequately is not a scientific fact. Sometimes this hypothesis is more important than his observed facts, because without it these facts have no meaning and do not lead to any further knowledge of scientific facts. The hypothesis or the theory that explains them opens the way to further scientific research and investigation making possible the discovery of new scientific facts which belong to the "observed" category and which otherwise would have never become known and thus establishes itself more and more securely as a "fundamental scientific fact.

An example of a hypothesis which the scientist believes to

be an undeniable scientific fact is the "atom" which has not been observed in the ordinary sense of the word by anybody so far. The atom first came to be known as a plausible assumption hundreds of year ago. But in the course of these centuries our study of the visible inferences and effects of this assumption, our study, that is to say, of the smaller wholes which organize and unify themselves into this bigger whole, the atom, has raised the hypothesis of the atom to the status of a real scientific fact which no one can deny. The knowledge of this fact is so effective that it can enable us to destroy a town like Hiroshima in the twinkling of an eye.

The scientist invents hypotheses to explain the facts discovered by him, because, owing to a necessity of our nature, our knowledge, as already mentioned, takes the form of wholes and the smaller wholes of knowledge organize themselves into a bigger whole and the bigger wholes organize themselves again into a still bigger whole and so on. This necessity must bring the scientist sooner or later to a stage in the development of his knowledge where the facts discovered by him will be adequately explained and organized only by a hypothesis which is capable of explaining and organizing all the scientific facts of the universe. When the scientist reaches that stage in the development of his knowledge it is all the same whether we designate him as a scientist or as a philosopher. The philosopher expplai as the universe along with all the scientific facts the knowledge of which is supplied to him by the scientist on the basis of an intuitively conceived hypothesis of Ultimate Reality, whether this hypothesis is materialistic or idealistic. The ph losopher is doing on a bigger scale what the scientist is doing on a smaller scale today and will do on a bigger scale tomorrow.

Thus, ultimately there is no difference between a scientist and a philosopher. Both have the same sphere of research and investigation—the knowledge of the Universe as a whole—and both have to depend for their search after truth on the same faculty of man which is intuition. Science cannot help becoming a philosophy at the higher stages of its development. For if it does not become a philosophy ultimately it becomes meaningless. The facts of Physics have forced the modern

physicists to adopt the hypothesis that the ultimate Reality of the Universe is not matter but consciousness. The reason is that their earlier hypothesis that the ultimate nature of reality is meterial has failed to explain these facts.

Similarly, the new facts of Biology are forcing the bilogists to explain them on the assumption that the Reality of the Universe is consciousness and not matter. A book written by Prof. I.S. Haldane in support of this hypothesis is entitled. The Philosophical basis of Biology. Changes in the theories of the scientists and philosophers are very necessary and very useful, for, by changing, they come nearer and nearer to absolute validity. When new scientific facts come to light and a hypothesis which was found adequate to explain scientific facts known so far, is no longer adequate to explain them, both the philosophers and the scientists have to invent a new hypothesis which is able to explain all the facts. new and old, adequately. Such changes must therefore, bring both the scientists and the philosophers ultimately to a hypothesis which is an adequate explanation of all the scientific facts of the present and future, that is, an adequate explanation of the Universe as a whole.

Naturally, if such a hypothesis is already known to the philosopher or the scientist, in other words, if he has already a thorough knowledge and a firm conviction of the true nature of Reality, he will be saved in his search after truth, from all those errors to which he must fall a victim on account of an erroneous view of the nature of Reality. The reason is that in the absence of a true idea of the nature of Reality he will have a wrong idea of it and this wrong idea must interfere with the validity of his inferences. This fact underlines the importance not only of the educator starting with a firm conviction of the true idea of Reality himself but also of his assuring that his pupils imibibe this conviction from him from the very beginning.

The existence of the Universe is a scientific fact based on "direct observation" as understood by a scientist. On account of the operation of the urge of our self-consciousness for beauty and perfection, however, we can know the Universe only as an organized and unified whole or we cannot know it at all, Our

natural conviction of the wholeness of the Universe has a number of implications as regards our attitude towards it. It is on account of this that we firmly believe, for example, without giving any proof of the validity of our beliefs,

- 1. That the Universe is not divided either in space or in time, into a number of different compartments or sections, each governed by a different set of laws of nature. While searching for smaller wholes within this big whole the Universe, which include the laws of nature, we assume consciously or unconsciously that all these wholes are consistent with the big whole and therefore with each other. We assume, in other words, that the laws of nature remain the same not only in different parts of the Universe but also at different times.
- 2. That there must be some principle which organizes and unifes the smaller wholes in the Universe into the big whole which is the entire Universe. This unifying principle of the Universe is the ultimate reality of everything in it and everything in the Universe is its manifestation in one sense or another. Thus the materialist philosopher thinks that this principle is matter and the idealist philosopher thinks that it is spirit, consciousness or self-consciousness.
- That the unity of the Universe must be rationally intelligible. This means that all scientific facts must be intellectually related to each other as well as to the Ultimate Reality or the Ultimate Unifying Principle of the Universe.

If we explain the cause of a scientific fact our explanation of its cause creates other questions the answer to which creates still other questions and so on. Since we assume that the Universe is a whole and there is a principle that unifies its multiplicity into a single whole, we also assume that the final reply to all questions like the above can be only the nature of this principle, no matter whether

the principle is material or spiritual. We justly assume, therefore, that knowledge is a single whole so that every part of it explains and illuminates its other parts. Segregated knowledge is only half-knowledge.

- 4. That there can be only one unifying principle of the Universe and not two or more, although there can be innumerable ideas, both spiritual and material, of this principle If the contrary may be assumed the Universe ceases to be a unity.
- 5. That all true scientific facts can be relevant only to the one true idea of the Reality of the Universe and not to any other idea of it. This means that a true Philosophy of the Universe, really consistent with all the known and established scientific facts, can be based only on this idea. If there is a single true scientific fact which is not consistent with a philosophy of the Universe, then, either that fact is not a true scientific fact or that philosophy is not based on a true idea of Reality. A true philosophy of the Universe alone is capable of absorbing all true scientific facts, as they are discovered from time to time, into itself. Such a philosophy must, therefore, gain and all other philosophies must lose equally, in rational support as real scientific knowledge accumulates.

The tilting of rational support in favour of one philosophy and against all other philosophies must be accelerated more by the facts of Psychology than by the facts of Biology and more by the facts of Biology than by the facts of Physics. Psychology is the point where all the three great provinces of our world intersect, the provinces which we call matter, life and mind. Biology is the meeting ground of matter and life while Physics deals only with matter.

This means further that all true scientific facts constitute a system or a family into which no untrue scientific fact can enter and hold its own and that there is an affinity between known and unknown true scientific facts. This affinity enables us to discover new scientific facts more and more easily as scientific

knowledge accumulates. A test of the validity of a new scientific fact is that it must be consistent with all those scientific facts which are already known and established. Consequently, the greater the number of scientific facts that are already known, the greater is the affinity of their sum-total on the one hand to the only true idea of the Reality of the Universe and on the other hand to all the unknown scientific facts relating to the various levels of existence and the easier it is for us to discover these unknown facts.

The assumption that the Universe is a single indivisible whole, is actually implied in the intellectual research of all great philosophers and scientists. The fact that it has not so far proved untrue is a proof of its validity. It is not a mere assumption but a fact which is at the bottom of all the progress of Science and Philosophy that has been possible so far. This progress itself is a proof of its being a real fact. Indeed if the scientists and philosophers had not assumed in their search for truth that the Universe is a single indivisible whole, characterized by a unity and a unformity which do not break any where or at any time, and if the assumption were not true, niether Science nor Philosophy would have been possible.

It is this assumption, existing as a staunch belief in the mind of the scientist which creates in him a desire to search for truth and enables him to test the validity of his conclusions and satisfy himself that his efforts are bearing fruit and leading him to a greater and greater knowledge of the Universe as a whole. Evidently, if a scientist were to know that a fact discovered by him is of a temporary or local importance and that there can be a large number of varieties of the same fact at different places or at different times (for example, if he were to know that water boils at the same place sometimes at one tamperature, and at other times at another temperature or at the same time at one place at one temparature and at another place of the same height at another temperature) he will abondon his scientific research as a useless activity.

The assumption that the Universe is a single indivisible whole is natural to a man of religion since he believes that it is the crea-

tion of a single Creator whose purpose unifies all its parts. Similarly, the philosophical attitude of an indealist philosopher also demands this view. But the fact that even a materialist philosopher like Karl marx, for example, feels obliged to assume the unity of the Universe, while giving his interpretation of it, is a significant clue to the nature of our urge for knowledge.

The Gestalt Theory asserts that man can know things only as wholes but does not explain what is there in the nature of man which is the cause of this necessity. We have already known, however, that self-consciousness is the ultimate Reality of the Universe. Since man's urge for knowledge is an aspect or part of the urge of his self-consciousness to love the Creator of the Universe, it is made only to perform its function of knowing the Creator who is a whole of the highest beauty and perfection or of knowing the things that reflect His beauty and perfection which they can do only if they are beautiful and perfect wholes. Man's intellectual experience of the Universe cannot ignore the limits set or the aids provided by the natural qualities and capacities of his intellectual urge. Our intellectual experiences like all our other experiences are governed by the laws of our nature which are the laws of the urge of our self-conciousness for beauty and perfection.

The educator who does not give his pupil the true idea of the Unifying Principle of the Universe and does not endavour to organize and unify all true scientific facts on its basis, thus giving them the shape of a philosophical system, leaves his pupils to acquire a wrong idea of this principle and to develop a wrong philosophy of existence.

The above discussion leads us again to the conclusion that one of the most important duties of the educator should be to assure that the learner not only knows from the very beginning that an All-powerful Creative Self-Consciousness is the Reality of the Universe but also develops, gradually, as complete a philosophy of the Universe based on this idea as possible. He should see to it that in the course of his educational growth from stage to stage, his pupil develops a philosophy of existence, founded on the Reality of Self-Consciousness, in which all the known and es

tablished facts of Physics, Biology and Psychology are explained and integrated and that, as a consequence, he comes to have a permanent intellectual attitude towards the Universe which enables him to explain in the light of, and to integrate into, this philosophy (consistently with all the canons of logic and rationality) all other scientific facts that may be known or established in future. For reasons already explained, no educated man who has been unable to acquire as complete a knowledge of the philosophy of the Universe based on the idea of the Reality of Self-Consciousness, as is possible in view of the known and established facts of science upto date, can be said to have given a full expression to his intellectual urge and to have become a fully educated man. The Philosophy of Self-Consciousness must be, therefore, the core of an educational system which has for its aim the complete educational growth of the individual and must continue to develop in the text-books and the lessons and lectures of the teachers and professors right from the first stage to the last.

The child's desire for knowledge begins to operate as a part of his urge for an ideal as soon as he becomes conscious of himself or begins to distinguish himself from things or persons other than himself. The reason is that his ideal has to be the idea of something other than himself. He becomes curious and inquisitive as if he has lost something which he very much liked and loved. His attitude is as if he says to himself, "There is certainly something around here which I love and which I must possess wholly and completely." His senses thirst for impressions and his intuition which is really his desire for beauty in action exerts itself to understand and interpret those impressions in order to know what the missing object of his desire may be. He wants to see things, to hear them, to feel them, to handle them, to throw them, to carry them, to use them, to break them and to reconstruct them so that he may know each of them as thoroughly as possible, to find out which of them is that desired object. He vexes his mother with repeated questions. "What is this", he asks every time that he observes something new and the mother-gives an answer which he accepts as true on her authority—the greatest of the authorities known to him. This is how his desire for knowledge seeks expression and satisfaction in early childhood. As he grows in years the sphere of his enquiries is enlarged and his knowledge expands.

What the young individual knows as a result of the expression and satisfaction of his urge for knowledge is nature or the universe around him which may be roughly divided into three compartments.

- (a) The world of matter.
- (b) The world of life and
- (c) The world of mind.

Knowledge can be also divided roughly into three compartments.

(a) The knowledge of the material world or the Pyhsical Science which relates to the study of the nature of matter.

This includes in its present developed form Physics, Ghemistry, Geology, Astronomy etc.

(b) The knowledge of the organic world or the Biological Science which relates to the study of the nature of the organism.

This includes now Botony, Zoology, Embryology etc.

(c) The knowledge of the mental or human world or the Psychological Science, which relates to the study of the nature of the human mind and its activities.

This includes in its present developed form, Individual Psychology, Social Psychology, History, the Philosophies of History, Politics, Ethics, Law, Education, Economics, Mathematics, Logic etc. The ability to express oneself in a language is a skill which must be distinguished from knowledge, although knowledge is needed for acquiring a skill.

These Three Sciences constitute the natural subjects of study for the human individual. There can be no branch of knowledge which does not fall into one of these three categories of science. The facts that the child can possibly know at any stage of his life and as a result of any scheme of edudcation at home or at a school can be either physical facts or biological facts or psychological facts. Nature meets him half-way in his effort to know and understand it. For a preliminary knowledge of it begins to come to him without his asking for it as a result of the spontaneous activity of his senses from the very day he is able to distinguish between himself and the rest of the Universe.

When he looks around him he sees the walls and furniture of his room or the heavens; the Sun, the Moon and the stars. Thus he gets some knowledge, however, vague and indefinite it may be, of the world of matter. He sees some animals and birds and hears the cock crow, the dog bark and the cat mew and thus he gets a preliminary notion of the animal world. He also sees and hears his father, mother and other near and dearones kissing him, petting him, addressing him, speaking to him, feeding him and sporting with him and thereby gets some knowledge of the human world. His knowledge of these three domains of existence grows constantly from the very beginning of his life till, by the time he goes to school, at the age of six or so, all his knowledge consists of an elementary acquaintance with the worlds with which the physical, the biological and the psychological sciences deal. The school curriculum too, so far as its object is to impart knowledge, cannot but be confined to these Three Sciences. All that the educator can do is to lay a greater or a lesser emphasis on certain parts of these sciences than certain others at the various stages of the educational development of the individual.

'The desire for knowledge is insatiable. The individual wants to know the meaning of what he knows and again the meaning of the meaning of what he knows and so on. There is no end to his curiousity and the reach of his desire for knowledge as long as it is having its natural satisfaction and bringing him the pleasure that is always associated with its satisfaction. But the moment it

ceases to be satisfied, it ceases to work and this happens when the child no longer experiences the beauty of the truth or knowledge that is being conveyed to him and consequently does not regard it as truth or knowledge at all. When this happens we say the child has lost interest in his lessons or has become a dullard. To the extent a fact is believed to be a truth, it is believed to be a thing of beauty and a source of joy and satisfaction. To know or learn is to experience the beauty of something that is considered to be true and therefore beautiful.

Every truth, however insignificant it may appear to be, is beautiful because it can be used by us in our direct or indirect effort for the realization of our ideal which is, to us, an idea of the highest beauty, goodness and truth. Our effort for the realization of the ideal is direct when we express our love for it and act to reach it; it is indirect when we express our hatred for the object that obstructs our love and act to destroy it. Our effort for the realization of our ideal whether direct or indirect is always moral and is always accompanied by an experience of the beauty of the ideal, the beauty, that is, of truth.

If it is really knowing or learning it must be an interesting process capable of absorbing the attention of the child throughout. The child loses interest in learning only when it is not the result of his natural, freely and spontaneously operating desire to know or when it appears to him that it does not serve any useful purpose that he can have in view as the lover of his ideal. His desire to know loses its natural freedom when the teacher, or the student himself, makes an effort to push the knowledge of certain facts down into his mind, in any case, whether the mind is ready to receive it or not, because the needs of an examinanation have to be satisfied or the censure of strict parents or teachers has to be avoided. The result is that his desire for knowledge which, like every other desire of the self, can function only when it is free, ceases to function so far as those facts are concerned. Since they become associated in his mind with something that he considers ugly and detestable, he loses the capacity to feel their beauty and consequently to know them as facts.

As digestion is an internal process which takes place under rigid laws operating within the body of an individual, so learning is an internal process which takes place under rigid laws operating within the mind of an individual. Neither of these two processes can be forced at will in disregard of the internal laws of each.

As food is taken and digested by the body only when the body has a keen appetite, so knowledge is acquired and assimilated by the self only when it has a sharp curiosity. As light and digestible food sharpens the appetite of the body while heavy and indigestible food makes it dull, so interesting and attractive material of instruction sharpens the self's desire for knowledge while un-interesting and un-attractive material makes it blunt. Again as food is desired by an individual when it is delicious, so a piece of information is desired by an individual only when it is interesting.

A piece of information will look interesting to an individual, if it happens to reflect the beauty, goodness and truth of his ideal and it will reflect these qualities of his ideal only if he believes that it will provide him with a greater knowlegdge of his ideal or of the ways and means of serving his ideal or serving any of his ends and purposes derived from the ideal. An illiterate person who desires to correspond with a dear friend can learn the art of writing letters more easily and more quickly than a person who has no such end in view and has to learn this art for a purpose which does not appear to him to be sufficiently attractive. Similarly an individual who is faced with the necessity of communicating with a loving friend, who does not know his language, finds it very easy to learn the language of his friend. When learning is made to subserve the love of the ideal or (which is the same thing) the love of an end or purpose that is subservient to the ideal, it takes a natural course and does not tax the brain; it rather becomes interesting and refreshing and what is learnt becomes a part and parcel of the being of a learner, never to be forgotten again.

The skill of the teacher depends, therefore, on the fact whether he is able to make his pupil sufficiently curious about the information that he wants to convey to him or whether he can relate this information to the things that the pupil will love to do. He has to bear in mind, in order to be able to achieve his object, that growth is a characteristic of life and that learning is an activity of life which results in growth. Growth means gradual development out of a lower state into a higher state. child cannot, therefore, learn absolutely new things from his teacher but he can learn more about old things which are already known to him to some extent as a result of his unavoidable sensory contact with the simple, concrete world that surrounds him. This is the psychological basis of the well-known padagogic principles that the teacher must proceed from the known to the unknown, from the simple to the complex and from the concrete to the abstract. The teacher will certainly find his task much easier if he makes it a point to start always with the knowledge that his pupil has already made his own and only proceeds to extend, elaborate and amplify this knowledge.

The continued expression of the intellectual urge enables an individual to acquire a better and better knowledge of the properties of things and the laws of nature at all levels of existence as he is able to understand them in the light of his ideal. It enables him, therefore, to act more and more usefully in the service of his ideal. The importance of knowledge depends not only upon the fact that it enables the lover of an ideal to know and love his ideal and thus to express his spiritual urge in a better way but also on the fact that it helps him to act rightly and usefully in the service of his ideal. When we know the properties of a substance we know how to avoid its harms and utilize its benefits. When we know a law of nature we know how to act so as to be safe from its disadvantages and make use of its advantages for the sake of our ideal. The knowledge of the Three Sciences that the individual acquires for its own sake and for the mere satisfaction of his desire for truth as a form of beauty is utilized by him for acting profitably in the service of his ideal.

We have already known that an individual is forced by the love of his ideal (which includes all ideas which are related to the ideal or derived from the ideal and the beauty of which he is, therefore, able to feel and experience) to do certain things and to avoid doing certain other things in order to realize the beauty of his ideal internally in the form of further additions to his love and externally in the form of the material and social conditions of his life which he creates in the service of his ideal. The ideal prescribes a moral code for the individual and he cannot act profitably according to his code unless he knows the laws of nature operating at all levels of existence. This means that in addition to the love of knowledge for its own sake there is another natural incentive for the individual to know the Three Sciences and that is the desire to love and serve his ideal being goaded by his powerful urge for beauty. Our desire for knowledge for its own sake is re-inforced and strengthened by the urge to love and serve our ideal and the urge to act, beautifully and morally in its service.

This brings us again to the conclusion that the best device to maintain the child's interest in learning is to make him learn things in the service of his ideal, that is, to say, in the service of ideas which sub-serve his ideal. Such ideas borrow their beauty from his ideal as the Moon borrows its light from the Sun and their beauty is, therefore, already known, felt and experienced by him. This is the real justification of the emphasis that the modern educationists lay on learning by experience as the basis of education and on the project or the problem methods as a device for imparting knowledge. The teacher is required to ask the student to solve a problem or to undertake a project or to achieve an end or a purpose, related to an idea in which he is very much interested. Since the problem, the project or the end set before him requires a certain amount of knowledge for its solution or accomplishment, he acquires that knowledge easily under the inner pressure of his love for the idea and is not at all bored in the process. Such a method of imparting knowledge is perfectly in accord with the nature of the intellectual urge and is, therefore, perfectly scientific. Unfortunately, however, the modern educationists who are using this method to the great advantage of their pupils have not been able to know yet what is the real nature of experience and why experience is the only possible method of learning. Had they known it, they would have also known that the cause of the educational process is the urge of the human individual for beauty, goodness and truth and that this process can achieve its end only if the individual is enabled to love whole-heartedly an ideal of the highest beauty, goodness and truth.

All experience is either the experience of beauty or the experience of goodness or the experience of truth. To acquire an experience, however unimportant, is to grow educationally, however little. The process of education is a series of acts of the realization or experience of beauty. Nothing can bring about the development of the child in one direction or another, in the right or the wrong direction, which he does not feel or experience as beauty. Acquiring knowledge is an experience of the beauty of truth, acting morally is an experience of the beauty of goodness and creating artistically is an experience of the beauty of form or appearance. That is why the method of education is the method of experience.

Although a learner develops by having one experience after another yet every leaner understands and interprets each of his experiences in the light of his ideal and hence dvelops educationally in a different direction— in the direction of his own ideal whether it is educationally right or wrong— on account of an experience which is apparently the same for all learners but which is really different for every one of them, to the extent to which his ideal differs from that of others. It is a well known fact that the same events and circumstances look differently to, and have a different import for, persons of different ideals. Our beliefs have much to do with the nature or quality of our knowledge.

A fact is never the same fact to two persons loving two different ideals. Since a person is forced by his nature to give all his love and devotion to his ideal and since his ideal is the motivating force of all his activities, every fact known to him is a fact in so far only as it is relevant to the theoretical and practical requirements of his ideal. His knowledge, therefore, acquires a particular complexion or colour borrowed from his ideal; it bears the stamp of his ideal. The Universe is not the same for two persons who believe in two different ideals. The Relativity

Theory, the Laws of Thermodynomics or the Binomial Theorem or even the simple statement "Two plus two is equal to four" cannot have the same significance and cannot impart the same piece of knowledge to a person who believes in the ultimate reality of mind and to a person who believes in the ultimate reality of matter. The famous story of a hungry man who was put the question: "What does two plus two amount to" and gave the reply: "Four loafs of bread" is a very eloquent statement of the fact that the needs and purposes of men modify their knowledge of hard facts.

The desire to know serves an individual's urge for an ideal since as a result of this desire he is able to know other objects or ideas in relation to his ideal and his ideal in relation to them and this adds to his understanding and realization of the beauty, goodness and truth that he attributes to his ideal. He acquires knowledge for the sake of knowledge but the knowledge that he so acquires enables him to understand his ideal better and better. The more he knows the world in relation to his ideal the more he knows his ideal, in relation to the world. Since he believes that his ideal is absolutely true, he is obliged to consider that all true scientific facts about the nature of man and the universe are a part of his ideal and meant to be used by him as intellectual tools in the service of his ideal and for the promotion of his own interests as its lover. Since he relates all knowledge acquired by him to his ideal, he regards all knowledge as the knowledge of his ideal. The knowledge of the ideal is, therefore, never exhausted. As his knowledge of "scientific facts" develops he goes on organizing all those facts in his mind around his ideal, utilizing and emphasising those that are consistent with it and rejecting, ignoring or belittling those that cannot be proved to be consistent with it. The love of his ideal forces him to alter and modify "scientific facts" known to him in order to make them consistent with his ideal.

True "scientific facts" can be relevent only to the Perfect Ideal which we have already known to be the only ideal that is totally good, beautiful and true. This means that if the ideal of an individual is perfectly good, beautiful and true the "scientific facts"

that he will reject as false will be really false and unscientific and the "scientific facts" which he will accept as true will be really true and scientific. He will not need to misunderstand misinterpret, distort or mutilate any real scientific facts to make them appear consistent with his own ideology. All real scientific facts will naturally and automatically fall into his ideology and all the so-called scientific facts which are really false will be seen by him to be inconsistent with it. His love for the Perfect Ideal will thus serve him as a dependable criterion for differentiating between false and true scientific facts and, therefore, as a trustworthy guide to fruitful scientific research and intellectual investigation. If, on the other hand, his ideal is not perfectly good, beautiful and true, many of the facts that he will reject as fa se and unscientific will be really true and scientific and many of the facts that he will accept as true and scientific will be really false and unscientific. He will need to misunderstand, misinterpret, distort and mutilate unconsciously some scientific facts which are established finally and beyond all doubt in order to make them appear consistent with his ideology and thereby to preserve his own faith and those of his other co-ideologists in his ideology.

The love of an individual for his ideology dominates and controls his intellectual experiences in such a way that he begins to feel that there is a true and natural relationship between his ideology and all scientific facts and it becomes impossible for him mentally to separate the mass of known scientific facts as he understands them and his ideology from each other. He begins to think that science and his ideology are identical with each other and that he cannot give up his ideology without giving up knowledge or science itself. To the extent he does not believe it, he does not love his ideology and does not think that the idea on which his ideology is based is an idea of total beauty, goodness and truth. In such a case he attributes the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth really to some other idea. Thus all scientific facts are regarded by an Ameridaan as consistent with only Americanism, by a Russian as consistent only with Communism, by a Roman Catholic as consistent only with Catholicism. It is perfectly natural for every individual to reject, ignore, belittle, alter or modify all those scientific facts which appear to him to be inconsistent with his own ideology. He cannot do otherwise on account of the very laws of his nature which are rigid and unalterable.

Since the ideology of a community determines the whole of its outlook on life, all its needs and purposes and all its activities, it is evident that every branch of science must develop differently in the hands of different ideological communities. What we call knowledge is not merely a piece of information about an object external to us. It is also our internal attitude, derived from our ideal, towards that object and our idea of the use we should make of it. It is the information plus the attitude towards the information. The information and the attitude both combine to form the complete idea of the object, the organic whole that we call knowledge. It is this organic whole which constitutes our intellectual experience. The knowledge of the properties of objective things is a subjective reality and our, subjective attitude towards those objective things which we derive from our ideal or ideology forms an inseparable part of that reality. Consequently, when ideals and ideologies differ knowledge cannot remain the same. That is why it is perfectly true to say that even the Physics or the Mathematics of a materialist is very much different from that of an idealist. It should not cause surprise to any one if a Nazi German says:-

We serve the German way in Mathematics...........
'German Physics?' one asks; I might rather have said
'Aryan Physics' But I shall be answered: 'Science is and remains international'.........

It is false. We renounce international science. We renounce the international republic of learning. We renounce research for its own sake". (P. 628, W.M. McGovern: From Hitler to Luther).

Nor one should wonder at a Russian Communist saying;-

"Soviet Science is not merely a branch of world science operating on the territory of the U.S.S.R. No, it is a distinct science, different in character, in scope".

"The fundamental feature of Soviet science is that it alone

possesses a clear philosophical basis. Such a basis is essential in scientific enquiry. For our science dialectical materialism of Marx-Engel-Lenin-Stalin is that basis."

"Our aim is to enter the arena of world science on a wide front armed with the irresistible arguments of dialectical materialism and (in that world arena of science) we shall combat all foreign concepts antagonistic to ours".

This attitude of subordinating all science and all knowledge to unconscious ideological preconceptions in the name of science and knowledge itself, is perfectly natural for any ideological community that has succeeded in developing its ideological consciousness, or the love of its ideology, up to the level that it really desires. The people of U.S.A. or the people of any other country that believes in freedom, cannot allow any department of knowledge or science to develop freely in their country in a manner that undermines the intellectual foundations of their ideal of "freedom" and favours instead a totalitarian view of politics. They cannot allow it to happen not because such a development is against their ideology, but, as they will honestly and sincerely hold, because it is against science and against knowledge itself. As a matter of fact no development of science or knowledge can take place in the right direction which is not in the service of the Perfect Ideal, the ideal of the highest truth, beauty and goodness.

The difference in the qualities of knowledge of persons who love different ideals becomes more and more pronounced as we proceed upwards from the physical sciences which are highly mathematical to the biological sciences and from the biological sciences to the psychological (the human and the social) sciences i.e. as knowledge approaches the realm of conscious purpose. The science of Physics as viewed by a scientist who has a real living faith in God as the reality of the universe is different from the science of Physics as viewed by an atheist. Yet much of this difference remains in the form of a mental attitude towards physical facts which though having an important bearing on the development of the science does not come into the actual statement of these facts. This is not the case with Biology and Psychology.

The actual statement of the biological theory of evolution by an intellectual materialist like Darwin who believed in God but did not believe that God had anything to do with the direction of organic evolution, is vastly different from the statement of the same theory by an idealist like Bergson. Russian Biology which is the product of a belief in Dialectical Materlism is vastly different from the Biology of England and America. Similarly a Psychology of the individual and the society or one of its branches (i.e. the Philosophies of Politics, Ethics, Edudcation, Art, Econimics, History, Law Etc.) which is based positively on the hypothesis that the Reality of the Universe is an all-powerful creative Self-Consciousness which has a purpose of its own in the Universe, will be vastly different from a Psychology of the individual and the society which is formulated in disregard of this hypothesis or is based on the contrary hypothesis that the reality of the universe is material.

Scientific knowledge and ideology are then closely related to each other in the following respects:—

- (1) Every action of an individual is intended by him to serve his ideology and the quality of every action as a service to his ideology depends upon his knowledge of the Three Sciences.
- (2) Since an individual thinks that his ideal is the highest truth in the world, he believes that there can be no truth in the world which is inconsistent with his ideology or cutside the range of its intellectual exposition. This makes him look upon the knowledge of the Three Sciences as the knowledge of his ideology itself. All educational subjects are according to him the various branches of the knowledge of his ideology.
- (3) An individual tends either to ignore that part of the knowledge of the Three Sciences which happens to go against his ideology, or to interpret this knowledge in such a manner that it does not conflict with his ideology which is his real, practical and practicable view of man and the universe. As his knowledge of the Three Sciences develops he goes on relating it to, and integrating it into, his ideology and since man has a tendency to regard all knowledge as a unity with an internal system, his

knowledge of the Three Sciences automatically takes the shape of a philosophy of Man and the Universe which is consistant with his ideology or rather which is a philosophical explanation of his ideology. This explains why an ideological community has its own phllosophy of life.

Science concerns itself not only with discovering facts about the nature of man and the Universe by means of experiment and observation but also with systematising and ordering those facts by putting forward theories to explain them. As long as theorising with a view to explaining observed facts continues to be a function of science, there can be no distinction between Science and Philosophy. To the extent philosophy makes an attempt to explain and order observed facts it is science. To the extent Science makes an attempt to explain and order the facts known to us at all levels of existence it is Philosophy. Science is ultimately the Philosophy of the Universe and Philosophy is ultimately the Science of the Universe.

We have already known that when the ideal of an individual is not Perfect it cannot be consistent with all "scientific facts" and that there are some true "scientific facts" which he is obliged to misinterpret, misunderstand or ignore and there are some wrong "scientific facts" which he is obliged to accept as true and to integrate into his ideology. As a consequence what happens is not only that his scientific research takes a wrong direction and yields wrong results but his ideology as a philosophy of the Universe becomes wrong. The reason is that it has not only a wrong foundation in his wrong ideal but also a wrong superstructure in his misrepresentation of scientific facts. If, on the other hand, his ideal is of the highest beauty and perfection, his desre for knowledge for its own sake leads him to results which are perfectly consistent with his ideal and his ideology develops into a true Philosophy of the Universe.

The intellectual, and, therefore, the educational value of a fact known to a learner depends upon the ideal with which it becomes related and around which it becomes organized in his mind. The conclusion for the practical educator, therefore, is that if scientific knowledge is not deliberately related to the most

perfect of all ideals, it must become related to an imperfect ideal and as such must become educationally defective and harmful. The educator must arrange matters in such a way that all the facts that the child comes to know as a result of the expression and satisfaction of his intellectual urge, at every stage of his educational growth, are related to the Perfect Ideal and organized around it. If he leaves any of the facts which the child comes to know as a consequence of his intellectual activity, at any stage of his educational development, without being related to the Perfect Ideal they will come to be related to some wrong ideal and will consequently cease to be true facts in one respect or an other. He should not, therefore, leave a single fact known to his student without being related intellegently to the idea of God.

## The Pre-School Stage

We have already known that the educational atmosphere of the home in which the child takes his birth goes a long way to determining the direction of his future educational development. This atmosphere consists of the ideology of the parents and the knowledge, skills, habits, attitudes, desires and inclination, purposes and motives, likes and dislikes, hopes and aspirations, standards and opinions which they come to have as a consequence of it. As such the parents of the child are the only persons who control this atmosphere and can maintain it in a condition which assures that foundations are securely laid for the educational growth of the child in the right direction. They are not only the first but also the most important educators of the child. If their ideal is God the child has a chance to start his life in an atmosphere that is perfectly favourable to his educational development of the highest quality. The reason is that in such a case the stock of knowledge, skills, habits, attitudes etc. which he must acquire at that stage of his life automatically as a result of his direct contact with his parents will be the best that can be expected.

It is very important to note that to belong to a particular religious community or to believe in the existence of God or in His qualities and attributes is not the same thing as to have God as one's ideal. For, in view of the characteristics of an ideal mentioned above, an idea will be the ideal of an individual only if it is known (and only to the extent to which it is known).

- (1) That it is actually the most attractive and the most lovable of all the ideas known to him and that he subordinates all his other ideas to this one idea in everything.
- (2) That he attributes only to this idea all the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth which he desires or cares for or which he thinks has any worthy or value for him.
- (3) That it serves him as the only criterion for determining what is true and what is false, what is good and whi is bad, what is beautiful and what is ugly, what to approve and what not to approve, what to admire and what to hate, what to do and what not to do.
- (4) That it dominates and controls all the activities of his life.
- (5) That he has succeeded in acquiring a set of habits and attitudes, likes and dislikes, views and opinions, manners and motives, beliefs and standards, hopes and aspirations, desires and inclinations which are relevant only to this idea.

The same conditions must be fulfilled by an idea which becomes the ideal of a community. In all countries of the world in which there are secular national states at present e.g. in England, France, India etc. a belief in God is almost universal. Yet the idea of God is not the ideal of the people of any of these countries. The reason is that in their case it is not the idea of God but the idea of the nationalism of their own country which fulfils the five conditions of an ideal mentioned above.

If God is the ideal of only one of the parents, the atmosphere of the home will not have the desired effect on the educational growth of the child, as in such a case the wholesome educational influence of one parent will be counteracted by the unwholesome influence of the other. Even if the child does grow educationally in a definite direction in such a case, his growth is bound to be slow and stunted and its final direction is bound to be determined by the knowledge, habits, skills and attitudes etc. of the parent who loves the child and whom the child loves better than the other, even if that parent loves in ideal that is wrong and miseducative. Generally, however, both the parents have the same ideal and if that ideal is God, they must see to it that their child gets the full educational benefit of his being born to them as the lovers of an ideal that is educationally the most perfect. This can be assured if they bring up the child under their own care and closely watch and direct his educational development. Of the two parents it is the mother who has the most immediate influence on the educational growth of the child on account of her deeper and closer contact with him and the father supports and re-inforces this influence.

The mother should begin to feel her responsibilities to the child as his first and immediate educator from the day he is born. We have already noticed that even before the conscious mind of the child has developed he—his unconscious mind—is most susceptible to good and evil influences of all kinds emanating from the thoughts, words and movements of persons who are near him, the former having a wholesome effect on his health and happiness and the latter the opposite effect. Since the impressions created by such influences tend to become permanent, if repeated, they are not unimportant and unworthy of the attention of the mother. She must take care that they do not proceed from wrong ideals and do not violate too often the sanctity of his mind which is created to harbour the love of God.

As soon as the child becomes conscious of himself and begins to distinguish between himself and the rest of the world, his urge for educational growth begins to press itself for expression and satisfaction. From this moment onwards he needs and responds consciously to the help and guidance of his mother. The child has an experience of some objects around him and he shows by his movements and appearance that he is inquisitive about them and wants to know more about them. This is an indication that the intellectual urge of the child has awakened and is seeking expression and satisfaction. The mother should

name the objects observed by the child and explain them as far as she thinks her explanations will be followed by him. After sometime he finds his tongue and begins to express his curiosity about the nature and origin of objects in words. He therefore puts such questions as these to his mother say, about a rose:

"What is this? Where from does it come? Who has made it?"

Such questions are a vocal expression of his desire to extend his experience and thereby to grow educationally. She must satisfy his curiosity not only by telling him that it is a rose and that its plant has grown out of the earth, but also that it has been created by God. She must make such remarks about other things too which the child may be curious to know intimately thus leading him to think that God is his Creator and the Creator of all things of the heavens and earth, the Sun, the Moon, the stars, the rivers, the landscape and the mountains and all animals and all human beings. He will be then curious to know more of the qualities and attributes of God and the mother can find occasion to introduce to him the notions of love, kindness, generousity, greatness, goodness, power and knowledge as found in human beings and to tell him that God likes these qualities because He is Himself loving, kind, generous, great, good, powerful and all-knowing, that all the beauty and goodness to be found in creation including the good and beautiful qualities that he finds in her are but a reflection of His beauty and goodness. She must say such things to him again and again on suitable occasions with the object of taking him from the creation as it is known to him to the Creator who is unknown to him till the idea of God gets rooted in his mind. She can go on imparting to him the knowledge of God through the knowledge of God's creation and the knowledge of God's creation through the knowledge of God. because neither of them can be complete without the other.

A rose is not a mere rose which grows of itself with none to grow it except the material and mechanical forces of nature, but it is a a rose which is the creation of God, the creation of His infinite Power, Wisdom and Creativeness. The knowledge of an object cannot be complete without the knowledge of its

ultimate origin and if the mother does not tell him that its origin is God it will be but natural for him to ascribe to it some other origin under the educational influence of some other person sooner or later, thus falling into an ignorance about the nature of the object which may persist throughout his life. It requires a hard effort to turn a wrong educational growth into the right one completely later on.

## The School and the University Stages

Although the home is a very important factor in the educational development of the child yet the shools and colleges of a community are ultimately more important than the home as a force which determines finally the direction of the educational growth of the community as a whole. The parents themselves are ultimately the product of the schools and colleges and if the schools and colleges of a community do not provide the right kind of education for its growing generations then there can be, after some time, no rightly educated parents to provide the right kind of education to children at home.

The teachers and professors should continue the process of relating the intellectual experiences of the student to the idea of God, which was started earlier by the mother. If they discontinue it at any stage of his educational development, they will not only undo what the mother has done but will also do an additional harm to him by leaving him to reorganize his knowledge around a different ideal. They will not only stop his growth and progress in the right direction but will also send him back on the road of progress and make him grow into a personality very different from what he started to grow into, under the guidance and care of his mother. The Three Sciences must form the core of the child's intellectual education right from the earliest classes to the end of the school and the University stage but the teacher must see to it that the material of these sciences is presented to the child openly and positively not as a mere knowledge of the Universe, but as a knowledge of the Universe of God's creation so as to avoid its dwindling into a dangerous half-knowledge. The presentation of the material of instruction in the Three

Sciences must be, of course, graded carefully to suit the age, the understanding and the previous knowledge of the child at each stage. The teachers and the writers of the text books must be all persons who have been educated to love and serve God sincerely and whole-heartedly—persons in whose case the idea of God is an ideal of life which fulfils completely the five conditions of an ideal mentioned above.

A person with an atheistic or secular outlook on life, cannot have a right perspective either of education or of knowledge. His presentation of the subject matter of the text book is bound to be faulty to a greater or a lesser extent-greater in case he is dealing with one of the human and social sciences and lesser in case he is dealing with one of the biological sciences and still lesser in case he is dealing with one of the physical sciences. It is only a teacher or a writer of a text book who is himself educated to love and serve God who can be expected to look upon all knowledge as the knowledge of God's creation and to infuse this idea into the mind of his students. This fact must be kept in view by those in a community who are entrusted with the task of preparing or selecting teachers and professors and approving text-books and courses of study for its schools and colleges. The text-books that are being generally taught in the schools and colleges of the world at present are a product of the fashionable creed of intellectual secularism of today. They ignore the true nature and direction of the educational process and are, therefore, definitely miseducative. They must be replaced by other text-books written in the light of the principle that the human individual has an urge for educational growth and that he can grow perfectly in one direction only and that is the direction of an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection which is God. Every text-book of science should have a main title as follows:-

"A text-book of the knowledge of God's creation" and a sub-title worded as

"The world of matter"

OI

"The world of life"

or

#### "The world of mind"

according to the realm of existence to which it relates and aslo a second sub-title mentioning the exact subject of study with which it deals.

e.g.

Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy etc. for text books dealing with subjects relating to the world of matter, and

Biology, Zoology, Botony, Physiology, Anatomy etc. for text-books dealing with subjects relating to the world of life and

Politics, Ethics, Economics, Education History, Individual Psychology, Social Psychology, Logic, Mathematics, Philosophy Geography etc.

for text-books dealing with subjects based upon the nature of the human mind and its expression in thought and action.

Evidently subjects relating to the world of life will require some knowledge of subjects relating to the world of matter and subjects relating to the world of mind will require some knowledge of subjects relating to the worlds of life and matter. The above classification of the various branches of knowledge is, of course, according to the main subject-matter of each. Thus Geography has been classified as a subject relating to the world of mind since its object is the study of man in relation to his environment. But its study involves the knowledge of certain physical and biological facts too. History is the expression of the human mind in action, while Logic, Mathematics and Philosophy represent the expression of the human mind in thought.

Naturally, a scheme of education based on the fact that education is a natural growth from within which takes place as a result of favourable educational conditions without, cannot include the teaching of any text-books or courses of reading in the Philosophies and Psychologies e.g. General Philosophy the

Philosophy of Organic Evolution, the Philosophy of Human Evolution or the Philosophy of History, the Philosophy of Politics, the Philosophy of Economics, the Philosophy of Ethics, the Philosophy of law, the Philosophy of Education, the Philosophy of Art, Individual Psychology and Social Psychology) which ignore this fact or any of its implications except with a view to knowing their errors and inconsistencies. The reason is that by ignoring the fact of educational growth and its intellectual implications the writers of such text books will make their text-books incapable of assisting the educational growth of those who study them. Since they will be based on a wrong view of human nature they will be intellectually wrong and, therefore, educationally harmful. The most important implications of this fact are:—

- (1) That man has an urge for educational growth.
- (2) That the urge for educational growth is the sole motivating power of all the activities of man, even those which proceed immediately from his animal instincts.
- (3) That this urge is, therefore, the driving force of the process of evolution at the human stage, known commonly as the process of History.
- (4) That the urge for educational growth can have its full and free expression and satisfaction leading to the full and free growth of the human personality only in the drection of an ideal of the highest beauty, goodness and truth.
- (5) That human activity is never at its best and highest and never rightly or perfectly educative unless it is directed deliberately and consciously towards the realization of this ideal.
- (6) That human activity which is not directed consciously and deliberately towards this ideal becomes directed towards imperfect and wrong ideals really lacking in the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth.
- (7) That every ideal has its own philosophies and psycholo-

gies based on it but true philosophies and psychologies can be based only on an ideal of the highest beauty, goodness and truth.

- (8) That since truth is one all true scientific facts relating to the physical, biological and psychological planes of existence can be relevant only to an ideal of the highest truth, beauty and goodness.
- (9) That such an ideal can be only an All-powerful and All-Perfect Self-Consciousness which may be the Ultimate Reality as well as the Sole Creator and Evolver of the Universe.
- (10) That the urge of the human personality for educational growth and perfection is really the latest manifestation of the urge of the Universal Self-consciousness for the creation of a perfect humanity.
- (11) That an earlier manifestation of this urge was the urge of the organism for biological growth and perfection, which took the form of biological laws and evolved life upto the stage of its highest perfection in the human body. A still earlier manifestation of this urge was the urge of the material universe for material growth and perfection, which took the form of material laws and evolved matter upto the stage of its highest perfection in the material universe as it came to be before the emergence of life.

A Philosophy is the rational interpretation of an ideology. The reason is that it is an attempt to explain and interpret all the known scientific facts relating to the Three Sciences, the facts of Physics, Biology and Psychology, on the basis of a hypothesis—an ideal—and thereby to organize them in the shape of a coherent intellectual system. As such it is a "Science of Man and the Universe" and should be designated as such. A science not only discovers scientific facts by means of experiment and observation but also performs another function. It makes assumptions to explain, order and organizie scientific facts discovered in

this manner. As long as these assumptions remain unchallenged by new scientific facts and continue to organize, explain and order them as they emerge, they have the status of scientific facts themselves and serve as a basis for further scientific investigation. Since a philosophy that is really worthy of its name performs this very function, we need not invent another term for it. Needless multiplication of terms confuses the learner and makes it difficult for him to think clearly and accurately. The term "Philosophy" is really not necessary and the learner will understand much better the meaning that it is intended to convey if the teacher were to use the term "Science of man and the universe" in place of it.

Since all true facts are related to each other and explain and support each other, knowledge is potentially a single organized whole or unity and there must be some idea which is able to explain, order, organize and systematize all true facts and thus to become the nucleus, the centre or the unifying principle of this organized whole or unity. That this idea can be no other than the fact that man has an urge for educational growth demanding for its complete satisfaction an ideal of the highest beauty, goodness and truth, follows from the implications of this fact, including the qualities and characteristics of an ideal mentioned above. We have already known that every ideal is potentially a philosophy of life. But since every ideal is not true, every ideal cannot organize true scientific facts in the form of a coherent and rationally sound intellectual system or a true philosophy of life. This means that only one science of man and the universe is possible and that is the one which organizes and systematizes all scientific facts at the physical, biological and psychological planes of existence on the basis of this fact and this fact itself must be, on account of its capacity to organize all these facts, not a mere hypothesis but a true scientific fact. A science of manand the universe which is not based on this fact cannot be a true science of man and the universe and cannot have any educational worth or value of its own.

None of the human and social sciences which we have designated above as the philosophies of Politics, Ethics, Education, Art, Law, History, Economics, Individual Psychology and Social

Psychology, is really a separate science developing and existing independently and in its own right but only a branch, a part or a section of this one Science of Man and the Universe. As a science of human activity, every one of these sciences is based on a view of human nature and as such it can never be perfectly true and scientific and hence perfectly educative as long as it is not relevant to the eleven implications of the most fundamental of all the facts of human nature, namely, the fact that man has an urge for educational growth, which we have enumerated above. Since it is a fact that man has an urge for educational growth, all the conclusions of Science and Philosophy arrived at so far which are inconsistent with this fact and its implications and which, therefore, can not find a natural place in this one Science of Man and the Universe must be wrong and miseducative.

It follows that the educator who wants to see that his students are not miseducated, intellectually corrupted, misguided or confused and who wants to assure their perfect educational development, will be forced to ban from his educational scheme the teaching of all philosophies and psychologies which are not based on the intellectual implications of the fact that man has an urge for educational growth, except with a view to discovering their intellectual weaknesses, rational discrepancies and philosophical errors, not merely as an intellectual exercise, but also as an effective method of avoiding such weaknesses, discrepancies and errors in their own philosophical research. For reasons already explained, such philosophies and psychologies are Dialectical Materialism, Freudism, Adlerism, McDougallism, Darwinism etc.

A revision of text-books in the human and social sciences mentioned above is essential in order to save not only the intellectual activity of the learner but also his moral activity from error; it is essential in order to assure the full and free expression and satisfaction of not only his intellectual urge but also his moral urge. The reason is that each one of these sciences is ultimately an intellectual statement of some aspect of the moral activity of man and if it is intellectually wrong the moral activity that it will inspire will be also low in the standard of its mo-

rality. The core of each of these sciences has to be some view of human nature, some ideal of life and unless this view of human nature is true and this ideal is of the highest beauty, goodness and truth, it will be not only a wrong statement of the human activity with which it deals, but also an exhortation to channel that activity in a wrong direction. No human activity can be at its best and highest and no human activity can achieve the object for which it is meant in nature, unless it emerges in the service of an ideal of the highest beauty, goodness and truth and is directed towards its realization. Unfortunately, the present assumption of these sciences is that no human activity can be at its best and highest unless it emerges in the service of the ideal of secularism and is directed towards its realization in practical life. All these sciences are, therefore, wrongly formulated at present and if we teach them in our colleges, in their present shape, they must miseducate our young learners by misdirecting not only their intellectual urge but also their moral urge.

This view may call forth the objection that it means encouraging indoctrination, academic slavery and curbing intellectual freedom but this objection, raised generally by those who have never cared to know the direction in which the perfect educational growth of a human individual takes place or to study the factors and conditions on which this growth depends, has been already answered. As there are laws which govern biological growth, so there are laws which govern educational growth and we cannot break either set of laws with impunity and without suffering dire consequences. After all why do we not give our childen the freedom to take all sorts of foods, drugs and drinks and why do we warn them sternly against taking some of them? As there are poisonous or obnoxious foods which undermine the health of the body and interfere with its development so there are poisonous and obnolious opinions which undermine the health of the self and interfere with its development.

If an educator desires the perfect educational development of his pupils he must protect them from falling into the error of loving wrong ideas or opinions. Intolerance is not bad if we know its use. It supplements education and protects its benefits. There is no use injecting a poison into the system depending upon the efficacy of an antidote. If cure is essential, there is no reason why prevention should not be equally essential. We can bother about intolerance as repressive of the individual's freedom only so long as we do not know, for certain, in what, does the individual's welfare consist. When the knowledge of the highest good becomes the common property of all, as it must ultimately, we shall not mind being hard to the individual in his own interest as well as in the interest of the society of which he is a member.

We know today the rules of health definitely and certainly and the result is that we enforce them at the point of the sword in the interest of public health. A man who commits a nuisance on a public road is at once sent to the prison and no one is astonished at the penalty. A day is coming in the progress of our civilization and culture when we shall understand the rules conducive to the health of the self or happiness as surely and as commonly as we know today the rules of bodily health. Then may the people laugh at a man, who delivers a speech in a public gathering in favour of Marxism or Freudism and no one will wonder at his going to the prison.

There must be a frequent mention of God in the course of the text-book as the Creator of the qualities and properties of the objects the knowledge of which is being presented to the student in the form of the text-book. The text-book writer should indeed present the material of his text book as a study of the creative activity of God and of the manifestation of His qualities of Beauty in that part of the world of His creation with which the text-book deals. His object should be to make the student feel that the knowledge that is being imparted to him is not the knowledge of a mere Universe-a Universe existing irrespective of the fact whether it has or hasn't got a Creator, and remaining the same for an atheist and a believer-but a knowledge of the Universe created by God as an expression and manifestation of His qualities of Beauty, Goodness. Truth, Creativeness and Power and that the idea of God as the Creator of the Universe cannot be separated from the knowledge of the Universe without falsifying the latter or thoroughly affecting its accuracy.

If it is to be believed that the Universe is created by God, then, it has also to be believed that the nature and qualities of the Creator enter into its creation making it what it is and our knowledge of the Universe can be neither complete nor accurate unless we know it as the manifestation of His qualities. It makes a world of difference to the educational growth of the student to know the Universe as an entity which may or may not have been created by God and to know it as an entity which has been created and is being created by God from day to day and step by step. In the former case his educational growth takes a wrong and unnatural direction while in the latter case every bit of the knowledge of the Universe that he makes his own makes him grow educationally in the right direction.

It may be said that it is enough to tell the student once for all that the Universe is the creation of God and that it is not necessary to prepare special text-books bearing the above titles and mentioning the name of God frequently throughout in the material that they contain. But the suggestion ignores the fact emphasised above that the idea of God is not an external appendage to the material of instruction but a part of the material of instruction itself on account of which the material as a whole becomes different.

A text-book is meant to be a complete written presentation of a piece of knowledge required by the students of a particular class in a particular subject. If it is really intended that the students should look upon that piece of knowledge positively as a knowledge of God's creation, the text-book should itself say so, clearly and emphatically. To leave it to the teacher to say it verbally is to deprive it of the required emphasis. For it must give the student the impression that what he is being told varbally is not a part of the knowledge embodied in the text-book and that it is more or less an incidental opinion of the teacher which has nothing to do with real knowledge, the subject matter of the text book, itself.

Moreover, the argument, if carried to the end of its logical implications, will mean that we should have no text-books at all and that everything to be taught must be left to the verbal in-

structions of the teacher. The text-book has to be a self-sufficient whole of the knowledge to be imparted to the learners in each class. The role of the teacher is only to present this knowledge in a simplified manner suited to the intelligence and previous information of the particular group of learners which constitues his class. We have already seen that knowledge itself has no intellectual or educative value without the right kind of attitude towards it created by an ideal. There is no reason, therefore, why the educator should use the text-book to impart knowledge but not to create the right attitude towards knowledge. The teacher of Physics may tell his students that all knowledge of matter is the knowledge of God's creation, but the tex-book of Physics itself will be only half-useful educationally if it is not so prepared that every time that the learner handles it, observes it, or reads it, he is reminded that what he is studying is not merely the laws of Physics but the Greatness, Goodness, Beauty, Power and Perfection of God Himself through Physics.

The text-book should open with the name of God followed by suitable words of praise to Him for creating the world of the studies with which the text-book deals and then by the avowal that we study this subject to know Him and to serve Him better and end with an earnest prayer to Him to grant us more knowledge of His Creation and of Himself so that we may know know Him and serve Him better and still better. The suggestion given to the learner by the title and the opening sentences of the text-book in this manner should be repeated appropriately in the course of the text-book as often as the context permits.

The most important factor in the growth of a plant that is growing normally is neither any of its leaves nor any of its branches but the seed itself. For the plant grows out of the seed and in the direction of the seed, and it is in the seed at every step of its growth and all the time it is growing. Similarly, the most important factor in the growth of the human self that is growing normally is neither the knowledge of one scientific fact nor that of the other, but the seed out of which it has emerged namely the Divine Self. The human self grows out of the Divine Self and in the direction of the Divine Self and it is in the Divine Self at every step of its growth and all the time it is growing. If

the text-book is really meant to guide the growth of the self in its natural direction at every step, the presentation of its subject-matter must be such that it necessitates the mention of God, in the beginning, at the end and at every appropriate stage of its development in the middle. The intellectual experiences, indeed all experiences, of the self grow out of its ideal as a result of its reaction to external situations, as leaves and branches of a plant grow out of its seed as a result of its reaction, to air, water, soil, manure and sunshine. If the educator insists on each textbook having the titles mentioned above, he will help both the student and the teacher to keep in view constantly the nature of the material that the former has to learn and the latter has to teach. The educator who realizes the need of relating the intellectual experiences of his pupils to the ideal of their nature, namely to the idea of God, will have to arrange for special text-books for them also because all the text-books available at present are a product of the fashionable creed of intellectual secularism of today and cannot serve his purpose.

An efficient system of education based on the Perfect Ideal will lay a special emphasis on the teaching of the Three Sciences. The Three Sciences will be, in fact, the core or the back-bone of such an educational system. The reason is that the knowledge of the Three Sciences is the knowledge of creation at all its three levels; and the knowledge of creation is, in its turn, the knowledge of the Creator which is essential for the complete growth of the love of the Creator and consequently for the full expression and satisfaction of the educational urge. The knowledge of creation is, moreover, the knowledge of the laws of nature which can enable an individual to act efficiently for the realization of his ideal in cooperation with the other members of the community.

Since the Universe is a whole being the creation and manifestation of a single Reality—the Self Consciousness of the Universe—the knowledge of the Universe is also a single whole which is organized and unified by the fact of this Reality. All branches of knowledge, therefore, stand related to each other and their mutual relationship which is recognized even today must become more and more obvious with their development

in future. This fact underlines the great educational importance of teaching all branches of Science side by side with each other for a considerable period of studies, say upto the degree stage, so that their knowledge develops simultaneously and the student is led to experience their mutual relationship and finally to integrate them into a single whole of knowledge. Early specialization in a branch of science must give the student an impression that it is an independent and isolated department of studies and has nothing to do with any of its other branches and as a consequence must deprive him of the light that other branches of Science throw upon it and must ultimately hamper the growth of that science. The scholar who begins to specialize in a branch of Science too early in his career as scholar, is obliged to shut his eyes to all other branches of Science and to endeavour to obtain an answer to every question raised by the facts of that science from that science itself. But on account of the ultimate unity of all sciences this is not always possible. The result is that many of his answers are wrong and lead to the development of that science in a wrong direction -a direction which is inconsistent with the potentialities of the growth of that science itself. Specialization is the curse of this age. It is the cause of our failure to synthesise our existing knowledge of the Universe and thereby to evolve a satisfactory intellectual explanation of the world as a whole which humanity needs so much at present.

In the earlier classes there may be for each class a single text-book of Science with three separate parts one for each of the Three Sciences. It may present in an interesting and attractive manner simple scientific facts relating to all the Three Sciences and partly known to the students already. The material of each text-book will be, of course, graded carefully according to the age and ability of the students for whom it is meant. At the later stages of study there may be a separate text-book for each of the Three Sciences. Specialization may be a feature of the post-graduate period of studies. At this stage all the prescribed books may deal with that particular branch of Science in which the student is particularly interested and in which he wants to specialize.

Earlier lessons in Physics may contain elementary descriptions of heat, light, electricity, sound, aeroplane, motor car, telephone, telegraph, lightening, thunder, electric fan etc. in the form of interesting stories. lessons in Chemistry may consist of descriptions of common salt, wood, lemonade, soap, air, water, etc. Lessons in Astronomy may contain stories of the Sun, Moon, Mars, Jupiter, Milky Way etc. and lessons in Geology stories of mountains, rocks, rivers, deserts, etc. Similarly, lessons on Ethics may consist of interesting stories of kindness, generousity, justice, truthfulness and lessons on Individual Psychology of easy descriptions of human faculties like memory, attention, imagination, habits, instincts, emotions and ideals and lessons on Social Psychology may include stories of the activities of groups, associations, mobs, communities, social organizations, states etc.

The presentation of material even in elementary text-books of science usually follows at present the classical order which appeals to a scholar who has already acquired a full view of the subject. But for a person who has yet to learn the subject a more natural order i.e. an order more consistent with the nature of the urge for educational growth, will be to begin with the description of an object already known to him and then to elaborate this description in such a way that a host of new facts relating to the subject may become its natural elements. In such a case the student will acquire the knowledge of these new facts with out being bored in the least. This method of presentation must be followed not only by the text book writer but also by the teacher in his oral lessons.

For example, a teacher of Chemistry may place on his table in the class-room a piece of common rock salt and ask the students whether they know what it is and whether they are aware of all its properties. He may give a brief description of it telling them that since it is one of the necessities of man, God Almighty has in His bounty created it in abundance in the form of rocks on land and dissolved in sea water. He may then go on to enumerate and demonstrate its properties and at the end tell them that it is a compound of sodium and chlorine. Then, he may introduce to them these two elements separately and enumerate and demonstrate their properties. He may then proceed to describe

other compounds of sodium and chlorine similarly. When he has thus exhausted sodium chloride, he can take up another substance and impart its knowledge in the same manner.

A teacher of Physics may start with an electric bulb the use of which will be, of course, already known to his students. He may tell them that the light of the bulb is due to the fact that a wire inside is heated to white heat by an electric current. Then he may explain to them by a series of experiments what an electric current is, how and why does it heat a wire and what other effects it creates. Then he can explain to them an electro-magnet and the principle of the motor and so on. He may tell them in the course of his lesson that God Almighty has in his wisdom enabled man to subdue the forces of nature, one of the most powerful of which is electricity.

This method should be followed not only by the teacher but also by the text-book writer so that the text-book becomes easy for the student.

Evidently, the suggestions given above about the methods of teaching and curriculum of studies are not meant to be exhaustive. They are a statement of some of the basis principles derived from the nature of the urge for educational growth, which must be kept in view by the educator who undertakes to plan the curriculum of studies and to direct the preparation of text-books and the training of teachers. For example, the question, what languages must be taught in what classes, has not been answered, because it must be answered by each community according to its requirements. All that is needed is that the educator works out the details of the curriculum of studies and the methods of presentation of the subject-matter of the text-books, lessons and lectures for each class in such a manner that the basic principles mentioned above are not ignored.

## THE EXPRESSION AND SATISFACTION

The first ideal of the child is his mother. He loves her and, therefore, resorts to actions which please her and enable

him to win her love and approval and avoids actions which displease her and result in the loss of her love and approval. Thus he regulates his conduct according to a moral code which he derives from the personality of his mother with everything that she believes to be good, beautiful and true, as his ideal. This is the beginning of the expression and satisfaction of his moral urge. Gradually, the child comes to know that the approval and disapproval of the mother is derived from an ideal of her own which she loves. The ideal of the child, therefore, shifts from the mother to the ideal of the mother. Soon he finds that this ideal is also the ideal of all his teachers and elders and in fact of all individuals in the community old or young high or low and that his cwn worth as a member of the community is to be judged by his love and devotion to this ideal and his zeal and enthusiasm to serve it. For the love of an ideal is ultimately an urge for action to change to the conditions of practical life in a manner that suits the ideal

All activity in the service of an ideal is moral activity the moral standard of which depends upon the standard of the ideal's beauty and perfection. Thus political activity, economic activity, educational activity, legislative activity, intellectual activity, spiritual activity, aesthetic activity, military activity, social activity etc. are the various forms of moral activity by which an individual seeks to express and satisfy his moral urge. All these forms of activity have an educational importance.

Action in the service of an ideal, i.e. moral action, is always a specialized activity more or less and requires previous training to be capable of serving the ideal beautifully and efficiently. Even when I have to do some shopping, to motor to my office, to write a letter to my friend, to read a newspaper, to help a blind man cross a road, or to give first aid to an injured man, I must know previously how to do it. It is this necessity that has brought the various skills, trades and professions into existence.

Some skills are now necessary for every individual (whatever his walk of life) in order to be able to play efficiently his role as the lover of his ideal e.g. reading, writing and numerical calculation. There are other skills the nature of which is such that if each of them is acquired by a selected number of individuals in the community—those who have the inclination or the aptitude for it—the needs of the community are adequately met. Such are the skills of the tailor, the carpenter, the mason, the cook, the driver, the pilot, the merchant, the mechanic, the manufacturer, the factory manager, the doctor, the professor, the engineer, the surgeon, the architect, the teacher, the lawyer, the judge, the atomic research scholar, the journalist, the translator, the inventor, the public servant, and the agriculturist. An ideological community cannot realize its ideal unless it has a sufficient number of trained persons to undertake its skilled or specialized activities in the service of its ideal. This explains the great importance of technical, vocational or professional education in every system of education.

Skills are not possible without knowledge. The more we know of the Universe and of the laws of nature operating at the three levels of existence, the better are we able to act in the service of our ideal, the better are we able to achieve the ends and purposes prescribed by our ideal. Thus, although knowledge is needed by man for its own sake and in order to enable him to satisfy directly his intellectual urge, which is an aspect of his urge for educational growth, it serves the urge for educational growth also indirectly by enabling him to indulge in a highly skilled and specialized moral activity in the service of his ideal.

As the young individual progresses in age, knowledge and experience, he is able to understand better and better the true demands of the moral law of his ideal. His love for the ideal provides him with a dependable criterion for the rest of his life for judging what actions are right and what actions are wrong in view of the practical requirements of his ideal. This criterion enables him to judge all actions which are consistent with his ideal and promote his interests as its lover, as right and all actions which are inconsistent with it and detrimental to his interests as its lover, as wrong.

It follows that if a person's ideal is not perfectly good, beautiful and true, he is obliged to judge many actions which are really right as wrong and many actions which are really wrong as right.

His wrong love mars the validity of his moral judgements and he is unable to judge correctly the moral worth of his intended actions. There is in him a conflict between his wrong love and the innate desire for moral action for its own sake and according to absolute and universal principles of morality. In this conflict his powerful love for his wrong ideal which, of course, must rule all his desires, has the better of his moral desire. The result is that the so-called moral action that does emerge is the product of a wrong love and not the product of an unrestrained quest for the excellence and beauty of moral action itself. It is, therefore, not really moral. Its moral quality is spoiled, its truth, excellence, or perfection is marred and its natural form is altered and twisted out of shape to serve his wrong and imperfect ideal.

That is why individuals who believe in wrong and imperfect ideals make different judgdements about what is just, virtuous, moral, good or true. The justice, truth, morality, virtue honesty, fraternity, equality or liberty of a man who believes in a wrong or imperfect ideal is very much different from and very much inferior to the justice, truth, morality, virtue, honesty, fraternity, equality or liberty of a man who believes in the Perfect Ideal. The former is forced by his love, unconsciously, to interpret these terms narrowly and wrongly and hence immorally and wickedly. He ignores the true demands of these qualities in practice. In spite of his best efforts and best intentions, his activities and efforts, though they may be very splendid and very efficient in their own way, are directed towards wrong ends. He has a wrong attitude towards life and its values. His faculties of thought and action function in a wrong channel and lead to wrong results. He hates what is really admirable and lovable and loves what is really ugly and detestable. His view of things is distorted and his judgement of men and matters is vitiated. He can neither see nor hear nor think nor act rightly and he is never conscious of these disabilities of his own on account of the dominating spell of his wrong love.

The ideal being the generator of the deed and the creator of its value, the deed is good or bad according as the ideal from which it results is good or bad. Hence the character of a man

who loves a wrong ideal is never really noble or lofty. He thinks that no truth, no justice, no equality, no liberty and no virtue is good enough which conflicts with the interests of his ideal. The result is that he cannot express and satisfy completely his moral urge and cannot grow educationally to the fullest extent. If, on the other hand, a person's ideal is perfectly good, beautiful and true, his moral action is of the highest ethical standard. The reason is that, in such a case, his desire for an ideal does not interfere with his desire for moral action for its own sake. Both of these desires seek expression and satisfaction in the same direction. The love of the ideal re-inforces the desire for moral action and the desire for moral action for its own sake re-inforces and strengthens the love of the ideal, while both of them are seeking expression in the right direction. Each helps the other to achieve its full expression and satisfaction.

As the intellectual and educational value of a fact known to a learner depends upon the ideal with which it becomes related in his mind, so the moral and educational value of a moral action performed by an individual depends upon the ideal with which it becomes related in his mind. And action will be perfectly moral, will be educationally profitable, and will lead to the growth of the self, only if it is meant to serve and also actually serves the Perfect Ideal.

The conclusion for the practical educator is that he must see to it that his pupil loves God and His qualities of beauty and perfection sincerely and whole-heartedly so that no part of his innate urge of love is diverted into the channel of any other ideal and that his love for God actually determines his action. Action is the test of love. A person loves an ideal only to the extent to which he is able to act according to its moral demands and no more. Only those moral judgements and moral actions can be really moral and conducive to the perfect educational growth of an individual which result from a sincere, unmixed and wholehearted love of God.

The educator must see to it that the Ideal of God dominates and controls all the activities of his pupil relating to all aspects of his life and not only a few or even most of them. For, if any part of the life activity of his pupil, say his political or economic activity, is left to be controlled and dominated by another ideal, then, since that ideal will be wrong that activity too will be wrong and misdirected. In such a case, it will not be a moral activity at all and will not permit the student to give a full expression to his moral urge and to grow educationally to the fullest extent. Moreover, since his activity will be based on a wrong ideal, his scientific knowledge relating to that activity i.e. the Science of Politics or the Science of Economics in which he will believe, will be also based on a wrong ideal. It will not be a true knowledge of the nature of that activity. He will be forced by his wrong love to misunderstand and misinterpret scientific facts relating to the nature of that activity taking those that are true as false and those that are false as true in order to make them appear relevant to his activity.

Again, since he will believe that the moral law derived from the idea of God is not meant to control his political or economic activity, his admiration, adoration and worship of God will be halfhearted and will not result in the full expression and satisfaction of his urge for educational growth. To say nothing of a whole activity of a life-time, even a single act of the learner, like a single fact known to him, which is not related to the idea of God, has a bad effect on his educational growth, since it becomes related to a wrong ideal and ceases to be a true moral or intellectual experience. Just as the idea of God must be fully related to all branches of know ledge to prevent any of them being related to a wrong ideal and becoming wrong and miseducative, so the idea of God must be allowed to control fully all departments of human activity to pre vent any of them being controlled by a wrong ideal and becoming wrong and miseducative. CONTRACT OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY ADDR

#### The Pre-School Stage

The fact that the child's urge for an ideal which can find its ultimate expression and satisfaction only in the ideal of the Creator gets its first outlet in the personality of the mother, ownig to the affectionate care with which the mother treats him and also owing to the child's ignorance of his Creator, makes her task as the first educator of the child very easy. She should make a

good use of the position in which the child regards her (i.e. as an ideal worthy of all admiration, love and devotion) and should become a self-appointed interpreter of his true ideal, the Creator of the Universe, so that his love goes beyond the personality of his mother to the personality of his Creator. The more the mother loves the child, the more the child will love and admire her and the easier it will be for her to impress upon him her views about God and Universe. She must utilize every opportunity that offers itself and also create more opportunities as frequently as possible, to tell him that he should do what is liked or loved by God and should refrain from doing what he dislikes and hates. She must tell him that God likes good actions e.g. obedience to parents and teachers, kindness and gunerosity, courage, truthfulness, justice, honesty, industriousness, dutifulness, cleanliness, regularity, etc.

If the mother is not herself God-conscious and tells the child to be good for the sake of goodness, kind for the sake of kindness and generous for the sake of being generous etc., she will, in her ignorance, do a positive harm to the educational development of the child. The child ought to love goodness for its own sake, no doubt, because goodness is really lovable, but he cannot be free to love goodness for its own sake as long as he does not love also the ideal of which perfect goodness is a quality and unless he relates his good actions deliberately, to this ideal. To say that he must love good actions for the sake of goodness means that he must love them for the sake of that perfect, living, observing, appreciating, rewarding goodness which is God. If he fails to relate his good actions to the idea of God they will gradually, imperceptibly and unconsciously come to be related to an imperfect ideal lacking in the quality of goodness and thus cease to be good actions performed for the sake of goodness. The mother should, of course, enforce her moral code wisely and tactfully and by persuasion and love so that the child is able to feel that he is doing certain things of his own accord, as a result of his own free will and because he likes to do them and not as a result of force or compulsion.

There is no ground for the objection which is sometimes made that it is too early for a child to know and understand his Creator

and that we should not burden his undeveloped faculties of understanding with a philosophical idea like that of God. This objection ignores the fact that every child is bound by the laws of his nature as a human being to have some ideal at every stage of his life and that in his early childhood, in particular, this ideal is bound to be the ideal of his parents, whatever it may be and that every ideal, as an idea of beauty, goodness and truth, is bound to be a philosophical idea. All that happens to the ideal of an individual—which is very vague and hazy in the beginning—as his knowledge and experience grow with his age, is that it becomes clearer and clearer.

There is no escape, therefore, from teaching a philosophical ideal to an individual in early childhood. The educator's choice is not between teaching and not teaching a philosophical ideal to an individual at this age, but it is between teaching him a wrong and imperfect ideal, certain to misdirect his educational development and teaching him the only ideal that is right and perfect and capable of assuring his educational development in the proper direction. If the individual does not know the idea of one True God at any stage of his educational growth as much as he can know it, in view of his age and experience, the idea of a false God will automatically take its place to enable him to satisfy his urge for an ideal and to fill the ideological vacuum of his mind and this idea will be no less philosophical than the idea of the one True God that he really needs.

Moreover, the philosophy of the idea of God is presented to the child at every stage of his educational growth in a form which is fully intelligible to him and which is in accordance with the requirements of his nature at each stage. The child sees, understands and loves God through his mother. There is no confusion and no misunderstanding in his mind, therefore, about the idea of God in spite of all, the philosophy that it contains. The love (along with the knowledge that is a part of it) of the Creator arises and develops in his mind, quite naturally and irresistibly, as a part of the love of his mother. If she is really acting as the representative and the interpreter of the Creator for him, as s'e must, in view of her own ideological convictions, he begins to act according to the likes and dislikes

of the Creator (as the mother understands and interprets them) because they are the likes and dislikes of the mother as well.

### The School and the University Stages

The teachers and professors should relate all good actions which they expect of their students to the idea of God and, of course, they must expect all the actions of their students to be good and moral actions emerging in the service of the Perfect Ideal. At this stage of his educational growth the student must be initiated more and more deeply into the philosophy of goodness. He must be told that all goodness belongs to God and that good actions are good because they are in accordance with God's qualities of beauty and lead to the practical realization of these qualities.

## THE EXPRESSION AND SATISFACTION

The desire of an individual to admire, adore, and revere his ideal is irresistible. There are some moments every day in the life of every individual-whatever his ideal may be-when he cannot help contemplating the beauty of the qualifies of his ideal and losing himself in a secret admiration and adoration for it. Even a child cannot help looking at the face of his mother, who is his ideal, frequently with a feeling of admiration. Sometimes, such a contemplation of the beauty of an ideal is regularized as a ceremony and given the external form of an act of prayer or worship. But the essence of all such ceremonies is the expression of a feeling of admiration for the ideal. Every ideal whether right or wrong is admired, adored and worshipped by its lover with or without the help of a symbol or symbols. A religious man admires, adores and worships his ideal in a church, a synagogue, a mosque or a temple. A member of a modern ideological community (which may have for its ideal either a geographical idea like a country, a biological idea like a race, a social idea like a nation, a cultural idea like a language, a political idea like Democracy or a philosophical idea like Communism) admires, adores, and worships his ideal by reciting the national anthem-which takes the place of the prayer of the religious man-at the end of a show or a function or

programme of a national importance or by bowing his head to a symbol of his ideal in the form of a national flag, a tomb, a preserved dead body, a statue, a portrait or a photograph of a national leader. Such acts of worship enable an individual to have a fuller experience of the beauty of his ideal, to develop his love for it further and ultimately to grow fully into the particular ideological form that is latent in its nature.

When the ideal of an individual is Perfect, he is able to attribute to it all the qualities of beauty consciously and deliberately and with a full knowledge of their presence. The result is that his admiration and adoration of the ideal isfull and free and leads to a perfect development of his personality. But if his ideal is imperfect he is able to attribute to it only a few qualities of beauty consciously and with a knowledge of their presence of which he is certain. The result is that his admiration and adoration of the ideal is never full and free and can never lead to the full development his personality. Since he cannot attribute to his ideal all the qualities of Beauty consciously and with a complete awareness of their presence, he cannot love it wholeheartedly. A secret unconscious, vaque and unidentified hatred for the ideal (which ultimately becomes, open, conscious and well defined not only for him but for the entire community to which he belongs) lurks always in the heart of his hearts. That is why the lover of a wrong ideal leads a dissatisfied life and falls an easy prey to fear, grief, worry, hysteria, shocks, phobias and other nervous disorders. He can in any case never acquire as powerful and unified a personality as that of the lover of a Perfect Ideal.

A condition for the full expression and satisfaction of the spiritual urge of an individual is not only that he should admire the Perfect Ideal but also that he should not admire any other ideal along with it except as an idea subservient to the Perfect Ideal, in which case his admiration for this idea will be a part of his admiration for the Perfect Ideal. The reason is that if any part of his urge for admiration seeks a channel other than that of the Perfect Ideal, it will be denied to the Perfect Ideal and, as a consequence, his urge for admiration will not receive a full and free expression as a whole and his love for the Perfect Ideal and,

consequently, his personality, will not grow to the fullest extent. So far as his capacity to give a perfect expression to his urge to admire an ideal is concerned, the case of such an individual is not different from that of one who does not at all love the Perfect Ideal, but attributes some qualities of the Perfect Ideal to an imperfect ideal. Both of them are unable to give a full and free expression to their spiritual urge and consequently to grow their personality fully and freely.

The educator who wants his pupil to grow educationally to the fullest extent has, therefore, not only to see to it that his pupil gets frequent opportunities to admire, adore and worship God but also that his admiration, adoration and worship of God is absolutely whole-hearted, sincere and single-minded. Otherwise, his pupil will not be able to give a full and free expression to his spiritual urge and will not be able to grow educationally to the fullest extent. The educator must assure not only that the spiritual urge of his pupil is rightly directed, as early in life as he begins to feel it, but also that he gets adequate opportunities to express it and satisfy it regularly throughout the period he is under his care. In other words, he must persuade the child at every stage of his educational growth to admire, adore and worship God for His qualities of beauty, goodness and truth sincerely and whole-heartedly and with as great a concentration of mind as possible, at regular hours of day and night.

Unfortunately, a number of isms have arisen in modern times to compete with the idea of God as the only ideal that is worthy of admiration, adoration and worship. The result is that the spiritual urge of the individual is being thwarted and misdirected and his educational growth is being seriously hampered. The most popular, the most powerful and educationally the most harmful of these isms is secular nationalism. No human individual has more than one heart to love an ideal. Consequently, the more an individual loves a particular nation, country, territory, race or language for its own sake and as an end in itself, the less able he is to love God wholeheartedly and to grow educationally to the fullest extent.

Aldous Huxley refers to these isms in his book Ends and Means

(1937) very appropriately as forms of idolatry or false religions which have, in this age, taken the place of the true religion of monotheism. He writes:—

"The last fifty years have witnessed a great retreat from monotheism towards idolatry. The worship of one God has been abandoned in favour of the worship of such local divinities as the nation, the class or even the deified individual."

These isms prescribe their own modes of worship and rites and ceremonies (suitable to the ideals that they represent) which have unfortunately a far more powerful appeal to the common man today than the rites and ceremonies of traditional religion. Aldous Huxley writes referring to the "rites, customs and ceremonies of traditional Christianity":—

"They do absolutely nothing to hold together the social pattern of Christendom and they have proved themselves incapable of standing up to the competition of the new rites and ceremonies of nationalistic idolatry. Men are much more German or imperialistically British than Protestant, much more French or Fascist than Catholic."

These isms gained in power, according to Huxley, as a result of a reaction to the philosophy of the meaninglessness of the universe which had begun by the end of the twenties. They, however, themselves assume that the universe is meaningless. Says Aldous Huxley:—

"By the end of the twenties a reaction had begun to set in—away from the easy going philosophy of general meaninglessness towards the hard, ferocious theologies of nationalistic and revolutionary idolatry. Meaning was re-introduced into the world, but only in patches. The universe as a whole still remained meaningless but certain of its parts, such as the nation, the state, the class, the party were endowed with significance and the highest value. The general acceptance of a doctrine that denies meaning and value to the world as a whole while assigning

them in a supreme degree to certain arbitrarily selected parts of the totality, can have only evil and disastrous results. 'All that we are (and consequently all that we do) is the result of what we have thought'. We have thought of ourselves as members of supremely meaningful and valuable communities—deified nations divine classes and what not—existing within a meaningless universe. And because we have thought like this, rearmament i: in full swing, economic nationalism becomes ever more intense, the battle of rival propagandas grows ever fiercer and general war becomes increasingly probable."

The universal popularity of these *isms* in modern times has made the task of the educator difficult. He has to save his pupils from their love and admiration so that they may be free to love and worship God wholeheartedly and thereby to give a full expression to their spiritual urge. He must impress upon them that the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth that are being attributed to them are no more than an illusion, that none of them can provide an adequate explanation of the Universe as a whole, that they are short-lived because their lovers cannot be deceived by their false beauty for long, that their continued love cannot but lead to disastrous results for the human race and that the only ideal capable of bringing a perfect and permanent satisfaction to humanity is the ideal of God.

The educator must bear in mind that the Philosophy of Self-Consciousness, the philosophy of man and the Universe based on the true nature of Ultimate Reality, is a very powerful intellectual weapon which he can use for the protection of his pupils from the love of all wrong isms and for the eradication of that love in case it has already taken its root. It is also a powerful intellectual aid to the development of the love of God. As already explained the educator has not to teach this philosophy to his pupils as a separate subject of study to be taken up at any stage of their educational growth earlier than the stage of high specialization. His pupils will develop automatically and unconsciously a thorough and scholarly knowledge of this philosophy before they complete their general education in case he makes it a point, as he must, to prepare his text-books

and arrange his lessons and lectures in the Three Sciences for each class, in such a manner that every scientific fact that they come to know is related intelligently to the nature of Ultimate Reality. In this way all text-books and lessons and lectures in the Three Sciences from the earliest classes to the final, will reflect the Philosophy of Self-Consciousness and its teaching will come to be graded automatically from class to class according to the age and ability of the learners.

In such a scheme of education the Philosophy of Self-Consciousness will automatically become the fundamental subject of study and all sciences will become its various parts or branches, without the learner being fully aware of this fact. Such a scheme of education will, of course, assure the proper direction and expression of not only the spiritual urge of the individual but also his intellectual urge, his moral urge and his aesthetic urge. Such a scheme of education alone can assure the full growth of the human personality. We have already known that Science and Philosophy are not exclusive departments of knowledge and that neither of them can be independent of the other. In fact all knowledge is, potentially, and tends to become, actually, a single indivisible whole. A continuously developing science must, therefore, have a true philosophical basis. Otherwise, it must ultimately take a wrong direction in its development and cease to develop altogether. The fact that Self-Consciousness is the Ultimate Reality of the Universe as well as the only ideal that is perfectly satisfactory to the nature of man can be the only true philosophical basis of Science.

### The Pre-School Stage.

The mother must put the child's spiritual urge on the right path of expression as soon as she has familiarized him on the one hand with the idea of God and on the other hand with such notions as good and bad, beautiful and ugly, true and false, praise-worthy and detestable etc. She must tell him that all praise is due to God who is the originator of the heavens and the earth and all that they contain and that all admirable qualities—the qualities of beauty, goodness and truth—belong upto the highest degree of perfection to God alone and to creat-

ed personalities in so far only as they are bestowed upon them by God. God bestows admirable qualities of conduct and character upon all those who desire them and make an effort to acquire them. As soon as she begins to feel that the child has begun to love God to some extent for His qualities of beauty, goodness and truth she must teach him to express his love by praising Him sincerely and whole-heartedly and with a perfect concentration of his mind so that his love may grow further and achieve its perfection. When the child has once tried the experiment of expressing his genuine feeling of love for God in appropriate words of praise to Him and tasted and experienced the satisfaction or the joy that accompanies it, he will feel the urge to repeat the experiment in order to get more enjoyment out of it.

If the child is really enjoying his admiration of God it will be a proof that his spiritual urge is having its proper expression-and resulting in his educational growth, otherwise it will be a useless activity. The mother should, therefore, teach and prepare the child beforehand, in such a manner that he really feels the urge to praise God and really expresses that urge so that he really enjoys its expression and satisfaction. She must make him understand that an attitude of submission and humility is psychologically a necessary attendant of a sincere and wholehearted admiration of the Creator's qualities of greatness; goodnness, beauty and perfection during the act of prayer and that he must create such an attitude while he is busy with his prayers. so that his admiration of God may be sincere and whole-hearted. The expression of the spiritual urge should not be haphazard and fitful. It should be properly planned and there must be regular periods of time set apart for it at appropriate hours of day and night. The spiritual activity of the child will yield far better educational results if it is indulged in by the child in the company of his parents.

### The School Stage.

The school time-table must have regular periods for prayers which must be joined by all the students and teachers in the school. Like the mother the teacher must look to it that his pupil's admiration and adoration of God in his prayers is perfectly

sincere and whole-hearted. He must impress upon him why God alone is worthy of admiration and adoration. He must utilize every opportunity that arises in the course of his lessons in the Three Sciences to impress upon him that the admirable qualities of God i.e. His qualities of Goodness, Beauty, Truth, Power, Creativeness, Justice, Generousity, Kindness, Love etc. are manifested in His creation, that it is, therefore, God alone who deserves to be loved, admired, adored and worshipped and that our love and admiration of everything else should be subservient to our love and admiration of God.

### The University Stage.

The professor must continue the work of the teacher at the university stage at a higher intellectual level suitable to that stage. The text-books to be used by the student at the school stage and the univesity stage will be, of course, so prepared as to present all knowledge of man and the Universe as the knowledge of God'screation and, therefore, as the knowledge of the beautiful and admirable qualities of God as they are expressed in His creation. The mother the teacher and the professor should all set an example to the learner by admiring, adoring and worshipping God regularly themselves. But they will be failing in their duty towards him if they create in him a sentiment to admire adore, and worship God sincerely and whole-heartedly in this way and do not give him ample opportunities at home and during school and college hours to express and satisfy that sentiment as completely as possible in actual practice in their own company and under their own supervision, guidance and direction.

# THE EXPRESSION AND SATISFACTION OF THE AESTHETIC URGE

The child feels happy when he is in beautiful surroundings and there are beautiful objects of brilliant colours around him or when he is dressed in clean and beautiful clothes or is given a present of a beautifully bound booklet. If he is given a number of small pieces of wood or plastic of geomatrical shapes or beads of glass or sticks of a match box or pieces of chess he begins to arrange them in various forms which he endeavours to make as beautiful as possible. When anyone makes regular and

rythmic movements in his presence he feels interested and attracted and desires to copy those movements. This is how his aesthetic urge seeks to express itself.

The aesthetic activity of the child exercises his powers to conceive, admire and create by means of intelligent and systematic controlled action beauty of forms, appearances, movements and manners and is, therefore, extremely valuable educationally. This principle is one of the bases of the philosophy of "learning by doing" which has an important place in modern educational practice. Since the expression of beauty through a medium enables the child to satisfy an aspect of his urge for educational growth it develops his personality and has, therefore, a great educational importance.

Art is generally supposed to be confined to expression of beauty in brick, stone, voice, colour, sound, word or movement, known as architecture, sculpture, singing, painting, music, poetry or dancing respectively. These varieties of art can be indulged in by persons who are specially gifted or trained to indulge in them. But the commonest variety of art, in which all people indulge, is the manner in which we live our daily life. We desire to see beauty in the material things that we possess in the material surroundings in which we live, in the manner in which we talk, walk, read, write, eat, drink, bathe, travel and play and in fact in everything that we do, make, build or create. Fashion, etiquette and ceremony in all their varieties are the various forms in which the aesthetic urge of a community expresses itself. There can be no activity of an individual which he does not endeavour to make as orderly and as systematic and beautiful as possible.

Art, therefore, covers the whole of our activity and it is as old as human intelligence and human consciousness. Even the primitive man endeavoured to make his hut of twigs or mud and his tools of wood or stone and his dress of leaves or skin as beautiful as as he could.

The desire to admire and create beauty in forms and appearances is an aspect of the desire to admire and create beauty

in everything and in the moral aims, objects and purposes of our actions. The aesthetic urge of man is also his moral urge, his spiritual urge and his intellectual urge simultaneously. Our intellectual activity, the object of which is to discover truth, is a moral activity because it is action in the service of an ideal, it is aesthetic activity because it is a search for beauty in the from of truth and it is spiritual activity because it involves admiration for the beauty that is being sought after.

All these activities are consistent with each other and complimentary to each other. They merge into each other and intensify each other. The reason is that all the urges that give birth to them are in fact the various facets of a single urge of man—his urge for beauty. Henceif any of them is not being expressed in the right direction all others must suffer. That is why the aesthetic urge of man like his intellectual, moral or spiritual urge becomes related to and sub-servient to his ideal. As every ideal has its own brand of scientific and philosophical knowledge, its own brand of moral, or good action and its own brand of adoration or worship of the ideal, soit has its own brand of artistic creation in all its varieties.

So long as we are expressing any of our urges for beauty in the right direction, we are growing educationally, no matter what is the urge that we are expressing. Beauty is one and indivisible. We cannot divorce the beauty of form from the beauty of action or the beauty of idea or the beauty of fact. Art that gives an immoral suggestion is not true art; it is the result of a perversion or misdirection of the aesthetic urge of man. Art is beautiful action and, therefore, also moral action. Conversely, moral action is beautiful action and, therefore, also art. Similarly, sincere and honest investigation of truth is creation of beauty and, therefore, art as well as moral action.

A free and full expression of the urge for beauty, which is the urge of self, through one channel, qualifies the self to give a fuller and free-er expression to it through other channels. A person who has been trained to conceive, admire and create the beauty of forms, appearances, movements and manners, is better qualified to act beautifully and morally, to search for truth honestly and sincerely and to admire and adore his ideal sincerely and whole-heartedly, than a person who has not been so trained. Drawing, paper or clay modelling, singing, painting, making rythmic movements of the hands and legs and all other devices giving the child an opportunity to create beauty of form in objects and movements, used in a kindergarton school, are helpful in providing such a training to him.

An individual's aesthetic sense is trained by his ideological environment in such a manner that he can love, admire and create only the forms that are relevant to his own ideal. Hence his expression and satisfaction of his aesthetic urge only enables him to develop into the ideological form of his own community. Naturally, the aritistic creation of a person who loves intensely an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection will be of the highest quality. The love of an imperfect ideal cannot give full scope to the expression of an individual's urge for beauty. A person who loves a wrongideal is never, therefore, capable of the highest artistic creation.

The conclusion for the practical educator is that he must arrange for the full expression and satisfaction of his pupil's desire to admire and create beautiful forms and appearances and stress particularly the expression and creation of beauty in his manner of living at the pre-school, the school and the university stages of his development. But that will not be enough. He must endeavour to relate all the aesthetic experiences of his pupil to the idea of God. He must tell him that God is beautiful and loves beauty and that he must, therefore, express beauty in everything. He must aim at the perfect beautification of all his thoughts, words and deeds by relating them and subordinating them to the Perfect Ideal the ideal of the highest and the most perfect beauty.

#### NON-SERIOUS EXPRESSION OF THE URGE FOR EDUCATIONAL GROWTH

It is a characteristic of the urge for educational growth that it seeks not only a serious expression in the manner we have detailed above but also a non-serious and playful expression particularly in childhood and this characteristic too deserves notice on account of its peculiar educational value. The child is too little developed educationally and his ideal, the mother, and later on, the teacher, has too few demands on him to make it possible for him to devote the whole of his time and attention to serious activity for the realization of his ideal. Hence he fills the gaps in his serious activity emanating from his desire to win the approval of his real ideal—the mother or the teacher—by playing.

Play in all its varieties is the result of a tendency to set up a supposed ideal (generally a social ideal shared by a number of children forming a group or a team for its realization) having a particular moral code and to make an effort to realize it in the way in which it can be realized in view of this code. The intellectual urge, the moral urge, the spiritual urge and the aesthetic urge of the child all play their part in the realization of the mock ideal of the player as they do in the realization of his serious ideal. In play too the child acquires intellectual, moral, spiritual and aesthetic experiences of a certain level which educate the child and that is what makes play a valuable device for the education of children. The additional advantage of play as an educational device is that it enables the child to educate himself—to whatever extent it does so—without tears and rather laughingly. The child derives a pleasure from his activity which his mock ideal calls forth for its realization.

Play is the manner in which the individual gives expression to, and obtains satisfaction of, his urge for an ideal in childhood and thus prepares himself for that part of his life, to come later on, in which he has to strive seriously after a real ideal. Play should, therefore, prove a useful method of educating the individual in childhood. The educator should allow the child to give a large amount of his time to playing but the nature of the play should be made to change consistently with his age and experience and the time spent on it should be decreased in a suitable proportion as the child grows in years. The educator should see to it, above all, that there is nothing in the artificial moral code of the play which is really immoral, which borders on immorality or gives an immoral suggestion.



