

B.A.(Hons.) Part-III

Philosophy, Paper-V

Sl.No.	Topics	L. No.	Page
1.	Nature of Religion	1	2
2.	Religion and Science : Their Relation X	2	9
3.	Religion and Morality	3	16
4.	Religion and Theology	4	22
5.	Religious Consciousness	5	27
6.	Conative Element	6	33
7.	Affective Element	7	37
8.	Foundations of Religious Belief	8	42
9.	Revelation and Mystic Experience	9	48
X 10.	Forms of Primitive Religion X	10	54
11.	Causal and Cosmological Argument for the Existence of God	11	60
12.	Ontological Proof for the Existence of God	12	66
13.	Teleological Proof for the Existence of God	13	72
14.	The Moral Proof for the Existence of God	14	78
X 15.	Attributes of God X	15	83
16.	Problem of Evil : Natural and Moral Evil	16	89
17.	Theistic Solution of the Problem of Evil	17	94
18.	Proofs for the Immortality of Soul	18	99
19.	Unity of Religions	19	104
20.	Conversion and Secularism	20	110

NATURE OF RELIGION**Lesson Structure**

- 1.0 Objective**
- 1.1 Introduction**
- 1.2 Main Theme**
 - 1.2.1 What is religion ?**
 - 1.2.2 Religion and Philosophy of Religion**
 - 1.2.3 Nature Of Religion**
 - 1.2.4 Features of the Nature of Religion according to Dr. Masih's Definition**
- 1.3 Summary**
- 1.4 Key words**
- 1.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - 1.5.1 Objective Questions**
 - 1.5.2 Short Answer Questions**
 - 1.5.3 Long Answer Questions**
- 1.6 Suggested Readings**

1.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to analyse and explain the different aspects of the nature of Religion. There are so many religions and you must have come across followers of such religions around you. Every religion has its own system of beliefs and practices, its own distinctive features. And yet we can find some common elements characterising every religion. We shall be explaining these features in this lesson.

1.1 Introduction

Religion is as old as man himself. Man has always been pursuing some sort of religion. Anthropologists are almost unanimous today that religion in the sense of a belief in spirits or higher powers

of some kind, has been a universal phenomenon. No primitive race has been devoid of such belief. Religion, thus, is as old as human consciousness. Arnold Toynbee, a great historian, has observed that religion has been guiding man from the very beginning and it will probably remain inseparably connected with human civilization in future also. The nature and form of religion may change in course of time. But religion in some form or other is always present as it is inherent in human nature.

1.2 Main Theme

The main theme of this Lesson is Religion. Although we so often talk of religion and assert that religion is ingrained in human nature, it is not so easy to define religion. And so we must be clear about what Religion is and how it is different from Philosophy of Religion.

And then, we can discuss the nature of religion.

1.2.1 What is Religion ?

Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and Jainism are religions. But it is not possible to find a definition which will include all the religions. Galloway's definition that Religion is "man's faith in a power beyond himself whereby he seeks to satisfy emotional needs and gains stability of life, and which he expresses in acts of worship and service." Galloway's definition of religion is very popular because it not only includes western religious systems but also Hinduism. There are two views about religion. Thinkers like Whitehead and Price believe religion to be an individual experience. "Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness." The great religious conceptions which haunt the imaginations of civilized mankind are scenes of solitariness: Prometheus chained to his rock, Mohammed brooding in the desert, the meditations of the Buddha, the solitary man on the Cross. Sociologists like Durkheim, on the other hand, take religion to be social and congregational behaviour. Religion has no meaning without the element of social service, congregational prayer like Bhajan, Kirtan etc. Galloway's definition of religion includes both these aspects of religion. But then it fails to explain Buddhism and Jainism. Hoffding's definition of religion as conservation of moral values does justice to such religions. In fact, there are various forms of religion. Religion in the wide sense means man's devotion and commitment to an ideal. Communists and Marxists in general consider religion to be an opium of mind, but they also consider the establishment of a classless society as their ideal. This is their religion. The Humanists regard man or some human quality and service to humanity as their ideal. Religion is faith, unflinching devotion and commitment to an ideal. It is an expression of the entire personality of man and is reflected in his conduct and character.

1.2.2 Religion and Philosophy of Religion

Philosophy is critical inquiry. It is an intellectual inquiry into any subject, without any bias or prejudice. There is no place for any authority, no place for any feeling or emotion. It is a free, rational inquiry. When any religion, religious concept or religious experience is subjected to critical scrutiny, it

is called Philosophy of Religion. Philosophy of Religion is an independent intellectual enterprise. Its purpose is not to supply any rational basis to religion, nor even to refute religion. Its only objective is to critically study the religious concepts. Religion, on the other hand, is faith, devotion and invariably associated with human feelings and emotions. Philosophy of Religion reasons and doubts religious experience.

Philosophy of Religion is not religion. Religion is commitment to certain ideal. Philosophy of Religion has absolutely no such commitment. It is a free and impartial inquiry into religion.

1.2.3 Nature of Religion

We have already seen that there are many forms of religion and it is not possible to comprehend all of them in the compass of one definition. But adopting the definition of Galloway, which is the traditionally accepted definition, we can note down the following characteristics of Religion.

Firstly, Religion is faith in some Superior Power. It is not only belief, but an abiding faith, an unflinching faith in some power which man designates as God. Man as a rational being cannot pin his faith in any power unless he is convinced of the superiority of that Power. He can be convinced only when his reason is satisfied. Religion is not blind faith. It is devotional faith. Devotional faith can only arise when man is thoroughly convinced of the superiority of that power and has full faith in the capacity and strength of that power.

Secondly, man seeks to satisfy his emotional needs by this faith. Man is not only a creature of reason, he is also a being with feelings and emotions. Emotions and feelings together constitute the affective elements of the mental life of man. Emotion is the disturbed mental state of man's life. So long as this disturbed state persists, man suffers; he has the feeling of pain and agony. By relying fully on such a power man's emotions and feelings get satisfied and he attains stability in life. Just as after satisfaction of hunger and appetite, and after a sound sleep man gets peace and stability, so when man's affective elements get satisfied, he gets stability in life.

Thirdly, man gives vent to his faith not only in his inner life of peace and tranquillity, but also in his acts of worship, congregational prayer, and acts of social service. Unless man engages himself in such religious activities, he is not considered religious.

Galloway's definition thus brings out that religion involves the entire personality of man. All his cognitive, affective and conative elements find full expression in religion. But although Galloway's definition has the merit of explaining theistic religions, it fails to explain Jainism and Buddhism wherein there is no belief in any super power but only a belief in the ideal of liberation. Similarly, atheistic religions like Humanism and Communism lie outside the domain of Galloway's definition of Religion. For Galloway Religion is a conscious response. But recent researches in psychology show that the unconscious also has a role to play in religion.

Dr. Y. Masih has suggested a definition of Religion which is more comprehensive and relevant in the context of shortcomings present in Galloway's definition. It runs thus : "Religion is that all-perva-

sive attitude which is based on devotion towards an ideal object and towards which commitment is expressed and strengthened by worship and /or meditation."

1.2.4 Features of the Nature of Religion according to Dr. Masih's definition :

On an analysis of this definition, the following further features of the nature of religion must also be noted :

An Ideal Object of Devotion :

In every religion there must be an ideal object of devotion. This object may be God , a supernatural power or something else. The ideal may be liberation or *Nirvan* , or a classless society or simply human welfare .

Adherence to the ideal with heart and soul

The adherence to the ideal is not a temporary affair. Man sticks to the ideal in all the ups and downs of life.

Religion is based on devotion towards an Ideal Object

The object of devotion may be the Supreme Reality or God or anything else. Hence, under this definition, theism, humanism, Communism, Jainism and Buddhism all are included. For religious people the object of devotion is very valuable. They have immense respect for such an object. If this object is not an ideal object, there will be no sense of devotion in the devotee. For the devotee the object of devotion must be ideal and most valuable. It may be that the religious ideal of one community may not be an ideal for another community. The ideal of a classes society may not be the ideal for the Capitalist class. But the Communist will always be ready to sacrifice his life, all that he has for realizing such an ideal. Every religion must have some ideal object of devotion. This is why Hoffding is of the view that Religion is the conservation of values.

The second key notion of this definition is 'devotion'. This term must be distinguished from 'belief' and 'faith'. 'Belief' or 'faith' imply that there is some independent knowable thing in existence in which one can believe or put in his faith. That knowable thing or object may be true or false. But the question of true or false does not arise with respect to the ideal object of religion. The question of truth and falsity does not arise with respect to 'Liberation' which is considered to be the ideal for the Jainas. Nirvan is not knowledge of God or Brahman, it is a state, a condition. The Ideal is not an object whose knowledge is possible and can be stated or mentioned. Hence we should not use terms like 'belief' or 'faith'. The term 'devotion' is more apt because although it denotes emotional outburst, it speaks of the calm, peace of mind which characterizes a true devotee. The description of a *sthitipragya* who is above pleasure and pain, in the Gita is the real description of a devotee. Devotion to an ideal object does not mean that the object is knowable and may be true or false.

The word "devotion" is not a cognitive state. In cognition there must be a cognizable object and there must a criterion of truth by which we pronounce the knowledge to be true or false. Religious experience is unique experience; it is like the experience of the dumb about the sugar pill which he enjoys but cannot describe.

Commitment to the Ideal Object : In religion , the entire personality of the devotee is involved and engaged in his devotion to the ideal. "Religious beliefs provide an all-pervasive frame of reference or a focal attitude of orientation to life and induce a total commitment to an object of devotion", says W. T. Blackstone. Commitment means pledging of one self to some object or ideal for the sake of which one can sacrifice his entire personality. In fact, in religion, the devotee's thinking, feeling , emotions centre round the object of devotion. In religion the cognitive, conative, the affective, the unconscious activities are found together in all the activities of individual. Religious life therefore is said to be a life of self-sacrifice and a life committed to the ideal. The religious man sees the grandeur of his object of worship in everything.

Religion is an all-pervasive attitude : Self-sacrifice and self-surrender by the devotee to the Ideal Object result in making the devotee so absorbed in himself as he begins seeing God or the Ideal in his own self and in all things around him. In religious activity, the entire personality of the devotee is involved on the one hand and the entire world becomes the object of his activity. Hence it is said, "In religious response the whole man is involved in relation to the whole reality."

A line of distinction must be drawn between 'all pervasive attitude' and 'commitment to an ideal'. Devotion in an Ideal object is the first stage; and as a result of such devotion the individual sacrifices his entire power for this ideal object. This is called commitment.

An attitude is more or less permanent. An all-pervasive attitude in religion is somewhat different from other attitudes. Religious attitude is more pervasive and is related to the entire world and no aspect of life remains untouched by this religious outlook. Moral attitude pervades human relations alone. But religious attitude pervades the entire universe. Religious attitude is related with entire living beings on earth. It embraces in its fold the entire human relations with the entire world. of animate and inanimate beings. The religious man visualises his object of devotion everywhere.

Meditation and Worship : Religious attitude is expressed in various religious activities like meditation, worship, congregational prayer, Bhajan, Kirtan etc. Worship and meditation are slightly different from each other. Worship is accompanied by various rituals like fasting, and repetition of mantras. Meditation needs preparation so that mind may be pure and one can concentrate on the ideal without disturbance. Both meditation and worship are external manifestations of religiosity. Like devotion and attitude, worship and meditation are sacred.

Religious activities go a long way in revivifying and strengthening religiosity and religious beliefs. Hinduism and Islam like other religions observe several rituals at the time of birth, marriage and death. Even communism observes May Day.

Thus we see that religion is an all-pervasive attitude which is generated by man's devotion towards an ideal object. This attitude is expressed in worship, meditation and other religious activities.

1.3 Summary

Now we can summarize the main points in the nature of Religion as follows:

1. Religion is rooted in human nature. Man cannot but follow some religion.

2. As there are so many men, so there are many religions. Religions are of different forms and they have their own specific characters.
3. Religion is a continually developing process. With the advancement of knowledge, man's thinking process has been growing from day to day. Religion also has been developing along with man's advancement of knowledge. There has been a continuity in the development of religious ideas.
4. Religion is a complex phenomenon. The entire personality of man is involved. Religion is not a response of one aspect of man's nature, but it is a reflection of his entire nature.
5. There is always some ideal in religion. The ideal object is the centre round which man's entire religious activities revolve.
6. Devotion to an Ideal object is paramount in every religion. Respectful, unflinching faith characterizes one's belief in the ideal.
7. Religious men have an attitude of commitment and dedication for the ideal.
8. Religious attitude is all-pervasive. When we say that religious attitude is all-pervasive, we mean to say that a religious man has not only devotional attitude to the ideal object in religion, but he begins seeing in everything around himself and in himself the grandeur of the Ideal.
9. Lastly, Religion always expresses itself in various religious activities. Worship, meditation, congregational prayers are some of these religious activities.

1.4 Key words

- (a) **Personality** : a distinctive character of man; mental activities like feeling, willing and thinking—all are included in the word 'personality'.
- (b) **Ideal** : Ideal is what is not actual : the more you try to realize it, actualize it, the more it recedes from your grasp.
- (c) **Devotion** : It is unflinching faith coupled with reverence and respect on the part of the devotee or *Bhakta*.
- (d) **Commitment** : To pledge; to entrust the behaviour of the religious aspirer, his activities appear to be giving evidence that he has pledged himself to live such a life.

1.5 Questions for Exercise

1.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Religion is
- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (a) imposed upon man | (b) natural to man |
| (c) copied by man | (d) partly copied and partly imposed |

Answer— (b)

RELIGION AND SCIENCE: THEIR RELATION

Lesson Structure

- 2.0 Objective**
- 2.1 Introduction**
- 2.2 Main Theme**
 - 2.2.1 What do we mean by Science?**
 - 2.2.2 What is Religion ?**
 - 2.2.3 Relation between Religion and Science**
- 2.3 Summary**
- 2.4 Key words**
- 2.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - 2.5.1 Objective Questions**
 - 2.5.2 Short Answer Questions**
 - 2.5.3 Long Answer Question**
- 2.6 Suggested Readings**

2.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to clearly state the distinction between religion and science and remove the wrong notion that science and religion are quite opposed to each other.

2.1 Introduction

Both Religion and Science have come into existence because of man's effort to adjust with the environment. With the development of civilization and the growth of human culture, science and religion both claim to have their own independent realms. Although they now claim to have their own independent existence and their own separate field of activity, some sort of mutual understanding and interdependence and adjustment claims among them cannot be ruled out. After all, the two have a common origin in as much as they both have emerged as a result of man's reaction to the environment

and on the basis of man's experience. It is quite natural that because of their common source of origin, there must be some common bond of affinity between them. We shall be trying to discuss their relation in the following pages.

2.2 Main Theme

In our daily life and activity, we usually regard science and religion as being diametrically opposed to each other. We regard them to be poles apart. But we must admit that in spite of so much progress in the field of science and the advent of the present Computer Age, Religion has not disappeared altogether. There is still a strong cry for peace of mind, for tranquillity in life and for this we look to Religion. Religion is very much present in spite of the fact that many of its beliefs have been demolished by scientific discoveries. As a matter of fact, quite a fair number of scientists themselves are religious minded. And, therefore, it will be an interesting study to see how they really stand in relation to each other. A clear idea of what we understand by science and what we understand by religion will throw much light on the problem.

2.2.1 What do we mean by Science?

Science is a systematic and well-organised knowledge based on observation and experiment. Scientific inquiry has three main features: observation and collection of facts; analysis and elimination of irrelevant instances and circumstances, hypothesis; then generalisation and then verification. Science aims at establishing causal connection between the events in the world of our experience. Science assumes that the world is a cosmos and not a chaos. It tries to discover the laws governing this world. Science makes a sincere effort to understand this universe. It is an unbiased rational inquiry. The role of reason is paramount in a scientific inquiry. Feeling and emotion have no role to play in science. We can say that science aims at finding out the truth. Another important feature of Science is that it never claims finality for its conclusions. Its conclusions are always open to change and corrections in the light of new facts discovered by the new generation of scientists. Science does not believe in chance and accidents. It also believes that different phenomena in this world are interrelated.

2.2.2 What is Religion?

In the earlier Lesson we have already studied about the nature of Religion. We have learnt that different thinkers have held different views about Religion. There is no unanimity among them about the nature of religion. Naturally views differ about the relation of religion with science. For some, religion is a matter of faith and emotion. Reason has very little or no role to play in religion. For them religion is based on a special kind of mystical experience or is based on a special kind of Divine Revelation. The truths of such mystical kind of Divine Revelation cannot be questioned. For such thinkers, there cannot be any meeting ground of religion and science. But there are thinkers who

stand for a scientific study of religion. They question the rationality of every item of religion and try to shun superstition out of religion and make religion a scientific pursuit of life to realize the ideal of religion.

2.2.3 Relation between Religion and Science :

Three types of views with regard to relation between Religion and Science have been expressed. They are as under :

- (i) Religion and Science are quite independent of each other. Each has its own separate domain and has nothing to do with the other.
- (ii) Science and Religion are opposed to each other. They are antagonistic. A relation of antagonism exists between them.
- (iii) Science and Religion are not incompatible with each other; they are compatible. Religion and Science are also complementary to each other.

(i) Emphasizing the points of difference between Science and Religion some thinkers hold them to be quite independent of each other and deny any possibility of relation between them. They regard Religion to be based on mystical experience or divine revelation and as such there can be no meeting ground between religion and science. Religious truths are indubitable and beyond verification. In science, there is no place for mystical experience and divine revelation. Every item in science must be observable and demonstrable before others. Mystical experience is subjective experience and such personal experience can have no place in science whatsoever. Further authority has supreme place in religion. Bible, Vedas, Koran and other religious scriptures are considered to be authoritative in religion. No testimony from any authority is accepted by science. There is basic difference between science and religion in that the aim of science is attainment of truth while religion aims at attaining Godhead or Liberation. Science is concerned with the world of nature while religion is concerned with the supernatural entities. Religion believes in morality; there can be no religion without morality. Science has nothing to do with morality. Science relies on reason; feeling and emotions have no place in science but religion is necessarily an emotional outburst.

(ii) Emphasizing the points of difference keenly, some thinkers believe that religion and science are opposed to each other. Whatever is accepted by religion as true is refuted by science. There is relation of opposition between religion and science. Science and Religion are opposed to each other in that Science accepts the theory of evolution, while Religion believes in the theory of creation. Science regards this present universe to have gradually evolved from simpler beginnings. At first the universe was a ball of fire. In course of its rotation the great ball split into smaller fragments of fire and one such fragment grew cold soon and became the earth. Gradually living beings began to exist. This theory of evolution is repudiated by Religion. Religion believes that the universe was created by God at a certain point of time out of nothing but mere will. God wanted that there should be light and there was light and people called it day. And so what is affirmed by religion is rejected by science. History also bears witness to the vehement opposition of the mediaeval religious fanatics to

the Copernican theory that the earth along with other planets revolved round the sun with the result that Galilee had to publicly withdraw the theory in favour of religious cosmology placing earth at the centre. The following points of antagonism between them are also emphasized :

- (i) Science interrogates Nature to find out how natural events are casually connected. Observation and experiment help the scientists in collecting materials and coming to conclusions by drawing inferences from them. Religion is concerned with more complex and comprehensive objects which transcend the natural.
- (ii) Religion is subjective whereas science is objective. The conclusions of science are assented to by everybody readily but the conclusions of religion are not assented to universally. They are believed to be true only by the followers of religion and not by all.
- (iii) Most of the religions announce a code of morals, certain creeds but there is no creed, no place of worship, no moral code for science.
- (iv) The method of science is inductive whereas the method of religion is deductive. Religion never questions the authority and passes judgments on various human and social issues in accordance with truths contained in them (authoritative scriptures). Thus its method is deductive. Science, on the other hand, does not believe in any authority to be true for ever. It does not hold any authority to be true simply because it is backed by any big authority.

Science has no concern with transcendental reality and supernatural powers with which religion is preoccupied. Its sole field of study is the external world. Religion deals with supernatural realities and powers like God, Heaven, Hell etc. The truths of religion are deemed to be eternal, unchangeable and final. But the truths of science are changeable. Science never claims finality for its truths. Scientific knowledge is always progressive; its laws and truths are liable to change in the light of new discoveries.

Last but not the least, science deals with facts while religion deals with values. Facts are known by the senses. Religion regards only those facts to be true which are in conformity with the values. Religion and science, therefore, are conceived to be incompatible and antagonistic to each other.

(iii) From the above mentioned points of difference between religion and science, one should not conclude hastily that they are absolutely hostile to each other as some thinkers usually do. True there exists difference between the two, but difference need not be exaggerated. In fact, neither science is anti-religious, nor Religion is anti-scientific. The difference between them is highlighted by saying that religion is based on faith and science is based on reason. Actually, this not a correct estimate. It is wrong to say that religion is based on blind faith and is absolutely anti-rational. Science also involves faith. Without faith in one's own capacity of senses, science cannot progress or proceed in its inquiry. Religion also is based on reason. Man is a rational being and he cannot pin his faith without exercising his reason. If unflinching faith is what characterizes a religious person, it must be a reasoned faith. Similarly, to say that science is theoretical and religion is practical is wrong.

Theory and practice are themselves related with each other. When practical life is faced with difficulties, the need to evolve some theory is felt. The success of a theory depends upon how it helps living a smooth practical life. "The head guides the hand and the intellect the will." They are inseparably interrelated.

Really speaking, religion and science are related to each other as a whole is related to its parts. Religion is more comprehensive than science. Like science, religion also deals with things and beings of this world, but unlike science, it also deals with supernatural beings as well.

In fact, science and religion have their own separate field of action. The realm of inner experience and spiritual values in which religious spirit lives and breathes is foreign to science. On these science cannot validly pronounce any judgment. Similarly, the material world which is the world of sense, is the field of science. Its findings are valid for the material world. But it cannot pass any judgment about soul, rebirth and God. This is the limit of science. Conflict between them arises when each of them tries to cross its limit. Thus, when religion transgresses its limit and begins explaining the material world there arises conflict. Really there is no conflict between them. Abiding conflict between them is out of question. As C.E.M. Joad writes, "I have sought to establish the commonplace proposition that there is no conflict between science and religion. Man is a member of two different orders or realms of being, it is only one of these that science takes into account....."

Science has made much progress. It has studied stars, moon and other planets, Men have walked upon the moon, fired satellites in the orbit, computer science has developed immensely and time and distance have been conquered. But it has neither been successful in solving all human problems nor does it hope to find solutions of all the problems in near future. There is still room for religion. The peace of mind which a modern man also seeks can be provided by religion. As religion brings peace to the soul, expands the soul in infinite proportion, makes life bearable and arouses nobler aims, there is great need of it despite the advancement of science.

Both religion and science are complementary to each other. Science aims at explaining the universe in terms of cause and effect relationship. It enables us to understand why causality operates in the world. Religion also demonstrates that there is purpose, planning, order in the universe. Religion thus serves science. Science also by investigating the different parts of nature proves that order and harmony are prevalent everywhere in this universe. Thus we see that where science ends religion begins. They are intimately related. Science purges religion of its superstition. It rejects the various dogmas of religion and provides a rational basis to religion. Religion and science are both essential ingredients of our knowledge. There are so many aspects of our knowledge. Religion is one aspect and science is another aspect of our knowledge-system. They are intimately related. It is wrong to call science irreligious, as it is improper to designate religion as unscientific. The famous scientist Einstein also does not conceive religion and science to be antagonistic to each other. As a scientist Einstein is fully aware of the merits and shortcomings of the scientists in their procedure. He laments how soon the scientist gets disappointed when his experiment fails to give the desired results.

On the other hand, he is much elated and inspired by the perseverance of the religious aspirers who continue in their efforts to realize the goal although they fail to get the desired result even after so many attempts. He wishes that such religious fervour should be emulated by the scientists in their inquiry. Science enlightens the religionist about the goal, clears the mist caused by superstition. Einstein, therefore, says, "Science without Religion is lame, and Religion without Science is blind." Humanity will be benefited when both science and religion co-operate with each other. Under the influence of science religion is undergoing several changes. Humanistic religions with the goal of 'Service to humanity' have seen the light of the day. Science and Religion are interdependent.

2.3 Summary

Thinkers differ among themselves with regard to the relation between religion and science. Some of them deny any relationship between them. Their view is that the two are independent of each other. Emphasizing the points of difference between them a group of thinkers consider religion to be diametrically opposed to science. In their eyes religion is based on faith while science is based on reason.

Science deals with the natural, bases its findings on observation and experiment, while religion deals with the supernatural, relies on divine revelation and mystical experience. Science is objective and religion is subjective. There is a third group of thinkers who hold a more rational view and believe that there is no antagonism between them. They are interdependent. The conflict between them appears only when each transgresses its own sphere and meddles with the area of the other. When religion begins theorizing about the material world or when science begins its inquiry into the supernatural, into the existence of soul, heaven and hell, there is bound to be a conflict. On a saner view, science also depends on faith in the capacity of our sense-experience to deal with the material world and religion also depends on reason. Man is a rational being and he cannot pin his faith in religious entities without reason. This is why religion gives a number of proofs for the existence of God. Religion and science are both ingredients of human knowledge. The way a religionist believes in an unseen entity like God and conducts himself in life with all sincerity in spite of his failure to realize the goal so far is worth imitating for a scientist who gives up his experiment altogether when he fails to achieve the desired result. Science has done great service to religion by rejecting superstition and by sharpening his intellect in perceiving the goal. Einstein has very correctly said that "Science without religion is lame and Religion without Science is blind". The two are dependent on each other. By their co-operation alone we can serve humanity and do good to the society.

2.4 Key words

- (a) **Science** : systematic and formulated knowledge
- (b) **Religion** : system of faith and worship
- (c) **Compatible** : consistent; agreeable with

'Science without religion is lame' means as a lame man cannot walk freely, so science cannot progress unless the scientist adopts the vigour and spirit of a religious aspirer who continues to pursue his search for goal even with little or no success. Science enlightens religion about the goal, guides about the path, so religion without science is blind.

2.5 Questions for Exercise

2.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Religion is based on
- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| (a) faith alone | (b) reason alone |
| (c) neither faith nor reason | (d) faith and reason both |
- Answer— (d)
- (ii) Religion and Science are
- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) one and the same | (b) absolutely different from each other |
| (c) partly different and partly identical | (d) opposed to each other |
- Answer— (c)

2.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- How are science and religion opposed to each other?
See 2.2.3 for answer
- Neither Science is anti-religious, nor religion is anti-science. Explain.
See 2.2.3 for answer

2.5.3 Long Answer Question

- Discuss the relation between Religion and Science.
See 2.2.3 for answer

2.6 Suggested Readings

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics | — James Hastings (ed) |
| 2. Dialogues concerning Natural Religion | — Hume, David |
| 3. Religion and Scientific Outlook | — Miles, T.R. |
| 4. Religion and Modern Mind | — Stace, W.T. |

RELIGION AND MORALITY**Lesson Structure**

- 3.0 Objective**
- 3.1 Introduction**
- 3.2 Main theme**
 - 3.2.1 Religion is primary, morality is secondary**
 - 3.2.2 Religion has developed from morality**
 - 3.2.3 Religion and morality develop simultaneously**
 - 3.2.4 Religion and morality are independent of each other**
 - 3.2.5 Religion and morality are mutually interdependent**
- 3.3 Summary**
- 3.4 Key words**
- 3.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - 3.5.1 Objective Questions**
 - 3.5.2 Short Answer Questions**
 - 3.5.3 Long Answer Question**
- 3.6 Suggested Readings**

3.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to explain the different views about the relation between Religion and Morality.

3.1 Introduction

We have discussed in the earlier Lesson how religion is related to science. A closer relation exists between religion and morality. We cannot think of religion without morality. Morality is an essential part of religion. But thinkers have thought in different ways about the relation between morality and religion. We shall be studying them in this lesson.

3.2 Main Theme

Must religion depend upon ethics or morality? Does ethics need a stable foundation in religion? These are some of the chief questions that haunt the mind of an intelligent person who ponders over the relation of religion with morality. Scholars are divided among themselves about the exact nature of relationship between the two. We can note down the following types of views about the relationship :

- i. Religion is primary, morality is secondary.
- ii. Morality is primary, religion is secondary.
- iii. Religion and morality arise simultaneously.
- iv. Religion and morality are autonomous; they are independent of each other. Neither religion depends on morality, nor morality depends on religion.
- v. Religion and morality go together; they are dependent on each other.

3.2.1 Religion is primary and morality originates from religion :

Some scholars hold that religion is prior to morality. Morality has originated from religion. Men first adopted religion, customs and it was only in course of time later that they became aware of moral codes. Thus, scholars like Waitz and Tylor are of the view that primitive religions had nothing to do with morality.

When primitive religions developed into naturalistic religions, morality came into being. The views of Waitz and Tylor have been supported by Descartes and Locke also. Historically viewed religion is prior to morality.

The contention of Waitz and Tylor that the primitive religions had nothing to do with morality is based on a misconception about their notion of morality. They have in their mind a very developed idea of morality and they find absence of such a high notion of morality in the primitive religion. We must realize that as religion has developed gradually, so moral ideas have also developed through stages. Some sort of primitive ideas of morality must have been present in the primitive religions also. It is true that in primitive religions, such customs were prevalent in the name of morals which to our mind today are repulsive and immoral. But to deny the presence of morality in those religions on this ground is not just and proper. The morals in the garb of customs of the tribes were intimately interwoven with their religion. Any disobedience of these customs meant offence to the presiding spirits and would draw on the offender mysterious and even magical evils. Hence, it will not be proper to deny morality to primitive religions.

3.2.2 Religion has developed from morality :

Some other thinkers believe that religion has developed out of morality. In other words, this is another extreme view. According to them, morality is primary and religion grows out of it. Morality leads man to believe in the existence of a moral Governor or God who gives reward and punishment

- iii. For religion, faith in a transcendent power or God is necessary. But for morality, not God but man's conduct is important.
- iv. The scope of religion is much wider than that of morality. Religion deals with all the three kinds of values viz. Truth, Beauty and Goodness. But morality deals with only one kind of value viz. Goodness.
- v. Religion invokes a type of sanction which may be called 'supernatural'. 'Fury of God' 'Torture in hell' are some examples of such religious sanctions. Moral sanctions may be internal i.e. of conscience or external, but they are not supernatural.
- vi. Religion as compared to morality, is more surcharged with emotion. Emotions have little role to play in morality. Matthew Arnold has defined Religion as 'morality touched with emotion'.

3.2.5 Religion and Morality are mutually interdependent :

Despite the apparent differences existing between religion and morality as pointed out above, there is a deep affinity between them. They go together. As Prof. Hoffding says, "Religion is faith in the conservation values." It is difficult to conceive of a religion devoid of moral values. Morality is an essential element of religion. In fact, the one influences the other. What is good, is also willed by God. The fulfilment of God's will and the performance of moral action are two aspects of the same process. Morality prepares man for perpetuation of religious beliefs. To be entitled to undertake religious pursuits or attain some religious ideal, one has to live a moral life. Thus for studying Vedanta, certain moral preparations are necessary. Buddha's eightfold path is out and out a moral life essentially which leads to the religious goal of Nirvana. Religion reinforces morality with supernatural sanction. Salvation, Blessedness are interpreted in terms of individual's relation to the moral ideals. Moral values, arrived at by man in course of his living, are appropriated by and incorporated into religion. In incorporating these values, religion strengthens and returns them in a refined form. The Ten Commandments, for example, before being part of Christian religion, were in the shape of moral maxims. The fact or the belief that they come from God or had a religious sanction gave them authenticity. Religion provides stability and objectivity to morals and saves them from being subjective. One of the postulates of morality is considered to be God. Thus both religion and morality jointly control human conduct. Religion and morality go together. Morality without religion has no solid foundation.

Prof. Atkinson Lee is of the view that morality is a purifier of religion. As he observes, "..... morality has been a great purifier of religion." He has criticized impure and immoral religions".." these have been among the great services of morality to religion." A number of religious thinkers have advised us to abandon such goods which are not morally good. Morality has done great service to religion by trying to banish superstition from religion and consequent superstitious fear from man's mind by criticizing the crude forms of punishment for the evildoers in hell and by raising strong voice

of protest and condemnation of untouchability and the practice of *sati* and animal sacrifices etc. being in vogue in the name of religion. Morality has certainly purified religion to a great extent.

It is true that there are some points of difference between religion and morality, but they are not poles apart. It is also true that a man may be moral without being religious, but this does not mean that morality is altogether disconnected from religion. Really speaking, the teachings of true religion are the same as those of morality. Whatever is acceptable as principle of morality is also acceptable to Religion. God's existence, Freedom of will, and immortality of soul are accepted as postulates of morality. Religion is based on these postulates. Moral values are also religious values. Morality is an essential constituent of religion. We cannot conceive of religion in absence of moral values. Religion can be evaluated in terms of moral values. Morality is a step for realization of Godhead.

Some social scientists are of the view that religion should divest itself of all dogmas and superstitions as far as possible and devote itself to the promotion of moral values.

August Comte, for instance, advocates a religion based on the moral teachings of Jesus Christ. Hobhouse has conceived of religion as 'emotionalised ethics'. In his view supernatural religion is not in keeping with modern civilisation and is in fact putting hindrances to social progress.

To sum up, then, it is not possible to draw a hard and fast line of distinction between religion and morality. The sphere of true religion and morality pass into each other. In fact ethics and religion may be regarded as the lower and higher levels of human experience respectively; the lower leading up to the higher. Whatever distinction may be drawn between religion and morality, their deeper unity should not be ignored. Galloway has rightly said, "Any attempt to divide them and to oppose the one from the other rests on a fragmentary and superficial conception of human nature".

3.3 Summary

Divergent views exist with regard to the relation between religion and morality. Some regard them to be absolutely unrelated, while others think them to be quite opposed to each other. A few thinkers regard religion to be primary and morality to have originated from it and a few others hold just the opposite view that morality is primary and religion to have originated from it. There are arguments in favour of each view. A sane view can be arrived at only after looking into the merit of each. The true view appears to regard both morality and religion to be interlinked. True religion and morality teach the same thing. Morality is a purifier of religion and cannot be dissociated from religion. One can be moral even without being religious, but that does not mean that morality should be dissociated from religion. There is a deeper unity underlying between them. Each passes into the realm of the other. Morality evaluates religion and religion guarantees stability to moral values. Both jointly shape human behaviour and regulate it to the best interest of the society.

3.4 Key words

- (a) **Primary** : original, which comes first or which is fundamental.
(b) **Secondary** : of the second rank, which comes next, not original.
(c) **Dogma** : tenet or principle, dogmatic means one-sided tenet accepted without proper scrutiny or examination.

3.5 Questions for Exercise

3.5.1. Objective Questions

- (i) Morality and Religion are
(a) intimately related to each other (b) absolutely opposed to each other
(c) partially opposed to each other (d) independent of each other

Answer— (a)

3.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (a) How can you show that religion is primary?
Ans— 3.2.1
(b) Argue how morality is primary.
Ans— 3.2.2
(c) How will you show that morality and religion are independent of each other ?
Ans— 3.2.4

3.5.3 Long Answer Question

1. Explain clearly the relation between morality and religion.

Ans— 3.2.5

3.6 Suggested Readings

1. Atkinson, Lee — Groundwork of Philosophy of Religion
2. Galloway, G. — The Philosophy of Religion

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY**Lesson Structure**

- 4.0 Objective
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Main Theme
 - 4.2.1 Theology : Its aim
 - 4.2.2 Relation : What it is
 - 4.2.3 Relation between Theology and Religion
- 4.3 Summary
- 4.4 Key words
- 4.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 4.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 4.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 4.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 4.6 Suggested Readings

4.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to explain the relation between Religion and Theology.

4.1 Introduction

Religion is often confused with Theology. The reason is that every theistic religion has a theology of its own. Thus there is Islamic theology, Christian theology, Protestant theology and Catholic theology. The present Lesson aims at removing this confusion.

4.2 Main Theme

The word 'Theology' is made up of two words; 'theos' and 'logia'. 'Theos' means God and 'logia' means discourse. Thus the word theology means discourse about God. Discourse is reasoning or study and so Theology means a science or systematic study of the concept of God. Every religion has its own theology which aims at solving the problems concerning that religion, and removing the objections raised against it, as also promoting people's faith in it. It is to be noted in this connection that every theology meets the objections against its religion only according to the viewpoint of that religion. It also tries to systematise its theories and postulates.

4.2.1 Theology : Its aim

The aim of theology is not to criticize the religious experience out of which it grew, but only to report that experience faithfully. Galloway highlights the intention of theology by stating that "it is a statement of the truths which have proved themselves the working values of a given religion and it strives to present them in an intelligible form, "so that they can be taught and may serve as a bond of union for a religious community.

Another point to be noted is that theology accepts the holy books of that religion as authority out of which it grows. The statements of that religion are blindly accepted and paraded as the basis of faith and devotion. The theology does not even feel the need of testing them independently. It does not evaluate them. Since there are separate theologies for every religion, a particular theology is beneficial and useful for that religion only. The theology aims at solving only the objections and challenges that arise from within that religion itself.

Theology, thus,

- (a) takes revelations, and holy books to be most authentic.
- (b) a number of statements based on mere faith are taken as final truth and are not challenged nor even tested independently.
- (c) All objections raised against a religion are removed and solved by the postulates of that very religion.

Theology, thus, is beneficial or the followers of that religion only and not for any other religion. Theology, therefore, is not to be counted as universal. Its application is only limited. Christians, Jews and Muslims have their own individual theologies. Theology is helpful for solving internal objections and problems. It originates in connection with challenges and objections which arise from within a religion; it is not concerned with attacks which come from outside the religion.

"Theology is important, but its importance is in the service it renders to those who accept the religious position to which it gives logical and systematic expression. It is important to him who professes a faith to know what is and what is not consistent with his profession." This statement is from S.M. Thompson, A Modern Philosophy of Religion.

Theology is, in fact, a part of theistic religion.

4.2.2 What is Religion?

We have already read as to what is religion and studied its nature in the first Lesson. There are so many religions; some are theistic, some atheistic. The question of relation of religion with theology arises only with theistic religions which are based on faith or devotion to a Supreme Being called God. Theology is a discourse about God.

4.2.3 Relation between Theology and Religion :

The relation between Religion and Theology is like the relation between a tree and its parts. If Religion is a whole, theology is its parts.

Religion is an all-pervasive attitude, an attitude of committal to the ideal. Theology also is an all pervasive attitude of committal. The theologian is fully committed to the religion to which he belongs. His defence, his arguments are all in favour of the particular religion.

An attitude of devotion and perfect self-surrender to the religion characterizes the theologian. In religion also the attitude of devotion, sincere faith characterize the religionist. Theology is the science of God of a particular religion. Religion is not a particular religion but a general designation of all religions. Theologians belong to one type of religion only; the theistic type. Religion may not necessarily be theistic.

Thus we can say that the scope of religion is wider than theology. Theology deals with the problems, doubts and difficulties concerning God and that also of one religion out of which it has grown. Religion is concerned not only with faith in God but also how man expresses his faith in his acts of worship and in his dealings with other living beings. Morality becomes central to religion. But Theology has nothing to do with morals.

For Theology, belief in God is absolutely necessary. But for religion, belief in the existence of God is not essential. Even devotion, practice and loyalty to moral values are termed as religion. Religion is belief in some superior power which expresses itself in some religious acts like worship, prayer or devotion. Religion is also committal to some ideal. The ideal need not be God ; it may be a classless society or Nirvana. This is why Jainism and Buddhism are considered great religions although they do not believe in God. Religion does not regard God-worship as the essence of religion.

Theology concerns itself with specific religion out of which it has grown. Not only this, even different theologies are found in one and the same religion. For example, in Christianity, Roman Catholics and Protestants have their own separate theologies. Theology regards belief in God as the essence of religion and as such it does not regard primitive religions as religion. But primitive religions are very much religions although a clear cut conception of God is lacking.

In religion, cognitive, affective and conative elements of man's psychical life are involved. Religious truths are justified by authority and faith. Theology is based on divine revelation and religious truths are believed on faith in such a revelation. The authority of the scriptures is supreme in Theology. Reason and logic have little or no role to play.

Theology is concerned with only one religion. Its attitude is prejudicial. Its attitude is always partial because it seeks to justify religious beliefs or truths on the basis of its particular religion. Its outlook is narrow. It does not consider the views of other religions. It strives to justify only a particular religion out of which it grows.

However, in spite of the above mentioned points of difference between Theology and Religion, it is sometimes difficult to keep the two strictly apart from each other. In fact, at a higher stage of culture development and progress we find theologies attempting to found religious beliefs on a rational basis. With the progress of science and technology, world-thought has undergone a vast change. Theologians have also been motivated to enlarge the scope of theology and broaden its outlook. It has not been possible for theology to ignore their methods of explanation. Hence we find theology offering explanations, for the nature of God, the origin and development of the world and the origin of man. Both theology and religion lay stress on faith. The fact cannot be ignored that reason has a role to play in faith also. The difference between religion and theology is only one of degree. Theology stresses faith in some what greater degree. Galloway has rightly observed that reason cannot work without faith and has its proper ally in reason.

In fact, theology and religion deal with the same material i.e. religious experience. The exposition of the meaning of a theological dogma is also similar to what religion offers to us. Thus, the two have many common features as well.

4.3 Summary

Every theistic religion has a theology which tries to resolve the conflicts inside the religion. It also tries to resolve the doubts and objections on the basis of the tenets of that religion. The aim of theology is to strengthen the faith of the followers of that religion. Thus theology becomes a part of that religion. Atheistic religions have no theology because such religions do not believe in God. Theology, as its etymology says, is a discourse about God. The relation between Religion and Theology is the relation between the whole and the part. The scope of religion is wider than that of Theology. Religious experience is the subject matter of both religion and theology. Faith plays a significant role in both Theology and Religion. Religion involves the cognitive, affective and conative elements, but theology lays emphasis on faith and grows out of a religion with the sole purpose of justifying the religious truths of that religion and confirming the belief of the followers of that religion. With the growth of science and progress in the culture, theologies have also been motivated to justify the faith of their specific religion with reason and arguments. Theology, also like religion, tries to explain the nature of God, man and the origin of the world.

4.4 Key words

Theology is a combination of Theos meaning God and logy i.e., logia meaning discourse.

Theology is what studies systematically the concept of God and justifies the faith of the followers by removing their doubts.

4.5 Questions for Exercise

4.5.1 Objective Questions

(i) Theology is

- (a) an essential part of every religion
- (b) a part of theistic religion only
- (c) a part of atheistic religion only
- (d) a part of Marxist religion.

Answer— (b)

(ii) Religion and Theology are

- (a) opposed to each other
- (b) one and the same
- (c) independent of each other
- (d) partially related

Answer— (d)

4.5.2 Short Answer Question

(a) Describe the subject matter and function of Theology.

Answer— See 4.2.1

4.5.3 Long Answer Question

1. Discuss the relation between Religion and Theology.

Answer— See 4.2.2. and 4.2.3

4.6 Suggested Readings

1. Brightman, E.S — A Philosophy of Religion
2. Galloway — Philosophy of Religion

RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS

Lesson Structure

- 5.0 Objective
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Main Theme
 - 5.2.1 Reason or cognition constitute religious consciousness
 - 5.2.2 Arguments against cognitive element in religion
- 5.3 Summary
- 5.4 Key words
- 5.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 5.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 5.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 5.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 5.6 Suggested Readings

5.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain the meaning of religious consciousness and explain and examine cognitive element alone as constituting it.

5.1 Introduction

When you happen to see an object of beauty like a beautiful spot or a beautiful landscape you suddenly exclaim: Oh! What a wonderful sight! This is because of your aesthetic sense which appreciates the scenery or the spot. This is called aesthetic consciousness. Similarly, when on seeing a person being beaten black and blue, a child cries out or begins sobbing, it is due to his moral consciousness. This consciousness of what is good and what is bad is called moral consciousness. In the same way, man also possesses religious consciousness. This consciousness enables man to be conscious of a superior power commanding his reverence. By religious consciousness is meant

man's awareness of religiosity. When you go to the temple and see the image of the deity and hear the chanting of vedic hymns by the priest there, you bow your head in reverence. This is because you are conscious of the religiosity and feel like bowing in respect. This is religious consciousness.

5.2 Main Theme

Religious consciousness is that activity on the part of man which tenders him to religion. Consciousness is knowledge or awareness. When we speak of human mind to be conscious, we do not simply mean awareness or knowledge possessed by the mind. Modern psychology has proved that human mind has three aspects: thinking, feeling and willing. Human mind cannot by itself be called conscious. As J.H. Leuba puts it, "The unit of conscious life is neither thought, nor feeling nor will but all the three in the movement toward an object." Religious consciousness has all the three elements viz.

- (i) The cognitive element
- (ii) The affective element and
- (iii) The conative element.

Because of the cognitive element, man becomes conscious of a super-sensible power and because of the affective element, he has the feeling of admiration, dependence and self-surrender to such a power. And because of the conative element, he indulges in various acts of worship and prayer to please such a power. The truth is that all these three elements of man's psychical life are present more or less in his religious consciousness. Their synthetic unity cannot be ignored. But there are writers who ignoring their synthetic unity, have emphasized one of these three elements at the cost of other two as the very core of religious consciousness. But this is a wrong estimate. In fact a psychical experience in which only one element is present is never found. As Galloway puts it, "A perfectly pure psychical experience in which only one element is present never occurs."

We shall be undertaking an examination of views which emphasize the presence of one element to the exclusion of other elements forthwith. To begin, let us start with the view which takes cognitive element only to be constituting religious consciousness.

5.2.1 Reason or Cognition constitute religious consciousness :

For the rationalists the seat of religion is not in feeling or will but in reason or thought. As man is a rational animal and as rationality is his distinguishing feature, religion cannot have its root in anything else than thought or reason. Reason must be the essence of religion, otherwise the truth of religion will be at stake. Religion will become subjective. In fact, it is reason which guarantees truth and objectivity to religion. It is reason which justifies myths and legends in religion. These myths and legends become assets of religion and are taught to its followers. Reason also removes internal contradictions and inconsistencies of religions. It enriches religion by incorporating the truths of science and philosophy in it and thereby brings changes and progress in religion. The development of religion from the primitive stage to the present monotheistic stage is a contribution of intellectual en-

deavour of men in the field of religion. By removing ambiguities in religion, by giving up dogmatism and narrowness from religion. We now think in terms of world-religion. All these are the contribution of the cognitive element. Hegel, Marx, Max Muller and Shankara are prominent among thinkers who hold cognitive element to be the cause of the origin and development of religion.

Arguments in favour of cognitive element as constituting the core of religious consciousness:

- (i) Religion originates in a feeling of imperfection and helplessness on the part of man. He can have knowledge of his imperfection only when he has an idea of what perfection is. Man must realize his helplessness before the Nature. In the absence of knowledge of his helplessness and imperfection religion will not arise. Man must be convinced of his limitations and realize his helplessness in spite of his best efforts. Hence knowledge is the cause of his being religious. He becomes conscious of a Power far superior to him and that is how he begins having faith in a Power superior to him and mightier than everything around him.
- (ii) According to Plato, man's curiosity is responsible for the origin of religion. Natural calamities like flash flood, earthquake, tornado, etc. generate in man the curiosity to know their causes. His curiosity cannot be satisfied by his feelings or by his activities to trace the cause. He has to take help of this reasoning. On failure of reason he imagines super-sensible deities as presiding over those events. And this is the beginning of religion. In religion, faith in an invisible power is proved to exist by rational arguments alone. The role of reason cannot be denied.
- (iii) Religion is based on a faith in some supreme Power which cannot be perceived by the senses. It is only with the help of logic and rational arguments that we can have knowledge of such a Power. Besides this, reason can silence the various objections raised against religion. Hence, reason or the cognition is necessary for religion.
- (iv) Why is it that man alone is religious? This is because, rationality characterizes man which makes him religious. There is absence of rationality in animals although the animals also have hunger, appetite and feelings of pleasure and pain like men. Animals are not religious because they lack reason, they have no rationality. This proves that men are religious because they have rationality in them. Cognitive element or reason, therefore, is proved to be the cause of religion.
- (v) If reason is not accepted as the basis of religion, religion will become subjective and personal. Feelings are subjective, but reason and knowledge are objective and universal.
- (vi) Intellect is higher than feelings and sentiments. Feelings are shifting and transitory. If religion is based on feeling, then the necessary character of religion cannot be explained. By making intellect or cognition the basis of religion, we can protect the objective character of religion. Therefore, cognitive element is the basis of religion.

- (vii) In religion we attain truth on the basis of symbols. Nature and natural events become symbols of religious thought. They are said to be vehicles of religious thought. This is the role played by knowledge and cognition in attaining truth with the help of symbols. Hence religion is based on cognitive elements.
- (viii) Rationality is the common and essential quality of man. Men differ with regard to their feelings and sentiments, but are one and the same on the platform of reason. The call for universal religion, one religion for the entire humanity, can be feasible only if religion is based on reason.

Galloway also is for basing religion on the sound basis of rationality. As he says, "And without the superior intellection that distinguished man from the animals and made the growth of language possible, it is safe to say, religion would not have come into being."

But we must examine the arguments against such a contention also, so that this view is not understood to be one-sided.

5.2.2 Arguments against cognitive element in religion :

To admit cognitive element as constituting the sole element of religious consciousness will be inadequate. The following objections are raised against such a view :

- (i) Cognitive element is admitted as the sole element of religion, then the illiterate and the ignorant ought not to be religious. But the history of religion refutes such a view. There are so many men in the world who in spite of being illiterate and ignorant are devoutly religious. There are numerous persons in this world (numbering lacs or so) who have no knowledge of religion and yet are strong believers in religion. On the contrary, there are many educated and learned persons who are non-believers in religion. This proves that religion is not something which depends on knowledge or is something which is essentially intellectual.
- (ii) The object of religion is to establish unity between the devotee and the object of devotion, identity between the worshipper and the worshipped. The gulf between the two cannot be bridged by the intellect. On the other hand, intellect widens the gulf or the gap between them. And so intellect or knowledge cannot be taken to be the basis of religion.
- (iii) The failure of reason to prove the existence of God demonstrates its bankruptcy. The different arguments advanced to prove the existence of God fail to prove the existence of God beyond doubt. The arguments are fruitless. We are unable to prove the existence of God with the help of intellect.
- (iv) Religion is what it is practised. But if we take cognition to be the basis of religion, religion becomes theoretical affair. Religion is concerned with practice. The essence of religion lies in religious acts.

- (v) If cognitive element is taken as the basis of religion, if knowledge is taken to be the object of religion, it will be almost impossible to distinguish between religion and philosophy. If religion is only cognition and has nothing to do with feelings and emotion, it will turn out to be mere philosophy.
- (vi) Lastly, we do not see the role of intellect at all in the primitive religions, still the primitive people were religious in their own way. Hence, it will not be correct to maintain that knowledge is absolutely essential for religion. As G.A. Coc has said, "Religion is not a product of intellectual leisure but of the grind of the existence, a grind that ever seeks to transform itself into freedom and joy."

5.3 Summary

Man has in him by nature a consciousness of religion in some sense. This consciousness may not be well defined. It may be a vague awareness. Scholars have distinguished three elements in religious consciousness. These elements are the cognitive, the affective and the conative elements. But there is a class of thinkers who think that cognitive element alone constitutes the core of religious consciousness. They are known as rationalists who champion the cause of reason. They give a number of arguments to prove their thesis. But there are also arguments against such a contention. On an examination of both types of arguments, we come to the conclusion that the rationalists hold one-sided view.

5.4 Key words

- (a) **Cognition** : knowing or perceiving or conceiving knowledge.
- (a) **Rationalists** : advocates of the cause of reason.

5.5 Questions for Exercise

5.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Religious consciousness means
 - (a) a vague awareness of religion
 - (b) a full knowledge of religion
 - (c) presence of religious knowledge in the unconscious
 - (d) none of these

Answer— (a)

5.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Give arguments to prove that cognitive elements form the core of religious consciousness.

Answer — See 5.2.2

(ii) Show how cognition or knowledge cannot be the basis of religion.

Answer— See 5.2.2

5.5.3 Long Answer Question

1. Can cognitive elements be the only basis of religion?

Answer— See 5.2:1, 5.2.2

5.6 Suggested Readings

1. D.M. Edward — The Philosophy of Religion
2. John Caird — Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion
3. Masih, Y. — An Introduction to Religious Philosophy

CONATIVE ELEMENT

Lesson Structure

- 6.0 Objective**
- 6.1 Introduction**
- 6.2 Main Theme**
 - 6.2.1 Arguments in favour of Conative Element**
 - 6.2.2 Arguments against Conative Element**
- 6.3 Summary**
- 6.4 Key words**
- 6.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - 6.5.1 Objective Questions**
 - 6.5.2 Short Answer Questions**
 - 6.5.3 Long Answer Question**
- 6.6 Suggested Readings**

6.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to state the viewpoint of those thinkers who take religion to be based on will only and to point out the drawbacks of such a view.

6.1 Introduction

In almost all religions, a system of religious activities dominates. Religious life means performance of certain activities like worship, fasting, undertaking of pilgrimage etc. There are thinkers who emphasize the aspect of will as constituting the essential element of religious consciousness.

naturally diminish. But every religion highlights the importance of prayer. Hence the role of will in religion cannot be underestimated.

6.2.2 Arguments against conative element :

- (i) It will be a grave error to regard will or action to be the only basis of religion. In the absence of knowledge an action will be treated as mechanical only. In the Vedas actions became prominent but with the development of philosophy, Vedic action and Vedic sacrifices were rendered mechanical and non-essential. If religion is taken to be based on actions only, it will not be possible to evaluate them and it will be difficult to designate actions as religious.
- (ii) Man cannot act like a machine. In every action man is guided by his reason and feeling. And so religion cannot be taken to be based on mere will alone.
- (iii) Religion will be degraded to empty formalism if it is based on will as divorced from reason and feeling. Cult without the guidance of thought and reason will simply be a mockery of religion.
- (iv) Man is a rational animal. Man has a mind and a heart also. Man cannot be compared with a machine. Whenever a man acts, he first thinks over the action he is going to perform. He thinks over the end of the action, over the means of the action and also calculates the profit and the limits of his action. If man's religion has to be based on mere will, religion will be representing only a part of human personality. Human personality is involved in its entirety in religion. It will, therefore, be wrong to take only will to be the basis of religion.

6.3 Summary

Thus we see that the entire psychological life of man involving the cognitive, affective and conative elements constitutes the religious consciousness of man and is responsible for the origin of religion. It is however, true that at times either of the three elements predominates. When feeling element predominates piety is termed emotional or mystical. When reason prevails over other elements, piety is termed as intellectual; and when will predominates, it is called practical. In fact, man wants to attain perfection and satisfaction in life through religion but these cannot be realized by laying emphasis on any one element of religious consciousness. Those religious feelings which reason cannot endorse, actions which are absolutely mechanical, and thoughts which are devoid of feeling and practical value are rejected sooner or later. In fact, religion is not the result of any one element of psychological life but it is the product of the entire psychological life. Religious consciousness develops as a reaction of the whole of man's psychological being. As J.H. Leuba rightly observes, 'The unit of conscious life is neither thought nor feeling nor will but all the three in the movement towards the object.'

6.4 Key words

Conative : pertaining to the will

6.5 Questions for Exercise

6.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Religious activities
- (a) are show business (b) are meaningless acts
- (c) can be done away with (d) bring stability to religious life
- Answer— (d)
- (ii) We call a person religious when
- (a) he has religious emotions (b) he has full knowledge of religion
- (c) he performs religious acts (d) he has none of these
- Answer— (c)

6.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Give arguments to show that conative element constitute religious consciousness.
- Answer— See 6.2.1
- (ii) Show how conative element does not alone form religious consciousness.
- Answer— See 6.2.2

6.5.3 Long Answer Question

1. Can conative element alone form religious consciousness?
- Answer— See 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.3

6.6 Suggested Readings

1. J.H. Leuba — The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion
2. G. Galloway — The Philosophy of Religion

AFFECTIVE ELEMENT

Lesson Structure

- 7.0 Objective**
- 7.1 Introduction**
- 7.2 Main Theme**
 - 7.2.1 Arguments in favour of affective element in religious consciousness**
 - 7.2.2 Arguments against affective element**
- 7.3 Summary**
- 7.4 Otto's analysis of Religious Consciousness**
- 7.5 Key words**
- 7.6 Questions for Exercise**
 - 7.6.1 Objective Questions**
 - 7.6.2 Short Answer Questions**
 - 7.6.3 Long Answer Question**
- 7.7 Suggested Readings**

7.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain and examine the arguments for and against Affective element as constituting religious consciousness.

7.1 Introduction

There are some thinkers who believe that religion originates from the affective element of man's psychical life. The affective element is constituted by feelings, emotions abounding in the hearts of men and women. Schleiermacha, Tylor and Mc Taggart are advocates of such a view.

- (v) In many religions idol worship is practised. Man takes the idol to be representative of God. Intellect cannot take a piece of stone as representative of God. It is by feeling and faith that man worships the idol of stone with full reverence as God and thereby gets mental peace and happiness. This proves that feeling is the chief element in religion.
- (vi) It is feeling which gives life to religion. Without feeling, religion will become mechanical. Religious activities are given value because feeling is associated with them. "We are religious not in virtue of thinking accurately or willing rightly but simply and essentially in virtue of a certain state of our feelings and affections towards God." This is how John Caird gives vent to the affective element in religion.

7.2.2 Arguments against affective element :

It is true that feeling is the chief element of religion But to regard feeling as the only basis of religion is one-sided view and is obviously wrong. The arguments against the affective elements in religion are as follows:

- (i) If religion is deemed to be based solely on feelings, it will become weak because it would not be able to defend itself against the onslaughts and objections against it with help of mere feelings.
- (ii) A religion based on feeling alone will be irrational, and dogmatic. Feeling generates superstition and obstinacy in religion. As Caird has said, "To place the essence of religion in feeling is self-contradictory, for a religion of mere feeling would not even know itself to be religion."
- (iii) Feelings are by nature subjective and ever-changing. My feelings are different from your feelings. If feeling is supposed to be the basis of religion, religion will lack stability. A religion ought to be objective and abiding.
- (iv) In fact, reflection is essential for feeling also. We first know an object and thereafter we develop feelings about it. Hence reason which is the basis of feeling is also the basis of religion. It is an error to think that feelings are independent of reason and knowledge. Feeling alone cannot be the basis of religion.
- (v) According to Schleiermacher, feeling of dependence is the essence of religious consciousness. But the feeling of dependence is not of one kind only. There are various types of feeling of dependence, for example, the dependence of son on the father, or dependence of servant on the master, or the dependence of the individual on society and so on. It is not clear which kind of dependence is the source of religion.
- (vi) Further to base religion on the feeling of fear as advocated by Hume and others also does not appear to be reasonable. Fear may be a cause of the origin of religion. But proclaim it as the sole and sufficient ground of the origin of religion is not acceptable.

Thus we conclude that feeling alone cannot be the sole and sufficient ground for the origin of religion. Galloway rightly says, "Hence, however central and essential feeling may be in religion, it depends for its religious significance on its relation to other elements, and it grows in purity and range as an element in the concrete development of the spirit."

7.3 Summary

Several arguments in favour of affective element as the essential element of religion can be given and similarly arguments against taking affective elements as the core of religion can be advanced. But all these arguments are one sided and suffer from some flaws. The truth, therefore, is that all the three elements, the cognitive, the affective and the conative constitute religious consciousness. Feeling by itself cannot even know if it is religious. The role of cognition cannot be underestimated although it has to be admitted that feeling has a great role to play in religion and religious consciousness is expressed through religious activities.

7.4 Otto's analysis of Religious Consciousness

In Otto's analysis, religious consciousness is a unique and perfect consciousness in which reason has no place whatsoever. Schleiermacher takes religious consciousness to be the feeling of absolute dependence on God. Hoffding takes religious consciousness to be conservation of values, But quite different is the view of Otto. For Otto religious consciousness is the experience of the numinous. Such an experience is beyond all logic, beyond reasoning. In his book 'The Idea of the Holy', while discussing religious consciousness, Otto has said that it is an experience which is mysterious and perfect.

Man is a finite being and the 'Numinous' is a Perfect Being and so it is impossible for man to know the Perfect Being. This mysterious reality is something which is beyond the phenomenal world. The use of the word 'Numinous' in place of the Holy indicates that the Numinous is an object of respect and devotion. The Numinous is an infinite, extraordinary and indescribable reality. This is a kind of being which cannot be explained by man. The experience of the Numinous is sui generis. Man can experience the Numinous but cannot explain it.

Religious consciousness is a kind of experience in which man finds himself very tiny and small. Reason fails to grasp the Numinous. This is why for Otto the basis of religious consciousness is non-rational something. Religious consciousness is experience of the *Mysterium Tremendum* surpassing all rational efforts.

7.5 Key words

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| (a) Mysterium Tremendum | : | Revealed religious truth of the greatest order |
| (b) Numinous | : | miraculous, wonderful |

7.6 Questions for Exercise

7.6.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Religion originates from a feeling of
- (a) fear only
 - (b) reverence only
 - (c) fear and reverence both
 - (d) none of these

Answer— (c)

7.6.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Give arguments to show that feeling is the basis of religion
- Answer— See 7.2.1
- (ii) Give arguments against the view that feeling alone is the basis of religion
- Answer— See 7.2.2

7.6.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Give arguments for and against the view the religion is based on feeling alone
- Answer— See 7.2.1, 7.2.2.

7.7 Suggested Readings

1. Flint — Theism
2. David Hume — Dialogues concerning Natural Religion
3. G. Galloway — The Philosophy of Religion

FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF**Lesson Structure**

- 8.0 Objective
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Main Theme
 - 8.2.1 Characteristics of Religious Belief
 - 8.2.2 Reason as the foundation of Religious Belief
 - 8.2.3 Faith as the foundation of Religious Belief
- 8.3 Summary
- 8.4 Key words
- 8.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 8.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 8.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 8.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 8.6 Suggested Readings

8.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to explain the nature of religious belief and to determine the foundations of such a belief.

8.1 Introduction

By religious belief, we mean man's belief in God's existence, immortality of soul, past life, future life, hell and heaven etc. Man's religious beliefs determine his religious behaviour. They are at the root of his religious experience. They immensely influence and determine his feelings and conduct. And so it is essential to explain the meaning of religious beliefs and inquire into their foundations.

8.2 Main Theme

Religious beliefs are deep-rooted and firmly fixed. It is very difficult to give them up or to bring any change in them. Defining religious beliefs, W.T. Blackstone says, "Religious beliefs induce a total commitment to an object of devotion. Man does not hesitate even in sacrificing his life for the object of his devotion. His entire personality lies committed to the object of devotion. "Religious beliefs, therefore, enliven the entire personality of man. Only the religious men have religious beliefs. A non-religious man has nothing to do with religious beliefs. A widely discussed and debated question about religious beliefs concerns their foundations. What are the grounds on which religious beliefs are based? There are four grounds of religious beliefs. They are :

- (i) Reason
- (ii) Revelation
- (iii) Faith and
- (iv) Mystic experience.

8.2.1 Characteristics of Religious Belief

A religious person generally believes in the existence of God. He is inspired to believe in God because of His omnipotence. He has belief in God because he believes that one who trusts in God can alone progress in life. A religious believer trusts God to be the arbiter of his destiny. But from this, it will be an error to think that only God-believers are religious believers.

The concept of religious belief can be made clear with the help of some illustrations. The Christian belief that Jesus Christ came back to life after crucifixion is a religious one. Islam believes in the existence of Angels. The Hindu belief in rebirth is a religious belief. Religious belief has been defined in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics in the following words: "Religious belief has a claim to uniqueness. In this form of belief..... the personality is enriched and dignified. There is a marked insistence also on the part that it is not by appealing to reason directly but in acting upon the will and emotion that religious belief is implanted and fostered....." The following characteristics of religious belief may be noted :

- (i) Religious beliefs are different from common sense beliefs and scientific beliefs in that they are implanted in different manner. They are unique in themselves.
- (ii) God and soul are the objects of religious beliefs. They are realities, not something mysterious.
- (iii) Religious beliefs are not based on reason directly. They are indirectly based on reason. They express themselves in and through will and emotions of men.
- (iv) Religious beliefs provide new dimension to the personality of the religious believer.
- (v) Religious belief is concerned with logic. It is not irrational or opposed to intellect.

8.2.2 Reason as the foundation of Religious Belief

Man has been called a religious animal. The basic difference between man and animal is that

man is religious, while animal is not religious. Hence it will not be wrong to conclude that man is religious because of his rationality.

Reason is an important human faculty which draws its conclusions about an object on the basis of absolutely clear and definite proofs and evidences. A man who solely relies upon reason accepts a hypothesis to be true or false only when he gets absolutely clear and definite evidences in favour or against it. He does not have any bias or prejudice for any hypothesis whatsoever.

Again, every religion has its sacred books from which it receives its strength and inspiration. It is the reason which explains and interprets the ideas contained in them. Besides, the sacred books of different religions are open to different interpretations and meanings. In fact, they have been interpreted differently by different scholars. Thus, we find Shankara and Ramanuja have interpreted the Upanishads quite differently and have established two different schools of religion viz. Advaita Vedanta and Visistadvaita (Monism and Qualified Monism). It is reason which either justifies or rejects the interpretation of one scholar or the other.

Besides, religious experiences are by nature subjective and fleeting. They need proper concepts in order that they may be known to others. Reason, by supplying concepts to religions, shapes religious experiences to be expressed in language. Moreover, reason by providing clear and adequate interpretation of the religious concepts, prevents to a great extent religious conflicts and paves the way for better understanding and amity.

In fact, different religions are not essentially conflicting and antagonistic to one another, rather they possess some common and essential points of unity and similarity.

Religious thinkers very often strive to bring unity and harmony among different religions through occasional meetings and seminars. For this reason is essential. Thus reason goes a long way in providing a pure and sound ground to religious beliefs.

Another contribution of reason is that with its help man tries to understand his own religion in all its aspects. There are so many religions in the world and man is able to know his own religion properly with the help of his reason. Every follower of religion is emotionally attached to his religion. Most of us pursue that religion which is being followed by the parents. Naturally man wants to be aware of the different aspects of his religion. In the early period of his life he has little knowledge about the nature, symbols of his religion. His knowledge about his religion remains incomplete. For a proper knowledge of religion, man must have knowledge of the different aspects of religion. An incomplete knowledge of religion causes tension in his mind and his peace of mind is at stake. And it is here that reason helps him. Hence, reason comes to his aid.

Religious experience is unstable. It lasts only for a few seconds. But man wants to make his religious experience lasting and stable. He needs concepts to express his religious experience. Concepts can be framed with the help of his reasoning faculty. One illustration of religious experience is the mystical experience. The cognitive element is present in mystical experience. Mystical experience is short lived. It ends soon. The Mystic derives great joy and inspiration from such an experience.

The mystic wants this experience to be published so that others may also be acquainted with such an experience.

Concepts are the proper vehicle for expressing such an experience. Reason alone can provide such concepts. Hence, reason helps in giving expression to religious experience.

Paul Tillich considers the contribution of reason essential for religious belief. According to Tillich, the message of Christianity for mankind can be explained with the help of reason alone. Hume, however, does not agree with Tillich and holds faith to be the ultimate source of religious belief. But from this we cannot deny the contribution of reason to religion. It will not be out of place to mention here that although religion is not directly based on reason, it is indirectly related to reason because faith which is basis of religion rests on man's reason.

8.2.3 Faith as the foundation of religious belief

The term 'Faith' is used in different senses. Faith is the chief pillar of religious belief. The primacy of faith in religious belief is due to two causes. The central point of religion is God. In the philosophy of Religion several arguments are given to prove the existence of God. These arguments fall under two heads: the A priori Arguments and the aposteriori arguments for the existence of God. But these arguments fail to prove the existence of God. Kant, therefore, says that God is an article of Faith. As rational arguments fail to demonstrate the existence of God, Faith is taken to be the source of God's existence.

Prof. Brightman has used the term 'Faith' in three senses. They are as follows :

- (i) Faith is acceptance of revelation. Faith is used in the sense of acceptance of revealed texts. In the Bible, it is said, 'Believe in Jesus Christ or Have faith in Jesus Christ and He will protect you'. St. Augustine terms faith as knowledge with consent. This is intellectual point of view about Faith.
- (ii) In the second sense, Faith is the gift of God. In the words of St. Paul, 'Faith' 'Love' and 'Hope' are the great gifts granted to man by God.
- (iii) In the third sense, Faith is equivalent to trust. Faith is trust and obedience.

Generally we use the term 'Faith' in the cognitive sense and in the non-cognitive sense. When anybody says that he has faith in God or that he has faith in his friend, he is using faith in the non-cognitive sense. Here he is not having any knowledge through faith. Here he has devotional faith. But when a man says that he has full faith in the existence of God, that God loves us, God is the creator of the universe, God hears our prayer: he is using faith in the cognitive sense; he is having knowledge about God.

Among the basic features of faith, what strikes most is that it is that belief which man accepts without evidence and without any logic. This feature distinguishes it from knowledge because knowledge is always based on evidence.

Secondly, faith centres on feeling of man. A man is emotionally attached to his faith. Faith is founded to be so strong and deep-rooted in him, that he, even in the face of definite evidence against it clings to his faith and is not ready to abandon it. Faith is a firm belief in something. As Bertrand Russel says, Faith is that for which there is no evidence. We do not speak of faith that two plus two equals four or that the earth is round. We speak of faith only when we wish to substitute emotion by evidence. As a matter of fact, faith is a matter of feeling and not of reason, trust and obedience to the holy books and is conceived as a gift of God.

A truly faithful man can even sacrifice his life, his faith. Thus faith means total commitment to a particular religious attitude.

Faith may be rational, a rational, antirational and even non-rational.

Rational faith is based on arguments for the faith and the purpose is to keep Man's faith alive.

Arational faith is one which can neither be proved or disproved. For example, Faith in transmigration of soul and immortality of soul belong to such a category.

Anti-rational faith clearly opposed to scientific knowledge. Faith in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ is anti-rational. Non-rational faith is one in which no rational argument can ever be given. For example, faith in Heaven and Hell, Day of judgment are faiths of this type.

8.3 Summary

There are four foundations of religious belief. They are Reason, Faith, Revelation and Mystic Experience. Man is essentially a rational animal and so his rationality must play an important role in all his activities including his religion. Although a lay man thinks religion to be a matter of faith, the truth is that reason determines his religious belief.

Various arguments by various philosophers have been given to prove this. Faith is also of many kinds and religious belief is unique in the sense that it is steadfast and yet without evidence.

8.4 Key words

- (a) **Unique** : having no equal or parallel.
(b) **Logic** : science of reasoning, power of convincing.

8.5 Questions for Exercise

8.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Religious belief determines
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (a) man's feelings | (b) man's religious behaviour |
| (c) man's religious experience | (d) all the above |

Answer— (d)

8.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) On what grounds do you think reason to be the foundation of religious belief ?

Answer— See 8.2.2

- (ii) What is Faith and how do you consider it to be the ground of religious belief ?

Answer— See 8.2.3

8.5.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Explain how reason and faith are the foundations of religious belief.

Answer— See 8.2.2 & 8.2.3

8.6 Suggested Readings

1. W.T. Blackstone — The Problem of Religious Knowledge
2. John Hick — Faith and Knowledge
3. E.S. Brightman — A Philosophy of Religion



REVELATION AND MYSTIC EXPERIENCE**Lesson Structure**

- 9.0 Objective
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Main Theme
 - 9.2.1 Revelation as a foundation of Religious Belief
 - 9.2.2 Mystic Experience as the ground of Religious Belief
- 9.3 Summary
- 9.4 Key words
- 9.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 9.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 9.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 9.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 9.6 Suggested Readings

9.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to evaluate the role of revelation and mystic experience as the foundation of religious belief.

9.1 Introduction

Religion deals with God, Soul, Immortality of soul, Rebirth, Heaven and Hell etc. which transcend the competence of human capacities. The problem, therefore, arises: How to believe in them? According to religious thinkers, they are believed on grounds of divine revelations and mystic experience of highly developed religious individuals.

9.2 Main Theme

Of the various foundations of religious belief, Revelation and Mystic Experience are most important. Revelation literally means 'to disclose' 'to make known what was hidden so far'. In the context of religion, Revelation may be defined as 'the communication of some truth by God to a rational creature through means which are beyond the ordinary course of nature.' Revelation is that medium through which God Himself lets man know about Him. Religious knowledge of man is really divine knowledge and not human knowledge. Religious experience takes many forms. Mystic experience is one such form. In such an experience man gets a vision of the Divine and feels beyond himself in joy. This is an ecstatic experience in which he feels himself to be one with God.

9.2.1 Revelation as a foundation of Religious Belief

By revelation, we may mean the communication, by God or by some supernatural agency, of true propositions which cannot be discovered by natural means. Revelation may also be understood as the self-manifestation of God. What is revealed is not proposition but God Himself. He unveils Himself, communicates Himself to man.

Almost all great religions of the world believe in the concept of revelation. Even Hinduism believes that God has revealed certain truths through the ancient seers engaged in meditation. The Vedas are regarded as containing the words of God.

Revelation according to Galloway is an apprehension of truth which rests on the activity of God directly or indirectly. For Hick "Revelation is the imparting to men of divinely authenticated truths." Revelation is not only one sided activity. It is possible only when God reveals Himself and man is active in receiving and assimilating the truth revealed.

We have already seen that revelation may be of two types: it may be revelation of propositions containing truths or it may be just manifestation of God Himself to a selected individual.

It should be borne in mind that God does not reveal the truth to every man nor does He reveal Himself to every one. He reveals the truths or Himself only to a deserving person.

God reveals Himself through various means. They may be as follows :

- (i) Through Creation: God reveals Himself more by His works than His words. The entire creation is God's act and He reveals Himself through it. We can know God through His unique and splendid creation. Man can have a glimpse of God in and through His creation.
- (ii) Through scriptures: God reveals Himself through the various scriptures. The Bible, The Vedas, The Koran etc. are holy books through which God reveals Himself. The followers of Islam believe that the Holy Koran contains the words of God which were heard by their Prophet Mohammed in a unique and extraordinary way.
- (iii) Through incarnations: The conception of God's incarnation in different forms have been accepted by some religions. Thus, Krishna, Jesus Christ and Mohammed have been re-

garded as incarnations of God. Luther and some modern Christian theologians think that God reveals Himself essentially in the life and acts of a person, for the best mode in which a personal God can disclose Himself more directly is through a personality. This view is similar to the Gita view. According to the Gita, an avatar (incarnation) is a descent of God in human form into the world of space and time, in order that men may meditate on it, and mould themselves in thought, feeling and action on the lines of the avatar and be raised into the divine nature and consciousness. In the Gita, Krishna declares, "Whenever there is decay of righteousness and rise of unrighteousness, then, I embody myself, for the production of the good, for the destruction of the evil, for the establishment of righteousness, I am born from age to age."

- (iv) Through Direct contact: Revelation also takes place through confrontation of the human by the Divine. We can know a person more fully and adequately by direct personal contact. Disclosures about Himself is made by God to such persons who have deep faith in Him and have sufficiently strengthened Himself spiritually. Just as mountain peak first catches the sight of rising sun, so the sages, saints and prophets standing high above the crowd of men catches the vision of God. In the Gita Lord Krishna says that He is known by devotion and is attainable by devotion.
- (v) Through other means : God also reveals Himself through dreams, voice of conscience etc. Mahatma Gandhi identified the voice of conscience with the voice of God. He also claimed to have been receiving the promptings of God in very difficult times.

Revelation presupposes the existence of active God. God has the power to reveal the truths. Revelation also presupposes the existence of rational and intelligent beings who appropriate the truths and reproduce and use them. Thus, Revelation is a gift of God and can be acceptable to only those who have faith in God. Some questions may be raised with regard to revelation. The first question relates to what need is there for revelation? Man is basically a religious being.

Man is basically a religious creature and he seeks the guidance of God whenever he is in difficulty. He always wants to have a glimpse of God. He needs revelation of God in times of practical difficulty.

The second question relates to verification of revelation. The answer is in the negative. Revelation cannot be verified but this does not mean that revelation is not authentic. To deny revelation will be to deny the self-revealing capacity of God. Nobody can comprehend the nature of God, nobody can know Him perfectly. He is an object of veneration.

9.2.2 Mystic experience as the ground of Religious Belief

Mystic experience also is a foundation of religious belief, but what is mystic experience? Mystic experience is a kind of religious experience which comes very close to what Otto defines as 'Numinous experience'. Numinous experience is a complex experience that involves :

- (a) awe or dread, the feeling of something uncanny
- (b) a sense of "importance and general nothingness as against an overpowering might"
- (c) the conviction that one is confronted with something overwhelmingly alive, vital and active,
- (d) a sense of mystery, of wonder over something that is radically other than the object of ordinary experience and
- (e) finally fascination or attraction. One wishes to possess or be possessed by the object of experience. Although mystic experience and numinous experience resemble each other in some respects, they should be distinguished. As sense of distance or otherness is a characteristic feature of numinous experience, whereas mystic experience involves a sense of union with or merging into the object of experience. Those who enjoy numinous experience describe their object of experience as personal, but the mystics who are theists describe the object of their experience impersonally.

Mystic experience has also been a strong foundation of religion. The concept of mystic experience has been accepted by almost every religion. The Upanishads, the Sufi tradition in Islam and Christianity all present vivid account of mystic experience. Among the western thinkers, we find mystic trends in Plotinus, Spinoza, W.R. Inge, Underhill, R.M. Jones, Henry Bergson and many others. William James and W.T. Stace have made comprehensive and authentic analysis of mysticism. Among contemporary Indian thinkers, Rabindra Nath Tagore and Radhakrishnan have strongly supported the role and importance of mysticism.

The chief elements of mystic experience are as follows :

In mystic experience, the devotee and God become one. The devotee is said to have merged his identity in God. But this feeling of identity is only momentary during his lifetime. The devotee feels for a while that he is one with God. When the devotee dedicates himself to God fully, all his personal desires vanish, his desires now consist only in obedience to God's orders. Really speaking, the mystic is so overwhelmed by his love for and devotion to God that he develops a feeling of oneness with Him. Another characteristic feature of mystic experience is that his experience cannot be expressed in clear and unambiguous language. In fact, it is inexpressible in language. However, when pressed to narrate his experience, the mystic cannot but use paradoxical language. Thus, when King Milind asked Nagasen to describe the nature of Nibban, he used metaphors to describe it. It is as high as a mountain, as deep as the ocean and so on.

According to Otto mystic experience is unique and extraordinary. It has no parallel whatsoever. William James has enumerated the following characteristics of mystic experience :

- (i) Ineffability: According to James mystic experience is ineffable i.e. inexpressible in language. According to Bergson and Alexander the mystic becomes one with God, the distinction between the knower and the known vanishes. There is no knower, how can the known be described at all?

9.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Explain Revelation as a foundation of religious belief.

Answer— See 9.2.1

- (ii) Explain mystic experience as foundation of religious belief.

Answer— See 9.2.2

9.5.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Expound revelation and mystic experience as foundation of religious belief.

Answer— See 9.2.1, 9.2.2

9.6 Suggested Readings

1. R. Otto — Idea of the Holy
2. R. Otto — Mysticism East and West.
3. W.T. Stace — Mysticism and Faith
4. R.C. Zahner — Mysticism : Sacred and Profane



10.0 Objective

10.1 Introduction

FORMS OF PRIMITIVE RELIGION**Lesson Structure**

- 10.0 Objective
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Main Theme
 - 10.2.1 Manaism
 - 10.2.2 Spiritism
 - 10.2.3 Fetishism
- 10.3 Summary
- 10.4 Key words
- 10.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 10.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 10.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 10.5.3 Long Answer Questions
- 10.6 Suggested Readings

10.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to acquaint you with the different forms of Primitive Religion and to highlight the essential features of each.

10.1 Introduction

Primitive religion is the earliest phase of the development of religion. It is that kind of religion which was prevalent among the uncultured and uncivilised people, the savage tribe as they were called. It was absolutely an undeveloped phase of religion in which there was very little or no place for logic and reason. In fact, feelings and emotions play a vital role in such a religion.

10.2 Main Theme

Primitive religion refers to the very ancient phase of religious development. But modern thinkers believe that primitive religion is found amongst the uncivilised men at all periods, and not only among savages. Culturally backward people furnish the finest examples of the primitive religion. The primitive religion has no holy scriptures, no prophets and no mystic seers. It is neither revealed religion nor founded by any individual. It is contended that the developed religions of today had their origin in some sort of primitive religion whose traces are still discernible in them. There are many forms of primitive religion. We shall be dealing with a few of them like Manaism, Spiritism, and Fetishism.

10.2.1 Manaism

Manaism is that form of primitive religion in which an impersonal and mysterious power called "Mana" is worshipped and is accompanied by various religious rites and rituals. 'Mana' is supposed to reside in various things and beings. It arouses awe in the people. Coderington says, "It is a power or influence, not physical but in a way supernatural; but it shows itself in physical force or in any kind of power or excellence which a man possesses." Mana acts in various ways for good and evil and it is advantageous to possess and control it.

The characteristic features of Mana are as follows :

- (i) Mana is a supernatural, impersonal and mysterious power. It is altogether distinct from physical force.
- (ii) Though Mana is not a physical power, yet it expresses itself in and through some physical object itself.
- (iii) Mana is a force which can move within and without and can produce good and evil.

Mana can be used for the benefit of the friends and for harming the enemies. Mana has the capacity to hear and understand human words; it may be said to possess will also in a sense. Mana thus is a unique, mysterious power which is also extraordinary and impersonal and also causes a feeling of awe among the believers. Brightman says, "Mana is a name for the power or force by virtue of which it exerts its peculiar effects."

Primitive people believed that the invisible 'Mana' power can dwell in various physical objects. Thus, if the king goes to the battlefield with a 'talishman' possessing 'mana' power, his victory is certain. If a bird having 'Mana' power sits on a tree, the tree is fully laden with fruits and flowers.

In fact primitive people entertained the belief that their life was fully under the control of 'Mana'. Growth and development of plants and trees in their orchards, rich harvest, rise in the number of household animals, a good fishing harvest..... all depend upon the 'Mana'. Among human beings, the king, the priests, doctors, chieftains etc. were considered to be possessing 'Mana' power.

From the above account of Manaism, it will be clear that superstition has a prominent role to play in it. Mana is assumed to have power similar to electrical power and can pass over from one object to another. Mana thus is dynamic.

be capable of separating themselves from the objects at will. Spiritism, unlike animism, believes in the liberation of the soul bound with a particular object. According to Spiritism the spirit may desert the object in which it resides and may again return to it. Spiritism means a worship of spiritual beings, who are not associated in a permanent way with certain bodies or objects. Spiritism marks an advance on mere animism, and implies a development of the idea of a soul.

Spiritism admits different categories of spirits. Some of them are noble and some are wicked. Wicked spirits cause diseases. If anybody falls ill, Spiritism will attribute his illness to some evil spirit. Spiritism believes that the soul experiences the pain received by the body inhabited by it. Spiritism also believes the same soul can inhabit various bodies one by one. Primitive people believed in the independent existence of soul on the basis of their dream-experience. They believed that the soul leaves the body and moves about in the external world. In course of their wanderings the souls meet with different objects which are experienced in the dreams. They were also led to believe that the soul can detach itself from the body. In dream they had the experience of meeting their dead ancestors. Their failure to explain the shadows also might have been one of the causes to believe the existence of souls as detached from the body. Primitive people by finding their shadows to be moving along them also had a conception of a second self. The reflection was also symbol of soul. Spiritism as a form of religion has an important role in the development of religion. Its contribution lies in evolving the concept of soul as different from the body. The dualism of mind and body which has been emphasized in the philosophy of religion is a contribution of Spiritism. The idea of transmigration of soul from one body to another and the idea of independent existence of soul as severed from the body are also contributions of Spiritism. Ancestor worship is also an innovation of Spiritism. The concept of personal God was present in a rudimentary form in Spiritism.

10.2.3 Fetishism

The term 'Fetism' originates from 'Feitico' which means 'attraction' or 'charm'. It is that kind of religion in which a material thing or stone or a part of human body is adored because of the presence of spirit in them. The fetish is worshipped because of its mysterious power believed to exist due to the presence of spirit in it. Because of this mysterious power, it can produce good or evil to man. The fetish is adored so long as it fulfils man's purpose. The moment it fails to fulfil man's wishes, it is thrown away. To some, Fetishism appears to be lower form of religion. But for Galloway "Fetishism is not the lowest form of religion as some have supposed but is the outcome and expression of a fully articulated spiritism".

In fact, there is no constant and regular relationship between a fetish and the spirit that resides in it. The spirit may be present in the fetish and may also desert it anytime. It loses all its magical efficacy as a result of the desertion of spirit. Fetishism is present in West African negroes. There is an attempt on the part of man to control the spirit for his purposes. There is preponderance of magic in it.

In fact it is a deterioration of religion. Galloway has rightly said, "Fetishism is a deterioration, not development."

In primitive times, the world was believed to be populated with various invisible powers, spirits and ghosts both of a helpful and harmful nature. To propitiate them various methods were employed which gave rise to manism, spiritism, fetishism and many other forms of primitive religions.

10.3 Summary

Primitive religion does not necessarily mean religion pursued by ancient people; it is a crude form of religion followed by the tribals, uncultured and educated people. Manism, Animism, Spiritism and Fetishism are some of the important forms of primitive religion. Manism is a form of religion which may be said to be the earliest phase. Some scholars regard animism as the earliest form of religion but in the eyes of the historians of religious development, animism is not religion, but philosophy. Spiritism is an important form of primitive religion. Spiritism believes the entire universe to be full of spirits. The conception of soul as distinct from the body, and the concept of transmigration of soul from one body to another had earlier beginnings in Spiritism. Fetishism is an outgrowth of spiritism, not on the progressive side but on the deteriorating path. It is worship of a fetish which may be a stone or a part of human body, or a wooden something believed to be temporarily inhabited by a spirit. The fetish is worshipped and adored so long as man's wishes are fulfilled. There is preponderance of magic in such a religion. As soon as it fails to serve man's purpose, it is discarded and thrown away.

10.4 Key words

- (a) **Mana** : a supernatural, impersonal and mysterious power. It is not physical power but it expresses itself in and through some physical object.
- (b) **Spiritism** : developed form of animism, a belief that external objects are possessed of spirits.
- (b) **Fetishism** : adoration of material objects believed to be infested by spirit.

10.5 Questions for Exercise

10.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Mana is
- (a) a bird (b) the mind
- (c) a power of mind (d) a mysterious, impersonal power

Answer— (d)

- (ii) Spiritism means
- (a) worship of the ghosts
 - (b) worship of the dead
 - (c) worship of spiritual beings
 - (d) none of these
- Answer— (c)

10.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Give an exposition of Manaimism as a form of primitive religion
Answer— See 10.2.1
- (ii) Discuss spiritism as a primitive religion.
Answer— See 10.2.2

10.5.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Describe some forms of Primitive religion
Answer— See 10.2.1, 10.2.2, 10.2.3

10.6 Suggested Readings

1. C.P. Tiele — The Science of Religion
2. E.S. Brightman — A Philosophy of Religion
3. J. Murphy — The Origin and History of Religions
4. G.Galloway — The Philosophy of Religion

CAUSAL AND COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Lesson Structure

- 11.0 Objective
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 Main Theme
 - 11.2.1 The Causal Argument
 - 11.2.2 The Cosmological Argument
 - 11.2.3 Evaluation
- 11.3 Summary
- 11.4 Key words
- 11.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 11.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 11.5.2 Short answer Questions
 - 11.5.3 Long answer Questions
- 11.6 Suggested Readings

11.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to explain the Causal and the Cosmological proof for the existence of God. We will also consider the objections raised against such arguments.

11.1 Introduction

Those who believe in the existence of God have to show that God actually exists and is not a figment of imagination. Causal and Cosmological proofs for the existence of God are some of the various attempts to demonstrate the existence of God.

11.2 Main Theme

The Cosmological argument aims at proving the existence of God by analysing the nature of cosmos or the universe. The argument is called Cosmological because it concerns the Cosmos. It tries to prove the existence of God for explaining the universe. Some thinkers emphasize the causal nature of the universe, while others highlight its contingent nature. Accordingly, the Cosmological argument takes two forms: (a) the Causal argument and (b) the Cosmological Argument. We shall take up the Causal argument first and then the Cosmological argument.

11.2.1 The Causal Argument or The First-Cause Argument

Unlike the ontological Argument which focuses attention upon the idea of God and proceeds to unfold its implications, Aquinas who champions the cause of Causal Argument, starts from some general features of the world around us and argues that there could not be a world with this particular characteristic unless there were also the ultimate reality which we call God.

Thomas Aquinas presents his First-cause argument thus: Everything that happens has a cause, and this cause in its turn has a cause, and so on in a series that must be either infinite or have its starting point in a first cause. Aquinas excludes the possibility of an infinite regress of causes and so concludes that there must be a First cause which we call God.

Martineau also presents the causal argument in three forms: all resting on the principle of causation. The first form of the argument takes its stand on the idea of cause and proves God's existence on an analysis and interpretation of the concept of cause. Scientifically viewed, a phenomenon is regarded as a cause of another phenomenon called the effect when the former is found to be invariable, unconditional antecedent of the latter. This view was as vigorously attacked by Hume on the ground that from a purely empirical standpoint the necessary relation between cause and effect cannot be established.

In fact, causal relation is a relation of necessity. The cause must be a power which produces the effect. The causal energy is directed to produce a particular effect to the exclusion of others. Will also is sometimes regarded as a cause. In self-consciousness we are aware of power in the form of will, which produces change in the external world. The will is selective and regulative. This idea of causality is extended to Nature by analogy and it is thought that causal energy in the physical world is not blind, unconscious energy but mental energy of God. The cosmic energy is the divine energy immanent in the world.

Martineau holds that God is the cause of the world in the sense that Divine Will is a power which is immanent in the physical world and which acts as the guiding principle of physical facts and phenomena. Martineau thus puts the argument of First cause.

In the second form, Martineau presents the universe as an effect whose cause is God. Every event has a cause and the universe is also an effect because of its changing character. And so the infinite God must be its cause.

Two objections may be raised against the argument. As the argument is a syllogism, the conclusion cannot be more general than the premises. And so we cannot argue an Infinite God from the universe which in spite of being very large, is after all finite. And secondly the infinite God is really infinite and necessary. But the world constitutes a limit to Him and makes Him to be something finite.

The third form argues that the innumerable phenomena of this universe are bound up with one another by a causal chain. So this world forms a continuous chain of causes and effects *ad infinitum*. as there would be an infinite regress. We must stop at some first cause which is not the effect. This first cause is God. We cannot ask for the cause of God because He is conscious. He is Himself uncaused. He is the cause of all.

Plato and Aristotle also have advocated such an argument when they conceive of God as the Prime Mover. Scientists also accept the universe to be an effect. Whatever has a beginning must have a cause. Geologists have proved that the world had its first beginning many, many years ago. The Universe, therefore, must have a cause. A limited finite cause cannot explain the universe because we shall have to find a cause for that limited cause. To put an end to the search for a cause in the series, we must accept an Infinite cause who is God.

Prof. Flint also says that 'Nature is but the name for an effect whose cause is God. "This argument helps us to proceed from the finite to the Infinite, from the limited to the unlimited, from the effect to the cause.

Kant objects to this form of argument on the ground that if we proceed to discover God on the principle of causation, we cannot stop anywhere, that would at once violate the very principle on which we started. Caird also thinks that it is impossible to establish the existence of an infinite cause from the existence of finite effects.

11.2.2 The Cosmological Argument

Thomas Aquinas has presented the Cosmological Argument in a logical way. It is based on the contingency of the world. Everything in the world about us is contingent, that is, it is true of each item that it might not have existed at all or might have existed differently. The proof of this is that there was time when it did not exist. The existence of this printed page is contingent upon the prior activities of trees, lumberjacks, transport workers, paper manufacturers, printers, publishers, authors and others as well as upon the operation of a great number of chemical and physical laws, each of which depends upon other factors. Everything points beyond itself to other things. Saint Thomas argues that if everything were contingent, there would have been a time when nothing existed. In this case, nothing could ever have come to exist, for there would have been no casual agency. Since there are things in existence, there must therefore be something that is not contingent, and this we call God.

In this world, things do not exist by themselves, their existence depends upon the existence of other things. If everything in this world is contingent, then in the infinite run of time, they will all be extinct. Now if everything is to be reduced to nothing, then by one time, the entire world will be

reduced to nothing. But nothing comes out of nothing. And so if once this entire universe is reduced to nothingness, the state of nothingness should have continued. But things do exist in spite of their being contingent. Hence there must be such a Being who lends support to the contingent world and who is not Himself contingent but necessarily existent. Such a Being is God, who is self-dependent, necessary and causa sui. He, therefore, exists necessarily providing basis for all contingent things of the world.

Caird also argues that the world presented to our immediate experience has no substantiality and independence, it is merely contingent. The whole world is limited to time and space. Hence it must depend upon a Being, who is necessarily independent, absolute and substantial.

11.2.3 Evaluation

The First Cause Argument is really a weak argument because it takes the Cause (God) to be existent in its fullness while the effect i.e. space time world to be actually nonexistent. This contradicts the whole analysis of causation. The argument is said to be based on the principle of causation, but the argument uses causation in a non-scientific manner.

Again, if God is assumed to exist merely as a First Cause of the causal chain, then there is little need of such a hypothesis. We can assume that the series had no beginning.

We have already seen how Hume has criticised the causal argument saying that the argument does not prove God to be necessarily existent. Just as we think of world objects to be existent and nonexistent, so we can think of God to be existent as well as non-existent. The argument, therefore, does not prove God to be necessarily existent.

Cosmological Argument takes the world to be an effect and proves God to be the necessary cause. But Kant refutes this argument. Cause-effect relation can be applied to the practical world, the world of experience. We cannot apply the causal relation to God who is beyond our experience. To apply the category of causation to God is not proper.

Russell also criticises the Cosmological Argument. He says that this argument assumes the existence of God only to be saved from the infinite regresses. Why should the causal nexus stop at God? The chain of cause and effect series may be assumed to be infinite. It is not at all necessary to assume the existence of God.

The assumption of Cosmological Argument is that the world is contingent. The different objects in the world may be contingent. To assume that the world as a whole is also contingent is wrong. What is true if the part need not be true for the whole. The world as a whole may not be contingent. John Hospers also raises his objection against the cosmological Argument. If every thing has a cause including the universe and God caused the universe, then what caused God? What is to prevent us from asking about God the same question we asked about the universe.

Prof. Caird criticising the Cosmological Argument says that this argument attempts to prove the existence of an Infinite God but explains the concept of Infinity incorrectly. An Infinite Being must

subsume the finite within itself. But the Cosmological Argument has explained the infinite to be what negates the finite. The Infinite which is attained by negating the finite is not a true Infinite.

Prof. Caird also points out that the Cosmological Argument is not congenial for the development of religion. Religion concerns the relation between the worshipper and the worshipped. God is what is worshipped and the worshipper is a finite human being, If the existence of finite souls are rejected then religious feeling will have to be rejected also. In the absence of finite individuals, who will worship God? And Religion will lose all its significance.

11.3 Summary

Cosmological argument has two forms: the causal argument and the argument from the contingency of the world often known as Cosmological Proof. The argument has been advocated by Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Martineau, Flint and many other thinkers. Thomas Aquinas has ably produced both the arguments. The argument has merits as well demerits. The demerits have been pointed out by Hume, Kant, Russell and Caird. They prove the weakness of the argument.

11.4 Key words

- (a) **Cosmos** : the ordered universe.
- (b) **Causal** : of the nature of cause and effect.
- (c) **Causation** : Universal operation of cause and effect as a belief.

11.5 Questions for Exercise

11.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The Causal Argument proves the existence of
- (a) a cause (b) causal relation
(c) God as a designer (d) God as the first cause
- Answer— (d)
- (ii) The Cosmological Argument proves the existence of God from
- (a) the contingent nature of the universe (b) the purposive nature of the universe
(c) the changing nature of the universe (d) creation of the universe
- Answer— (a)

11.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Explain the Causal Argument for the existence of God.

Answer— See 11.2.1.

- (ii) Explain the Cosmological Argument for the existence of God.

Answer— See 11.2.2

11.5.3 Long Answer Questions

- (i) Critically explain the Cosmological Argument for proving God's existence.

Answer— See 11.2.2, 11.2.3

- (ii) Discuss the Causal Argument for proving God's existence.

Answer— See 11.2.1, 11.2.3

11.6 Suggested Readings

1. John. H. Hick — Philosophy of Religion
2. Caird — An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion
3. Flint — Theism
4. John Hospers — An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis



ONTOLOGICAL PROOF FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD**Lesson Structure**

- 12.0 Objective
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Main Theme
 - 12.2.1 The Ontological Argument
 - 12.2.2 The Criticism of Ontological Argument
- 12.3 Summary
- 12.4 Key words
- 12.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 12.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 12.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 12.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 12.6 Suggested Readings

12.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to provide the students with a knowledge of the Ontological Argument for the existence of God and also to acquaint them with the objections raised against such an argument.

12.1 Introduction

Ontological Argument seeks to prove God's existence on the basis of the very idea of God as a uniquely perfect being. The thought of God in our mind demonstrates His Being.

12.2 Main Theme

The conclusion from thought to Being constitutes the gist of Ontological Argument. The argument has been presented in different forms by different thinkers. The idea of God as an absolutely perfect Being which is in our mind proves that such a Being must exist and if such a Being did not actually exist, we could conceive of another who does actually exist and who would, therefore, be most perfect. The argument has been put forward by a number of philosophers.

12.2.1 The Ontological Argument for the existence of God

Plato (427 B.C-347 B.C.) was perhaps the earliest, the first and the foremost philosopher to have conceived Ideas as the ultimate reality. In his thinking, we find the earliest evidence of the Ontological Proof. For him the objects of knowledge are not realities, they are transient and they depend for their existence on the knower and so they can not be regarded as ultimate realities. Cows are many, but the idea of cow or the concept of cow is one. Cows will be born and will die, but the idea of cowhood will always be there. There are so many ideas. There is, in fact, a hierarchy of Ideas. One higher Idea presides over many lower Ideas. This higher Idea again is presided over by still higher Idea and so on. Ideas in this way form, as it were, a pyramid and to this pyramid there must be an apex. There must be one highest Idea which is supreme and absolutely real Being, which is the ultimate ground of itself, of all other Ideas and of the entire universe. This is the Idea of the Good, which is the same as God.

After Plato, Anselm in the mediaeval period gave the argument its classical form. Anselm concentrates upon the monotheistic concept of God as "a being than which nothing greater can be conceived". By greater Anselm means more perfect rather than spatially bigger. Instead of describing God as the most perfect being that there is, Anselm describes God as the being who is so perfect that no more perfect can even be conceived. The most perfect conceivable being must exist in reality as well as in the mind. The idea of an "absolutely perfect" Being or "most real Being" which is in our mind proves that such a Being must exist. St. Anselm intends to suggest that consideration demonstrates the word God to mean that which must be thought as what is greatest, but to be in actuality as well as in thought, is greater than to be in thought alone. Therefore, God exists not only in thought, but in fact.

Anselm not only proves the existence of God but also that He exists necessarily. His uniquely necessary existence is proved in this way: God is defined in such a way that it is impossible to conceive God's not existing. The core of this notion of necessary being is self-existing. Since God is infinitely perfect, is not limited in or by time, the twin possibility of God's having ever come to exist or ever ceasing to exist are alike excluded and God's non-existence is rendered impossible.

With a slight variation of form, the argument is also maintained by Descartes. 'Existence' is one of the attributes which must be ascribed to an absolutely Perfect Being. According to Descartes, just as the knowledge of triangle implies that the three angles of the triangle together will be equal to two

right angles, in the same way, the knowledge of perfection of God implies that it must exist. A Being whom we think as absolutely perfect, would lack one of its essential attributes, if He did not actually exist. Descartes's ontological argument claims that existence must be among the defining predicates of God.

Some people think that Descartes's version of Ontological argument is a copy of Anselm's argument. But this is a misconception. For Anselm, the existence of God is proved because man has an idea of God. But for Descartes man has an idea of God because God exists. In Anselm's argument, God's existence depends upon man's idea of God, while in Descartes's argument idea of God in human mind depends upon God's existence. We have an idea of God, because God actually exists according to Descartes. Descartes's definition of God is also quite different from Anselm's definition of God. For Anselm, God is that than which no greater being can be conceived. For Descartes, God is supremely Perfect Being.

Descartes has also put the Ontological Argument in another form: we have an idea of Perfect Infinite God in our mind. There must be some Being who planted such an idea in our mind. Such a Being cannot himself be finite and imperfect. Only a Perfect and Infinite being can plant the idea of a Perfect Infinite God. And so the existence of God is proved without any doubt. Thus Descartes puts the argument in the form of an argument from effect to cause. He argues that the idea of infinite perfection implies the existence of an infinitely perfect Being as its author.

Spinoza also has taken the help of Ontological proof to prove the existence of God. For Spinoza the idea of God is the idea of an Infinite Substance which is clear and distinct. Existence is one of the infinite attributes. If God lacks existence, then God will be imperfect in that respect. Hence, the existence of God is ingrained in the idea of God as an Infinite Substance. Leibniz also supports the Ontological Argument. For Leibniz every monad has two elements: actuality and possibility: activity and passivity. The higher the monad, the more active and the more actual and less of possibility. In the series of plurality of monads, the highest monad i.e. God is actus purus fully active. God is a possibility because we can think of God. And because God is possible, he must be actual. From the possibility of God, we prove the actuality of God.

Hegel also has adopted the Ontological Argument. So far as ordinary objects are concerned, we can not prove their existence from their thought. But the idea of God is a unique idea and from the thought of such an idea we can prove the actual existence of God. Prof. Caird also says, "The thought of God in the mind demonstrates His Being. This conclusion from thought to Being constitutes the gist of the argument." Hegel puts the argument in the following words, "The individual self-consciousness itself presupposes a universal self-consciousness and, therefore, the idea of a universal self-consciousness carries with it the proof of its necessary existence or reality."

12.2.2 Criticism of Ontological Argument

The Ontological Argument has been subjected to criticisms from many quarters. Gaunilo first of all raised serious objection against Anselm's argument. According to him, Anselm's reasoning would lead to absurd conclusion if applied to other fields. He sets up a supposedly parallel ontological argument for the most perfect island. Given the idea of such a perfect island, we can argue on Anselm's principle that unless it exists in reality, it cannot be the most perfect conceivable island. Anselm's reply would be that the element in the idea of God which is lacking in the notion of the most perfect island is necessary existence. An island is a part of the contingent world; the most perfect island, so long as it is a part of the contingent world is by definition a dependent reality which can be thought not to exist without any contradiction. Anselm's principle does not apply to it. It applies only to the most perfect conceivable being which is defined as having eternal and independent, necessary existence.

Cartesian version of Ontological Argument was challenged by Kant. Descartes's ontological argument claims that existence must be among the defining predicates of God. Just as the internal angles together are equal to two right angles is a necessary characteristic of a triangle, so existence is a necessary characteristic of a supremely perfect being. A triangle without its defining properties would not be a triangle, and God without existence would not be God. Existence is an essential attribute without which no being would be infinitely perfect.

Kant rejected the basic assumption upon which Descartes's argument rested, the assumption that existence is a predicate that something can either have or lack. He points out that the idea of existence does not add anything to the concept of a particular thing or kind of thing. If I have a clear and distinct idea that there are hundred dollars in my pocket, this does not mean that there exists hundred dollars in my pocket. Descartes replies to the objection of Kant by saying that the idea of a mountain implies the idea of valley, in the same way the idea of God implies His existence. When I think of dollars in my pocket, I can think of both presence and absence of dollars but I cannot think of mountain without a valley. In the same way we cannot think of God's perfection without existence.

The Ontological argument is an a priori argument for the existence of God. It does not take experience into consideration. Other arguments are a posteriori arguments depending upon empirical data. The Ontological argument has perennially fascinated philosophers and there have been a number of discussions on it in recent years.

12.3 Summary

The Ontological Argument demonstrates the existence of God by analysing the concept of God. It is an a priori argument. The argument was advanced by Plato in the ancient period, Anselm in the

mediaeval period and Descartes in the modern period. Many contemporary philosophers have shown their interest in ontological proof. The argument seeks to prove the existence of God from the idea of God. God has been conceived to be perfect but a perfect Being must exist, otherwise it won't be perfect because it will be lacking the attribute of existence. The argument has been objected to by Gaunilon, Kant and many others. The advocates of ontological proof have put their defence also.

12.4 Key words

Ontology from Ontos + Logia;

(a) **Ontos** : Being

(a) **Logia** : Discourse. Thus ontology is science or study of Being

12.5 Questions for Exercise

12.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Ontological Argument proves the existence of God from the
- (a) idea of God
 - (b) finite character of world
 - (c) contingent nature of world
 - (d) infinite nature of reality

Answer— (a)

- (ii) Ontological Argument has been advocated by
- (a) Plato
 - (b) Anselm
 - (c) Descartes
 - (d) by all the above

Answer— (d)

12.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) How does Descartes explain the Ontological Argument ?

Answer— See 12.2.1

- (ii) Explain Plato's version of Ontological Argument.

Answer— See 12.2.1

- (iii) How does Kant refute Ontological Argument?

Answer— See 12.2.2

12.5.3 Long Answer Questions

- (i) Discuss the Ontological Argument for the existence of God.

Answer— See 12.2.1, 12.2.2

12.6 Suggested Readings

1. John Hick — Philosophy of Religion
2. John Caird — The Philosophy of Religion
3. Y. Masih — Samanya Dharma Darshan
4. Harendra Prasad Sinha — Dharma Darshan ki Rooprekha

TELEOLOGICAL PROOF FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD**Lesson Structure**

- 13.0 Objective
- 13.1 Introduction
- 13.2 Main Theme
 - 13.2.1 Exposition of the Teleological Argument
 - 13.2.2 Evaluation of the Design Argument
- 13.3 Summary
- 13.4 Key words
- 13.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 13.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 13.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 13.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 13.6 Suggested Readings

13.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to give an exposition of the Teleological Argument for proving the existence of God. The Lesson also presents an evaluation of Teleological Proof.

13.1 Introduction

The word Teleology has come from the Greek word 'Telos' meaning 'purpose'. The Teleological Argument, therefore, highlights the purposive nature of objects everywhere in the world indicating the workmanship of an intelligent designer. There is order, planning everywhere in the world. This orderliness, systematic, purposive character cannot be a chance or accidental product. There must be an

intelligent planner whose purpose the world objects are serving. There must be an intelligent Designer i.e. God who has planned this world on such a large scale.

13.2 Main Theme

The Teleological Argument is also known as Design Argument. From the presence of beauty, order, design and purpose in every part of the world, the argument seeks to prove the existence of a Supremely Intelligent Creator i.e. God. The Teleological Argument is not only old but is one of the most celebrated proofs for the existence of God. Although we find evidence of such an argument in Plato, Bacon and Aquinas, William Paley's exposition of the argument from design is quite bold and eloquent.

13.2.1 Exposition of the Teleological Argument or Design Argument

William Paley puts forward the illustration of a watch. If anybody finds a watch in a deserted place, the instant reaction would be that the watch was not there along with the rocks and forests. He must not think that as by the natural process the rocks, the forest exist there, so the watch must be existing there in the same process. A watch consists of a complex arrangement of wheels, cogs, axles, springs and balances, all operating accurately together to provide a regular measurement of time. We cannot think of the functioning machine to be a chance operation. We are obliged to postulate an intelligent mind which is responsible for the making of the watch.

Paley argues that the world is as complex a mechanism and as manifestly designed as any watch. The rotation of the planets in the solar system and the rotation of the earth, the regular procession of the seasons and the complex structure and mutual adaptation of the parts of a living organism, all suggest design. Just as we infer from the watch its maker in the same way, we on watching machine-like adjustment in different parts of the world, and visualising ordered phenomena in the universe. We must infer a supreme entity who has designed the world to function in well-defined manner. This is the gist of Design Argument.

James Martineau also supports Paley's logic and says that the universe has not appeared by itself. There must be some creator whose purpose is served by different kinds of order present in the world. Wherever we find selection, combination and gradation in the world, we can infer the contriver with high degree of intelligence. We find wonderful adjustment in the structure and different parts of the body of living beings. The structure of the claws, teeth of animals living in forest are suitable for their survival. The sun rises in the East and sets in the West in strict regular way. Change of season follow a uniform pattern. All these show that there must be a planner with infinite wisdom and power i.e. God exists.

Some thinkers view Teleological proof to be an extension of cosmological argument. In cosmological argument it is said that the cosmos is not an accidental product; it has come into existence not by accident nor by itself but has been made by God. In the Teleological Argument, it is maintained that

there is order, planning and adjustment of means to end. The world is a big machine; it is so subtle and so huge that the inevitable conclusion is that it must have been designed by an intelligent, supremely wise Being called God. In the Cosmological Proof the world is taken as an effect and God is proved to be its cause. In the Teleological argument we prove the existence of God as a contriver or planner from the purposive and ordered universe. The Teleological argument is also an a posteriori argument like the cosmological argument. The Teleological argument is also included in the cosmological argument. Hick defines Cosmological Argument as including the Teleological proof. " In the widest sense of the term, any Theistic argument that proceeds from the world to God can be described as cosmological." The Teleological Proof, therefore, can be regarded as extension of Cosmological Proof.

The Teleological argument appears to be very simple and attractive. The order and harmony characterising the world cannot be the work of any finite being. We must posit the existence of an intelligent, infinitely wise Being responsible for such an orderly universe.

Darwin maintains that in the Biological world, in different living species, chance variation occurs. If these variations help the living beings in their struggle for existence, they survive, otherwise they perish. F.R. Tennant has examined Darwin's theory very minutely. In his view, we must concentrate on the grand planning and order in the larger context. If we look at the whole universe and ponder over the Master Plan underlying the entire universe, we, shall be convinced that the universe is a perfectly designed universe and the contriver must be a supremely wise, intelligent God. The universe in all its various parts gives evidence of selection, gradation and combination. The living beings inhabiting the earth, air and sky have been equipped with breathing system appropriate to their environment. The birds have wings to fly in the air, land animals have lungs adapted to breathing air, while fishes have gills rather than lungs, as they are compelled to breathe the air dissolved in water; the bones of birds are light to lessen their weight for flying. The weak animals have been made alert and light footed, so that they survive in spite of their weakness. The extraordinary complexity and skill with various parts of an organism are adapted to serve its purpose cannot be regarded as mere chance- coincidence. The lifeless world works for the living world. In nature, we find a regular gradation of lower and higher till we reach the conscious human mind which is at the apex of creation. All these characteristics of Nature are marks of an intelligent creator who could be responsible for the ordered universe of ours.

13.2.2 Evaluation of the Design Argument

The Design Argument of Paley has been severely criticised by David Hume. According to him, the world has been compared with a watch and has been found to be well-ordered and well-planned. But the world which has been presented by the Design Argument is a finite world and the cause cannot be an Infinite God. From a finite effect only a finite cause can be inferred. The Design argument, therefore, defies the principle of causation.

The Design Argument is based on an analogy. It is a weak argument according to Hume. An analogical conclusion is strong only when it is based on a large number of similarities in essential points and can be observed repeatedly. But the analogy given by the advocates of Design Argument is not capable of being observed repeatedly for nobody has seen God creating the universe. The Analogical conclusion is not certain but only probable. We cannot infer the existence of an Infinite God with certainty. The analogy between the world and a human artifact such as a watch or house is rather weak. Only when the world is shown to be strikingly analogous to a human artifact we know to be designed, we could have a basis for inference to an intelligent Designer.

The Design Argument can be subjected to two points of serious criticism. In the first place while there are definite evidences of Design in the causal order of the world, there are also evidences of lack of design and maladaptation. Such instances go against the Design Argument. Secondly, recent discoveries in science tend to show that whatever design there is in the world, can be explained in terms of natural causes.

Kant has also criticised the Teleological Argument. This argument proves God to be a designer. But God is an infinitely Perfect Being. To call such a Perfect Being a designer is to make Him finite. Prof. Caird also says, "The notion of an external designer is something far short of perfect and absolute wisdom and power. If a human designer is limited by materials and laws of nature, such limitations must cling even to God who is an external designer"

Pointing out the defects of such a proof, Kant says that it proves God as an efficient cause of the world. This argument only demonstrates that the world has a definite purpose which can only be of a conscious Being. It does not prove God to be a creator.

From the evolutionary standpoint, this argument loses all significance. The Teleological Argument proves God to be a Designer, a planner only. But the theory of evolution substitutes external teleology by immanent teleology. The order and design in the world are due to mutual adjustments, combination and change. Things get ordered by themselves. God is not necessary for bringing order and adjustment.

Further what is true for the part need not be true for the whole. We observe adjustment of means to end in the various departments of the world. There are order and design in the various parts of the universe. From this we have no right to conclude that the universe as a whole must have a Designer who is infinite in power and wisdom.

The Design Argument proves God to be a Designer on human analogy and thus makes God anthropomorphic. If we attribute human characters to God, God will become limited and finite.

The Design Argument is also not congenial to religion. In religion we pray to God and believe that he hears our prayer. It makes God an external designer; He is not conceived as being near to us.

But in spite of the above mentioned defects, the Design argument commands a respectable place, Kant who has so mercilessly criticised the traditional arguments for the existence of God has also sympathy and regard for the Design argument. As he says, "This proof always deserves to be

mentioned with respect." John Hospess also appreciates the Design argument and says that the most popular of all the arguments for the existence of God is the Teleological Argument.

13.3 Summary

The Teleological Argument tries to prove the existence of God from the presence of order, harmony and adjustment of means to end in the world. William Paley has compared the world with a watch. Just as the watch is a time indicating machine, so the world is also a complex machine consisting of many smaller machines. The smaller machines in the watch are so adjusted with each other that they give us accurate time. Similarly, the world machine moves in a regular pattern giving us change of season, sunrise and sunset in a strict regular way. Just as there is a contriver of the watch the watch maker, so also there must be a Designer of the world machine i.e. God. The animals in the forest have claws and teeth for their survival, the land animals have their lungs to breathe, the fishes have gills to breathe air mixed in water. All these phenomena suggest that the contriver of this world must be a supremely wise and intelligent planner. The Teleological Argument is also known as Design Argument. It is an argument based on experience of order, purpose and beauty in the world. The argument has been criticised by Hume and Kant. Hume has attacked the argument as it is based on analogy. Analogical inferences do not yield a certain conclusion. What is true of a part need not be true for the whole. Kant considers Design Argument to be derogatory to the concept of God. If God is only a Designer He cannot be the creator and a perfectly infinite Being.

13.4 Key words

Teleology from Greek word Teleos meaning purpose.

Evolution Theory does not believe in creation theory.

13.5 Questions for Exercise

13.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Teleological Argument proves the existence of God
- by analysing the concept of God.
 - by proving the world to be an effect
 - by showing presence of Design, Order and Purpose in the world
 - by citing the Biblical version of creation.

Answer— (c)

13.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Explain the Design Argument.

Answer— See 13.2.1

- (ii) Give an evaluation of Teleological Argument.

Answer— See 13.2.2.

13.5.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Give a critical exposition of Teleological Argument.

Answer— See 13.2.1, 13.2.2

13.6 Suggested Readings

1. John Hick — Philosophy of Religion
2. John Hick — Arguments for the Existence of God
3. Richard Swinburne — The Existence of God
4. David Hume — Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion
5. F.R. Tennant — Philosophical Theology II Chap. 4

THE MORAL PROOF FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Lesson Structure

- 14.0 Objective
- 14.1 Introduction
- 14.2 Main Theme
 - 14.2.1 Kant's Moral Argument
 - 14.2.2 Rashdall's Moral Argument
 - 14.2.3 Argument from the objectivity of Moral Laws
 - 14.2.4 Argument from Conscience
- 14.3 Summary
- 14.4 Key words
- 14.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 14.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 14.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 14.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 14.6 Suggested Readings

14.0 Objective

The Moral Argument is in one sense the most important proof for the existence of God since it tries to establish God's existence as most worthy object of worship. The Moral Argument has been presented in various forms by the religious thinkers. The object of this Lesson is to explain in detail some of the important forms of moral proof.

14.1 Introduction

One of the most remarkable features of man's nature is that he knows what is meant by 'ought'. When we say that we ought to do such and such thing, we mean that the action is right. Similarly, when we denounce an act, we mean that the action is wrong and one should not do such an act. We

are born with a sense of distinguishing right from wrong. In pronouncing an act to be right or wrong, we are not expressing personal preference. The moral judgments are objective. There is a standard of right and wrong which does not depend on differing wishes and inclinations. They are objective because they have their source in God who is all-good and True. The moral argument is an expansion of the Teleological Argument. The Teleological argument proves the existence of God from the purposive order in the universe. The Moral argument adds that moral order is the decisive mark of the universe and God is responsible for the moral order of the universe.

14.2 Main Theme

The moral argument in its various forms claims that ethical experience and particularly one's sense of an inalienable obligation to one's fellow human beings, presupposes the reality of God in some way, the source and ground of this obligation. The realm of values which we discover does not depend on us. It has its source in God, who is all-good and True. This claim is known as the Moral argument for God's existence. Moral argument has been presented in various forms. The best known form is given by Immanuel Kant. Other forms of the argument have been presented by John Henry Newman, Rashdall W.R Soreley and others. We shall be looking into some of them.

14.2.1 Kant's Moral Argument

According to Kant, man belongs to two worlds: the phenomenal world (the world of appearance) and the noumenal world (the world of reality). As a creature of the phenomenal world he enjoys pleasure and happiness by satisfying his basic needs and cravings. But he also belongs to the noumenal reality. The phenomenal world is the appearance of things-in-themselves which is the noumenal reality. As a phenomenal self man satisfies his animal desires, cravings. But as a noumenal self, he receives commands, imperatives which he must do irrespective of consequences. By acting according to the demands of his noumenal self, he belongs to the higher realm or reality. The command of the noumenal self is called by Kant "Categorical Imperative". Everybody to the degree he is moral feels an absolute obligation to help the needy, to speak the truth. There is no way of evading the command. "Thou oughtest, therefore, thou canst not" The categorical nature of the moral obligation is expressed by Kant as the demand of the good will thus :

"There is nothing in the world, nay, even beyond the world; nothing conceivable which can be regarded as good without qualification, saving alone a good will... A good will is good in itself, and like a jewel shines by its own light".

The demand of the good will is autonomous and morality consists in having respect for the moral law alone. This categorical imperative for a moral agent is also called duty. One has to perform one's duty without any hope of reward or fear of punishment. Performing duty for duty's sake is its own reward. A good will is good in itself. Kant emphasizes these things in moral philosophy, viz.

- (i) Practical reason is higher than theoretical reason which is limited to phenomena alone. In morality we are the noumena. Therefore, the voice of Good will or the Categorical Impera-

tive takes us to the heart of the reality, the ultimate destiny of each individual.

- (ii) Morality has a law which is not the decision of an individual or a group. It is based on a universal maxim and is binding upon every person.
- (iii) Morality and scientific knowledge belong to heterogeneous realms. Thus virtue which follows performance of duty for duty's sake is quite different from happiness that follows from the satisfaction of natural desires and inclinations.

Virtue, thus, does not have any reference to happiness. They are heterogeneous. Practical reason insists a priori on the possibility of summum bonnum. Practical reason impels us to promote the highest good, which includes also happiness proportionate to virtue. If summum bonnum is a practical necessity, then some agency must be postulated capable of bringing about the relationship between virtue and happiness. What kind of agency will this be? It will be a being which can recognize moral worth, be capable of conceiving general laws. In other words, such a being must be intelligent. Further if the summum bonnum is to be possible exactly in accordance with maxims that could be universal laws he must be morally perfect. He must be eternal. And since conditions of space cannot be permitted to frustrate the summum bonnum any more than the conditions of time, he will be omnipotent. In other words God, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, all-good must be presupposed and postulated. Thus, for Kant God must be accepted as a necessary postulate of practical reason.

14.2.2 Hastings Rashdall's Moral Argument

The world which is a causal system is also a moral order and its purpose is moral. The Ideal of goodness must be accepted by individuals and attempts must be made to realize this. It is possible to regard God as the author and ruler of the universe. God holds moral values of which we are conscious. And the moral Ideal expresses His nature.

Are we to regard morality, its values, laws and Ideal as belonging to a Super Mind or God? This is the question tackled by Specific Moral Argument given by Rashdall.

The absolute Moral Law or Moral Ideal cannot exist in material things, nor in the mind of this or that mind. Only if we believe in the existence of a Mind for which the true moral Ideal is real - the Mind which is the source of whatever is true in moral judgment, can we rationally think of the Moral Ideal as real as the world itself. Only then, can we believe in an absolute standard of right and wrong which is independent of this or that man's idea. Belief in God is not a postulate of there being a Morality but is the logical presupposition of an objective or absolute Morality. In the words of Rashdall, "A moral ideal can exist nowhere but in a mind; an absolute moral ideal can exist only in a Mind from which all Reality is derived. Our moral ideal can only claim objective validity in so far as it can rationally be regarded as the revelation of a Moral Ideal eternally existing in the Mind of God." Thus God exists.

14.2.3 Argument from the objectivity of Moral Laws

We are conscious of values, laws and Ideal. They are valid not because we recognize them, but

because they are objective and eternal. How could eternal validity of the laws stand alone? They are not embodied in matter, nor realised by finite minds. Unless there were an eternal Mind whose thoughts and will are expressed through them God, therefore, must exist and His nature must be goodness.

14.2.4 Argument from Conscience

If we feel responsibility, are ashamed, are frightened at transgressing the voice of conscience, this implies that there is one to whom we are responsible, before whom we are ashamed, whose claims upon us we fear ... If the cause of those emotions does not belong to this visible world, the object to which (the conscientious person's) perception is directed must be Supernatural and Divine.' The conscience in man is the voice of God as claimed by Cardinal Newman.

14.3 Summary

The Moral Argument for the existence of God has been presented by Kant, Rashdall, Newman and others. Kant's argument is not strictly a proof at all. It consists of the claim that anyone seriously committed to respect moral values as exercising a sovereign claim upon his or her life must implicitly believe in the reality of a transhuman source and basis for these values, which religion calls God. Thus, Immanuel Kant argues that the existence of God is a "postulate" of the moral life. Moral life for Kant consists in recognition of duty as rightfully laying upon one an unconditional claim. In another form the argument is presented as logical inference from objective moral laws to a divine Law Giver, or from the objectivity of moral values or of values in general to a transcendent Ground of values; or again from the fact of conscience to a "God" whose "voice" conscience is. The basic assumption of all arguments of this kind is that moral values are not capable of naturalistic explanation in terms of human need, desires and ideals, self interest, or the structure of human society. The only valid explanation is an appeal to the existence of God or the Supernatural. Hasting Rashdall's moral argument is a specific Moral Argument proving that as an Ideal must exist in some Mind, an Absolute moral Ideal must exist only in a Mind from which all Reality is derived i.e. God. This argument also is based on the objectivity of moral law.

14.4 Key words

Noumena and Phenomena : Kant made a distinction between phenomena and noumena. For him the noumena or the reality is unknown and unknowable. What we know is phenomena only. Man as a noumenal self is a moral being, he is a partaker of reality.

14.5 Questions for Exercise

14.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) Kant's Moral argument proves that
- (a) men are moral
 - (b) God exists without any doubt
 - (c) God as a postulate of moral life.
 - (d) God is Creator of the Universe.

Answer— (d)

- (ii) Kant's Categorical Imperative is known to man
- (a) in satisfaction of his desires
 - (b) from his theoretical reason
 - (c) after he does his duty
 - (d) from his Practical Reason.

Answer— (d)

14.5.2 Short Answer Question

- (i) Explain Kant's Moral Argument.
- (ii) Explain Rashdall's Moral Argument.

Answer— See 14.2.1

Answer— See 14.2.2

14.5.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Explain the Moral Argument for the existence of God.

Answer— See 14.2

14.6 Suggested Readings

1. Rashdall, Hastings — The Theory of Good and Evil, chapter on The Moral Argument.
2. W. R. Sorley — Moral values and the Idea of God
3. J. H. Cardinal Newman — A Grammar of Assent
4. T. H. Green (ed). — Kant Selections
5. H. J. Paton — The Categorical Imperative: A study in Kant's Moral Philosophy
6. C. C. J. Webb — Kant's Philosophy of Religion
7. Y. Masih — Religious Philosophy

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

Lesson Structure

- 15.0 Objective**
- 15.1 Introduction**
- 15.2 Main Theme**
 - 15.2.1 Attributes of God**
- 15.3 Summary**
- 15.4 Key words**
- 15.5 Questions for Exercise**
 - 15.5.1 Objective Questions**
 - 15.5.2 Short Answer Questions**
 - 15.5.3 Long Answer Question**
- 15.6 Suggested Readings**

15.0 Objective

The objective of this lesson is to explain the various attributes of God.

15.1 Introduction

God is central to a theistic religion. Everything revolves round the concept of God. God is an object of devotion in religion. We worship God with reverence. God can be an object of devotion only because of attributes. What are those attributes which make Him worshippable? In the first place, He must be a person. He must be personal. He must hear our prayers, understand our woes and must have the power to remove our woes. He must have will to remove the afflictions of the devotee. The devotee surrenders himself to Him. God must, therefore, necessarily exist. He must be omnipotent.

His powers must be unlimited. He must be omniscient i.e. He must be all knowing otherwise He will not be an object of devotion. He must help the devotee. He must be kind and good. He must be a moral Governor. He must be just. He must have the power to punish the guilty and reward the virtuous. He must be omnipresent i.e. present everywhere. All our actions good or bad catch His notice. Nothing is hidden from Him. Thus, omniscience, omnipotence, benevolence, eternity, goodness, immanence, transcendence, infinity and perfection are the attributes of God.

15. 2 Main Theme

From the point of view of religion God must be conceived as personal, whom we pray, and crave for his mercy. This means that God is not impersonal but has feeling, thinking and will. That God must be moved by our prayers, must have power to remove our troubles and must be merciful. The metaphysical attributes of God are omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresent. The moral attributes of God are benevolence, goodness and righteousness. God must be infinitely perfect. He is not finite, i.e. not determined but is absolutely free. He is eternal and is the creator of the world. God has prior knowledge of everything, He is omniscient. He is Love, Kind and Holy.

15.2.1 Attributes of God

The theistic concept of God is the concept of a purely spiritual being who is perfectly good, omnipotent and omniscient. A number of important theologians like Augustine, Anselm and Aquinas have held that the concept of God also requires that He be necessary, timeless, immutable and simple (without parts). Let us clarify and explain some of the very basic attributes of the theistic God:

(a) Necessary Being

The idea that God is a necessary being is fundamental to theism. But what is meant by the expression "necessary being"? Logically 'necessary being' means one whose nonexistence is a logical impossibility. Cosmological argument proves God to be logically necessary Being. In Hick's view God is a factually necessary Being, not a logically necessary Being. Like other beings, God's nonexistence is a logical possibility. God is factually necessary being who is incorruptible, indestructible, without beginning or end and does not depend for His existence on any other thing. Logical necessity applies only to propositions.

(b) Omniscience and Fore-Knowledge

One traditional theistic belief is that God knows everything that has happened, everything that is happening, and everything that shall happen in future. God is all-knowing because he has created everything. If God knows everything, then he must be knowing what will happen in future. In other words, if God has foreknowledge of everything that happens, then it seems to follow that whatever happens, happens of necessity, could not have failed to happen. Divine foreknowledge then appears to preclude man's free will. Saint Augustine is of the view that man has the freedom to choose one of the alternatives and God also has foreknowledge of what man's choice will be. God's foreknowledge

does not preclude man's free will. Antony Flew and Mackie are of the view that just as an efficient psychologist can foretell man's future action in a particular situation. So God can have foreknowledge of man's free acts.

(c) Omnipotence

God is omnipotent does not mean that God can do anything. He cannot create things which are absolutely impossible. For example, He cannot create an object that is perfectly round and perfectly square. God's power extends only to those things which are possible. God's omnipotence also does not mean that He can destroy himself or do evil. To do such things is inconsistent with His nature. God's omnipotence means that He can do anything that is logically possible and that is not inconsistent with any of his essential attributes. Only an omnipotent God can be an object of our devotion and reverence.

(d) Immutability : Eternity

God must be unchangeable, for to change is to change either for the worse or for the better. But God being perfect, cannot change for the worse Nor can he change for the better since what is less than supremely perfect can be improved. God's immutability in Anselm's view, implies that no change whatsoever can occur in God, either accidental or essential. God may, however, acquire the property of being worshipped by some one, without undergoing any change. Immutability, as Anselm understands it, relates closely to timelessness. A being in time changes in virtue of the fact that, with each passing moment, it becomes older. God is completely outside time and so is immutable. God is eternal, He always is. Whatever changes is non-eternal. God is above change, above time and so is eternal.

(e) Omnipresence

God is not only omniscient but is also omnipresent. The religious person believes God not only to be all-knowing but also to be present everywhere. God is said to be the ground of all existence and so he must be present in every tiny particle of the world of space and time. The notion of omnipresence of God is only a way of expressing the truth that the being of God is inseparable from his creation. God is everywhere in the sense that He makes his presence felt everywhere. As soul is operative throughout the body and stands in direct relation to all the bodily elements and yet cannot be located in any part of the body being a spiritual principle. In the same way, God pervades the entire universe and being spiritual He also cannot be said to be located in any specific part of the universe.

(f) Creatorship

Theists are of the view that God has created the universe from nothing. But as nothing comes out of nothing, the statement that God has created this universe out of nothing must be explained. As God is the ultimate principle and there is nothing beside God, God must be said to be creating the universe out of Himself. As the spider is said to spin its web out of itself, so we can say God has created this universe out of His own essence. As such every created being in the universe and the universe itself bears His essence. God cannot be said to have created this universe from some

preexisting matter or entity because there is nothing outside God. This proves that God is present in the universe and the universe is God's appearance. But then the question will arise: whether God exhausts Himself in the universe or God is also beyond this universe.

(g) Transcendence and Immanence

The attribute of creatorship leads to the question whether God is immanent in the world or transcends the world. The Deist believes God to be transcendent whereas the pantheist takes God to be immanent. Transcendence can be understood in the extreme sense as we find in Sankara, Thomas Aquinas and Paul Tillich. They believe God to be indeterminate because He transcends all our efforts of knowing Him and describing Him in words. God is for a theist both transcendent and immanent. He is everywhere in His infinite grandeur. But this limited universe of ours does not exhaust him. He is beyond and far above this universe. He is transcendent also.

(h) Personality

From the religious point of view God must be considered to be a person. The distinguishing features of personality are feeling, thinking and willing. We worship God and pray for His grace in religion. We express our devotion in our religious activities. If God is viewed as Impersonal Absolute, our prayer, our devotion and acts of worship will lose all significance. And so God must be conceived as a person who hears our prayer, is moved by our suffering and takes steps to eradicate our sufferings. He has feeling, understanding and will. He acts to relieve us from our sufferings. One can say that to attribute personality to God is anthropomorphism. We ought not to think of God in terms of man, we must not humanize Him. But to attribute personality to God is not to limit Him. He is a super person. He loves us, but His love is not human love which is always selfish; His love for man is not for any purpose. It is selfless love. He is perfect and not imperfect like us. His love is His grace, His essential nature in action.

(i) Moral Attributes of God

Religion is essentially related with morality. A religion must express itself in moral conduct of the devotee. The religious Ideal must also be moral Ideal. God as a religious ideal is object of our devotion not only because of His being omnipotent, omniscient, perfect and eternal but also because He has created us and equipped us with all the comforts of life. God is worshipped because of His being a moral Ideal. What attributes characterise such a moral Ideal?

Goodness

God has created this universe out of His free will for the good of His entire creation. He is supremely Good. His Goodness is exhibited in the entire creation. The sun gives light, life and heat so necessary for the survival and development of all beings. He has given rain which can be put to so many uses. God is good and wants that every creature in this world may be good. He wants man to be Good. He has given man freedom of will, so that He may develop Himself and be Godlike.

Forgiveness and Love

Man forgets the mission of God and acts in ways detrimental to the intentions of God. God does not feel offended but is ready to forgive those who come with a clean heart and confess their error. God incarnates Himself in Jesus Christ, Moses, Mohammed and various saints to show human beings the right path for good life and godliness. When Jesus was being put to death on the cross, he prayed to God to forgive the people who were pelting him with stones. His Forgiving Nature knows no bounds.

Benevolence and Righteousness

God is not cruel to any one. The evildoers and the sinners also enjoy the benefits of His creation equally with the virtuous. His benevolence extends to all.

God is also righteous. He is the Moral governor who dispenses justice coupled with mercy. He is just and kind. He rewards the virtuous and punishes the sinners according to their deserts (merits and demerits).

The ultimate aim of this universe is to develop Goodwill and persons having goodwill. God Himself is infinitely good, just and righteous.

15.3 Summary

God is an object of worship. He must have all excellent qualities in the highest degree. He must be omnipotent, omniscient, intelligent creator of this vast universe. He must be perfect, eternal and immutable. Himself unchanging, he must be the ground of all changes. He must be a personalistic God who has feeling, willing and thinking. He is moved by our sufferings. He hears our prayer and takes measures to relieve His devotees of their afflictions. He has foreknowledge of every event. He knows our past, present and future. He is a moral Governor. He wishes the good of all. He wants his creation to be an expression of Goodwill. He is forgiving, benevolent and kind. He incarnates Himself in bodily form for establishing righteousness and for mitigating evil. He is dispenser of justice and righteousness. He is free and necessary existence. Himself undetermined, he determines everything. He is infinite and causa sui.

15.4 Key words

- (a) Omnipotent : All powerful
- (b) Omniscient : All knowing
- (c) Omnipresent : present everywhere

15.5 Questions for Exercise

15.5.1 Objective Questions

- (i) The attributes of God are
- (a) separable properties
 - (b) accidental qualities
 - (c) essences of God
 - (d) figment of human imagination.
- Answer— (c)
- (ii) God's omnipotence means
- (a) He can do anything absurd
 - (b) He can do everything that man can do
 - (c) He can do only what is logically possible
 - (d) He can do only what is logically possible and is consistent with His attributes.
- Answer— (d)

15.5.2 Short Answer Questions

- (i) Explain the omnipotence and omniscience of God.
- Answer— See 15.2.1(b) (c)
- (ii) Explain how God is necessary and immutable.
- Answer— See 15.2.1 (a) (d)

15.5.3 Long Answer Question

- (i) Explain the various attributes of God.
- Answer— See 15.2.1

15.5 Suggested Readings

1. A. Seth Pringle Pattison — The idea of God
2. S. Alexander — Theism and Pantheism
3. S. Alexander — Space Time and Deity Vol. II

PROBLEM OF EVIL : NATURAL AND MORAL EVIL

Lesson Structure

- 16.0 Objective
- 16.1 Introduction
- 16.2 Main Theme
 - 16.2.1 Natural Evils
 - 16.2.2 Moral Evils
 - 16.2.3 Problem of Evil
- 16.3 Summary
- 16.4 Key words
- 16.5 Questions for Exercise
 - 16.5.1 Objective Questions
 - 16.5.2 Short Answer Questions
 - 16.5.3 Long Answer Question
- 16.6 Suggested Readings

16.0 Objective

The objective of this Lesson is to explain the meaning of evil and the two kinds of evil : Natural and Moral. It also highlights the problem of evil for those who believe in God.

16.1 Introduction

The problem of evil has always been a knotty problem for the theists and philosophers. Buddha considered birth, old age and death as evils and devoted his entire life in finding out the final remedy of such evils. For Buddha human life is full of suffering. Sankhya distinguishes between three kinds of evil and aims at finding out the remedy of these evils. Evil refers to physical pain, mental suffering and moral wickedness. An enormous amount of human pain arises from people's inhumanity. This pain

includes such major scourges as poverty, oppression and persecution, war and all injustice, indignity and inequality that have occurred throughout history. Although a great deal of pain and suffering is caused by human action, there is more that arises from such natural causes as bacteria, earthquake storm, fire, lightning, flood and drought. The existence of evil poses a challenge to the theists.

16.2 Main Theme

Evil is defined as the absence of good. Death is an example of evil because it is absence of life. Suffering, falsity, ugliness, sin and poverty etc. are evils because they indicate absence of happiness, truth, beauty, virtue and wealth respectively. Happiness, truth, beauty and goodness are prime values and whatever contradicts or opposes these values are evils. Evils are chiefly responsible for human suffering. Evils have been classed into several kinds. On one classification evils may be metaphysical evils, physical evils and moral evils. Metaphysical evils are evils of creation. Every creation has certain inherent defects. They are inevitable evils. Physical evil is what causes bodily pains, like disease and death. Moral evils are due to abuse of freedom of will.

16.2.1 Natural Evils

Natural evils are evils present in Nature. Earthquakes, Flood, Torrential rain, Storm, Fire, Drought, Volcanoes, big deserts are examples of natural evils because they bring havoc to human existence. Wild animals like tigers, snakes, scorpions have their abode in Nature and they make human life and animal life an ordeal. Not only men but animals live in constant fear because of these wild animals. J.S.Mill's description of natural evils in his Three essays on Religion is worth mentioning. In his essay, "Is there More Evil than Good in Nature?" he says that Nature appears to be very harsh, cruel and completely immoral in her actions. Every day Nature engages in such evil acts as will bring death penalty to a human individual if he commits them. Thousands of living beings are destroyed by Nature when they become victims of excessive cold, heatstrokes, drought, flood, hurricane and earthquakes. According to Mill, Nature does not spare the virtuous. The sinners and the virtuous are treated alike without any sense of justice and equity by Nature. The virtuous also suffer by the cruelty of Nature. The question may be raised : "Are they really evils? Does Nature cause evils knowingly?" Nature is not conscious but is absolutely unconscious agent. Nature does not act consciously. Nature's acts cannot be judged as moral or immoral. Further it may be argued that being afflicted by natural calamities, man is forced to devise ways to outwit Nature. Famine and drought throw a challenge to man. Men come together, co-operate and moral qualities of sympathy, piety, kindness and service to humanity develop. Nature's activity therefore causes moral development. They are aids to morality. Such a reply, however, does not silence those who take the evils caused by Nature to be genuine. The loss of innocent lives caused by Nature's acts cannot be justified by such arguments. Even if it be admitted that the cruel acts of nature result in noble actions of men, the cruel acts will not be said to be good on any count. Natural evils are produced by Nature and are beyond human control.