

Do you know your real self ?

**A dissertation on the Self & Consciousness
from the view-point of
Science, Spirituality, Philosophy, Psychology,
Yoga, Religions & Commonsense**

*It includes two Papers, presented by the author at
International Conference on Science & Consciousness,
at Olympus, Greece
from January 3 to 7, 1993.*

Published by
**Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University,
Mount Abu, Rajasthan, India.**

Author : B.K.Jagdish Chander Hassija

First Edition 5000

Shivratri, 27th February, 1995

*Printed at
Om Shanti Press
'Gyanamrit Bhawan', Shantivan, Talhati
Abu Road - 307 026. Ph.: 22678*

© All rights reserved with the publisher.

Introduction

Knowing the Conscious and the Unconscious

Consciousness is believed by all as the substratum of all human actions. Man's thoughts, understanding, judgement, perceptions, learning, feelings, ambitions, goals, efforts, etc., are various expressions of his consciousness.

More than half the population of the world believes that consciousness is an essential and inherent attribute of an entity, called 'Soul'. They have the faith that the soul, by its very nature, is an entity different from the inorganic and the organic matter and the body and the brain. The world is thus divided into two major groups. One of these consists of people who believe in the existence of the soul and are called 'religious people' and the other consists of people who do not believe in its existence and are called 'non-religious' people. The religious people are further divided and subdivided into various sects and cults, depending upon what details they believe in about the soul and the Supreme Soul.

True knowledge of soul, however, is not a matter of superficial importance nor is it to be left to some philosophers or religious scholars to discuss. Since each and everyone of us is a conscient being, it concerns us all individually and severally. To deny ourselves the true knowledge of consciousness is to deny ourselves the right and the duty of living a meaningful life.

True knowledge of '*Consciousness*' should also include the knowledge of what Freud, the well-known German psychologist, called '*The Unconscious*'.

In the East, religious people in India, have, since very ancient times, been believing in *Sanskāras*. To some extent, the *Sanskaras* are like '*The Unconscious*' of Freud's Theory because these do not form the content of '*The Conscious*'. Man is normally not aware of them or their sources even though his personality and his behaviour, at all times, is influenced by his *Sanskaras*. His *sanskāras* do not leave him even in his dreams or his spiritual

efforts. In fact, these are so intimately related with man's peace and war or good and bad personality that it would be meaningless to talk of world peace, or a social, political or cultural change without talking of and planning and working for a change in man's *sanskāras*.

A research in, or an in-depth study of, *Sanskāras* and the methods of change will provide mankind with the essential tools for improving relationships among human beings and for making this world a better place to live in. Without the knowledge of 'The Unconscious', all the inventions of Science and Technology will not make the world peaceful even though they may make it comfortable. All the scholarship, erudition, religious rituals and *mantras* will also not help to land man in peace unless and until there is a change for the better in man's *Sanskāras* and unless man has been given the necessary consciousness-training.

Presently, there are different views held and expressed on this subject by various thinkers and various branches of knowledge. The present book discusses some of these.

Since Philosophy, Religion, Psychology, Quantum physics and some other fields of knowledge discuss '*Consciousness*', the subject has, therefore, been discussed briefly from the points of view of these.

The author had presented some papers at some International Conferences held on this subject. The book includes some of those papers also. The author hopes that readers would feel some clarity on this subject after having studied this book and would then make sincere efforts to learn the practical method of realising the self.

26th February, 1995

B.K.Jagdish Chander Hassija
19/17, Shakti Nagar,
Delhi-110 007.

CONTENTS

Chapter & Subject	Page No.
1. Introduction	
Knowing the Conscious and The Unconscious	... 03
Chapter - I	
1. The nature and identity of the self	... 11
2. What do Common Logic & Indian Philosophy say on this question?	... 12
3. The Observation and the Conclusion	... 13
4. The metaphysical and the material body	... 14
5. The difference between 'I' and 'My'	... 15
6. The self or soul exists even if it cannot be seen	... 15
7. The signs or characteristics of a soul	... 16
8. Philosophical arguments, based on the Law of Karma	... 16
9. The self carries its <i>sanskāras</i> with it	... 19
10. Peaceful and Divine in their original nature	... 20
11. Firm foundation layed for self-respect and also for worth and dignity of the human individual	... 20
12. All the problems arise from wrong belief about the real identity of the self	... 21
13. Different manifestations of Consciousness -- Mind, Intellect, Memory, Emotion, <i>Sanskaras</i>	... 22
14. The self is an infimeterimal point of light	... 23
15. Importance of conscious memory and Rajyoga	... 24

Chapter II

1. Consciousness in the light of the views of some other philosophers	25
2. Pythagoras	25
Xenophanes	25
Anaxagoras	25
Democritus	25
Socrates	25
3. Plato	26
Aristotle	26
Thomas Aquinas	26
4. Descarte	27
Leibniz	27
Kant	27

Chapter III

1. Consciousness from the spirituo-scientific perspective of Rajyoga	28
2. Consciousness from the perspective of Rajyoga Meditation	28
3. Scientific proof: Demonstrable and repeatable results	31
4. Support from other areas of research	32
5. Clinical tests	33
6. Scientific explanation of mind-body or self-brain contact...	33
7. Questions, addressed to those who consider mind as epiphenomenon	34
8. A sound identity for sound human relationships	35
9. A challenging question	35

10. All knowledge is for life	36
11. Divine Guidance and help and people's blessings..	37
12. This understanding answers scientific questions better	37

Chapter IV

1. Consciousness from a Religio-Spiritual perspective	39
2. Nature of self or consciousness from the perspective of religions	39
3. The core of Religions and Spiritual Thought	40
4. All religions believe	41
5. Consciousness from Spiritual and Religious perspective	43
6. Qualitative change by practice of this precept	44
7. The concept has consciously or unconsciously been the basis of society	44

Chapter V

1. Consciousness or self from the perspective of various sciences	46
2. Is not Thought an epiphenomenon of the brain?	47
3. What Karl Popper said about Consciousness as an emergent product?	48
4. Do altered states show that Consciousness is an emergent product?	49
5. Does analogy of a computer show that Consciousness is material?	49
6. Opinion of Eugene Wigner	50
7. "Consciousness is not a material force", said Thomas Huxley	51
8. "Consciousness does not come from neuro-physiological	

synthesis", said Sir John Eccles	51
9. Penfield's experiments show that consciousness is not an epiphenomenon of the brain	51
10. Mind-body contact takes place in the brain	52
11. Brain-death and not stopping of heart-beat shows disconnection	52
12. Experiments on the clinically dead	53
13. Visions of the Supreme Soul	53
14. Cases of Research on Re-incarnation	54
15. Research in the field of Hypnotic Age-regression	54
16. Explanation of unified experience in the light of Theory of Relativity and the Data-processing theory	55
17. Explanation of unified experience <i>vis-a-vis</i> Quantum Mechanics and Catastrophic Theory	56
18. The concept of soul strikes a balance between Free Will and Determinacy	58
19. The soul as an eternal point of energy <i>vis-a-vis</i> the Law of Entropy	59
20. Soul is re-charged or re-energised by Meditation and Entropy is reversed	62
21. Recycling of negative energy into positive reverses Entropy	62
22. Cases of split brain	63
23. Confirmation of the above view that there is only one person	66
24. Some questions or arguments with a touch of humour	67
25. The Split personality phenomenon	68

Chapter V

1. Consciousness or self and some systems of psychology	70
2. Behaviourists school of J.B.Watson	70
3. Gestalt School of Psychology	71
4. Hormic Psychology of Mc Dougall	72
5. Instincts points to the existence of the soul	72
6. The Theory of William Brown	74
7. James Ward's dynamic theory of the self and of subject-object duality	74
8. William James' doctrine of Mind as the stream of Consciousness	75
9. G.W.H.Myers' theory explaining transmudane energy	76
10. Sigmund Frennd's Psychology of the conscious, the Pre-conscious and the conscious	77
11. How is there unity and continuity without a persistent being?	80
12. 'Eternal Conflict' and Narcisstic State' discussed from the spiritual perspective	81
13. Oedipus Complex and Cathexis, viewed from spiritual perspective	82
14. Super-ego and Age-long values discussed	82
15. Spiritual review of child's Ego and Super-ego	83
16. Signs of change in Freund's view about yoga, etc. later	84
17. Explanation of opposite instincts	84
18. Personal pre-history also suggests existence of a soul	84

19. Adler's Individual Psychology	85
20. Feeling of insecurity and urge for superiority	85
21. All actions of every human being have a goal	86
22. Adler's agreement with Vaihinger and Kant about fictional goals	86
23. Adler's psychology of fictional goals and life-style	87
24. Adler's emphasis on social interest	87
25. Fundamental difference between Freud and Adler	88
26. Who is this individual that has all these?	89
27. What was the original stage of the self?	90
28. What led the soul to fall to have the feeling of inferiority?	90
29. Analytical Psychology of Jung	92
30. Law of Conservation of Energy applied to psychic energy	92
31. Intuition	94
32. Collective Consciousness	94
33. Archetypes	95
34. Persona and personality	95
35. A spiritual overview of Jung's psychology in order to explore his ideas on the self	96
35. The existence of the sanskarās and intuition also confirm the existence of the soul	96
36. 'Collective Consciousness, Archetypes' and the concept of 'persona' also confirm the existence of soul	97
1. Identity Crisis	100

*The nature and identity of the self
in the light of
Common Logic & Indian Philosophy*

“Do you know your *real* self? Are you aware of your *real* identity?” These questions were put to thousands of people across the world. In most cases, the answers given by them were substantially similar though there was difference in wording, mannerism and tone of the people who answered these questions. Some gave the name of their *profession* or designation, some spoke of their *nationality* and some others spoke of their *religion* and so on. A highly intellectual person, holding many degrees from a number of prestigious universities and Institutes of Technology was also asked this question. Following is the conversation that took place :

“Sir, may I ask you who you are. I hope that you won’t mind this question.”

“I am a Professor Emeritus in a university in California. My name is Mr.....”

“But, sir, what you have told is about your *profession*; you have also given the name of your *body* whereas I had asked who *you* are.”

“I’m sorry. Perhaps I did not understand your question. Even now it is not quite clear to me. What do you want to know?”

“Sir, as a conscient being, you had your existence even before you were appointed as a professor and even before your body was given this name.....”

“Yes; yes. So, what should be the answer ? I think that I should have said that I am an American — a citizen of America — because that is where I was born, where I was given this name, where I got my education and where I teach even now.”

“You have told me of *your nationality*. ’ thank you for that. But, my question was : ‘Who *you* are?’”

“Oh, I see. Perhaps you want to know my Faith. I am a Christian.”

“This is *your* Faith or the religion of *your* belief. But I am not asking about ‘*your*’ but about ‘*you*’. You have said about *your* profession, the name of *your* body, *your* country and *your* religion. But my question was about ‘*you*’ and not about ‘*your*’. Even as there is difference between ‘*I*’ and ‘*my* coat’ or ‘*I*’ and ‘*my* house’, so also is there difference between the *self* and the *body*.”

“Oh, I see what you mean. But I’m sorry. I don’t know, for sure, about the *self* as you say. I’ve told you what I knew and what I thought of me...”

The answers, as the one that is given above, show that most people had, never before, thought deeply on this question of the *real* identity of *the self*. Hardly did anyone know that the answer to this question determined their outlook, attitude, thought-pattern, behaviour and, finally, their state of mind and experience. Nor were most people aware that their answer to this question influenced their mood and had its effect on the atmosphere in their family and at their workplace and it influenced, more or less, all aspects of the society.

What do Common Logic & Indian Philosophy say on this question ?

‘*Who am I?*’ or ‘*What am I?*’— is indeed a very old question but it is as relevant today as it was when it was first raised. This question was, perhaps, one of the earliest questions that gave rise to various systems of philosophical reflection, contemplation and metaphysics. Man wanted to solve the mystery of his own existence and worked to solve the riddle of his own real identity. He wanted to understand wherefrom he had come and why he was here, what would happen after death and what was there before his birth, where was he then, and what is his role and goal. Many systems of philosophy developed round these questions and many religions came into existence to answer these questions.

We will not go much far into various systems of philosophy — Eastern and Western or Ancient and Modern — nor would we dwell on what each religion has said on this. We would confine only to what commonsense or layman's logic and also Indian Philosophy, in essence, say on this. The layman's logic or philosophical argument is based on one common observation.

The observation and the conclusion

All of us observe two kinds of entities or categories of existences in this world. One of these categories is of material things, made by man or created by Nature. For example, a bed, a bicycle, or an electric fan in a room are such *material things or objects* as have been made by man whereas the water in the river, the green forest, etc. are the works of Nature. The other category is of *persons*, not *things*. It is the category of '*beings*' as we call them. In this latter category are those who are capable of thinking, experiencing and acting with a purpose. These are the *subjects* for whom the first category of *objects*, such as water, bed, bicycle and fan, exist. Water, bed and fan do not have any ability of experiencing and they do not exist for their own sake. They are for the use of the subject, the beings or the persons. *The persons* or *the beings* find the meanings in the existence of *the things* like water or bed. In fact, the very existence of a bed, a bicycle or a fan shows that there must exist here some persons or beings for whose use these things have been provided by Nature or made by man himself. Especially, the things like the room, the bed, the fan, etc. which are an *assemblage of things* for specific uses or purposes very strongly indicate the existence of *a person* for whose use they are there. Don't we conclude the existence of a person there when we enter a room and see a moving fan and electric lights on and the bed ready for use even though we do not immediately see the person present there?

So also, layman's logic, commonsense and the basic logic of Indian Philosophy assert that the human body, which is an assemblage of organs — eyes, ears, nose, mouth, etc., which are for specific use, exists *not for its own sake* but for the purpose of

a user — a person who thinks, feels and acts, making use of it. The body is like a house, fitted with windows, doors, ventilators, sanitary conveniences, etc.; so, there must be an inmate in the body. The body is for the use of that inmate who uses or works with this mechanism.

The metaphysical soul and the material body

Indian philosophy calls this inmate the *Ātman* — *the self*. It is this one who uses the first person pronoun ‘*I*’, in singular form, for itself. This one is also called *Purusha* in some philosophical or religious texts because, if the body be compared to a *Puri*, i.e. a city, this person is the entrant, the in-dweller or the citizen. The very word “*body*” or ‘*deha*’ points to the separate identity of someone whose body or ‘*deha*’ it is. The self is called ‘*dehi*’. As the driver of a car is different from the body of the car so also the *self*, *dehi*, *purusha*, *Ātman* or the soul has a separate identity. The body is *material* or *physical* whereas the soul is non-physical; it is metaphysical. We all know that car has the *motor* power whereas the driver has the *motive* power, the intent, the will, the purpose or the goal, for it is the driver who gives the car a direction according to his goal and uses it at his will with the intent or purpose of going somewhere. So also, the soul or the *Ātman*, is different from the body. It is the soul which has intent, purpose, goal, will or motive and directs the body or decides when, how, where and why to use what part of it.

In some philosophical or spiritual texts, such as the Upanishads, the body has been compared to a chariot, the sense-organs to horses, the intellect to the reins and the soul to a charioteer. In Shrimad Bhagwad Gita, the famous scripture, also considered as one of the Upanishads, the body has been compared to the *dress*, and the *Ātman*, the soul or the self has been compared to *the person who wears* it. The Gita, which is also considered as a high-class philosophical classic, says that, as a person gives up an old or worn-out dress and puts on a new one, even so does the *Ātman* give up the old and take a new body time and again. The *Ātman* itself *never dies*; it only gives up the body — which is its

dress — and the soul is *never born* also; it only takes a new body as one puts on a new dress. So, *death*, according to the Gita - Philosophy, is merely the change of one's dress and also address. The self is thus a traveller here, for it never stays at one place, in one body for ever. It is moving on a journey towards a goal though some have been lost in this journey and some have even forgotten the goal.

The difference between 'I' and 'My'

Layman's logic points to the existence of two different entities — the soul and the body or the *Ātman* and the *deha* in another way also. Consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, we generally maintain the distinction between 'I' and 'my'; we use 'I' for the 'self' and 'my' for things which 'I', as a person, use or possess. For example, everyone says; 'This is *my* house' or 'this is *my* car'; no one ever says 'I am a car' or 'I am a house.' Similarly, everyone says: 'This is *my* face, these are *my* ears or *my* eyes" no one ever says : 'I am the eyes, the ears or the face.' So, when someone says: 'This is *my* body', his statement implies that the one who says this is different from the body. This, therefore, points to the distinction between the self and the body or *Ātman* and *deha*. The pronoun 'I' stands for the person, the subject, the being whereas 'my' stands for what belongs to, relates to or is possessed, owned or used by that person. The former is *conscient* and *metaphysical* whereas the latter is *material* in case it is the body or something that is used by the body.

The self or soul exists even if it cannot be seen

Some people doubt the existence of the soul on the ground that it cannot be seen whereas the body and the brain can be seen. Such people believe in the existence of a thing only if they can see it. Little do they realise that if one always applied this reasoning, one will have to give up his belief in the existence of many things, for there are so many entities that are invisible to the naked eyes. Our eyes have a particular range of vision, and things can be seen by them if only they are within that range. For seeing things or objects beyond that range, we have to use telescope or microscope. Still there are many things which cannot be seen

even with aided eyes. There are things, the existence of which is *inferred* by the influence or effect which they exert. For example, when an electric fan is working, we say that there is electric current there; we cannot *see* electricity but we *infer* its existence because we see that the fan is moving. When the fan begins to slow down and then stops, we *infer* that the light has gone, i.e., the electric current is no longer there. We do not *see* the current 'going' but we only infer its presence or absence by noticing the effect in either case. Similarly, by taking notice of certain signs, we infer soul's presence in, or absence from, the body.

The signs or characteristics of a soul

Some systems of Indian Philosophy, such as the Vaisheshika, have said that (1) Desire, (2) Experience of happiness and sorrow or pain and (3) Effort or meaningful and purposeful activity are the signs of the self or soul. These are not the characteristics of the material body but the conscient and metaphysical soul. When the self or the soul leaves the body, the latter lies like a log of wood. In fact, it is for making efforts or doing action by means of the body and for experiencing the result thereof in the form of happiness or pain that the body is given to the soul.

Philosophical argument, based on the Law of Karma

Indian Philosophy gives another argument, based on common logic and also on parallels from the administration of Law and Justice in the world. We observe that even the temporal or statutory law is based on the principle that only he, who has committed a crime, will be punished so that others be discouraged from violating the law. An innocent person must not be punished. Instead, he must be protected by the law. Moreover, the punishment accorded to a tried and proven criminal must be proportionate to the severity of the crime. These are the elementary principles of Justice and violation of these principles is 'Injustice'. Now, keeping in mind these principles of natural justice, one would like to know why do some infants, from the very time of their birth, suffer from some acute physical disease or from

some mental discomfiture or ailment. What crime, sin or wrong they have done at that tender age when even their sense-organs have not yet developed? They do not have even the capacity to commit a crime or a sin at least at the physical level. Is their suffering not some kind of a *punishment*? If not, then what is it? Is not the *law of cause and effect* operative in such cases at that time? In other words, what is *the cause* for their sufferings?

Sufferings appear in many forms. For example, some children are born to a family which is backward in every respect. Others have a good start because they are born to parents who have health, wealth, character, education and happiness. Does this happen *without a cause*?

Indian Philosophy says that, besides the State-laws, there is operative, in this world, another law, called the *Law of Karma*. According to Indian philosophy, every human action has a moral aspect. If a person's certain act is morally *good*, the person gets ultimately benefited. If, on the other hand, his acts are morally *bad*, he suffers. It would require lot of space to express elaborately the Law of Karma and also what is morally good and what is bad but, in one sentence, it may be said that, if a person acts under the influence of hatred, anger, lies, prejudice, greed, ego, partiality, attraction for sexuality, then his actions are *bad* or negative. These create disharmony and conflict and sufferings in the society. On the other hand, if a person has a balanced judgment, stability of mind, peace of the spirit and also he acts with the feeling of love, justice, sympathy, humility and the like, then his acts are *good* because such acts promote harmony, peace, unity and happy feelings. Keeping this elementary distinction between *good* and *bad* in mind, and keeping also in view the foundation of the Law of Karma, enunciated in the well-known proverb; "As you sow, so shall you reap", we may now think over the above-stated cases of the birth of children and answer the question whether the sufferings of those children, born with a disease, or born to backward parents, were without any cause, whatsoever?

If our answer is that there must have been some cause, then

the question would arise about the time of the cause. Naturally, the cause of the suffering must lie in the time *before* the birth of these infants because *the cause always precedes the effect*. This then leads us to the conclusion that the person or the being who is before us in the form of an infant now must have committed some actions under the influence of negative factors that clouded his judgment and impelled him to do such actions as caused sufferings to others. Conclusively, therefore, this means that this person or being existed even before this birth. So, it must, by its very nature, be different from the body.

Extending the application of the Law of Karma to the future, it would be correct to say that the person or the conscient being which is in the form of the infant now, will also continue to exist when his body, having become dead, is buried or burnt because he will have to get reward or suffer punishment for his actions done in this life. His own existence must not end with this body else the Law of Karma would cease to be operative and this would suggest that a person can escape punishment for his bad acts if and when he dies.

Also, the *Law of Cause and Effect* operates in the form of an eternal series as the links of an endless chain. It does not stop suddenly at one end because, at every step, the effect works as a cause and gives rise to another effect and this series of cause - effect - cause - effect... goes on. We may not be able to keep pace with it and continue to trace its track because of our own limitations but the forces of cause - effect - cause - effect... continue endlessly. So, the series of birth and death also remains unbroken because the series of *Karmas* continues. There may be a little pause between a cause and its effect and *the effect* may, at some stage, work as *the cause* for the first cause of the chain and may thus form a cycle but it cannot *end* finally and *for ever*. This Law of Cause and Effect and the Law of Karma and the principles of natural justice thus lead us to conclude that the '*conscient being*' reincarnates and this series of reincarnations must be cyclic though it may have a pause for a period, and the pace of reincarnations may speed up or slow down, but it must not stop *for ever and for ever*. Even if we do not agree as to whether the series of reincarnations is cyclic or linear, one thing to which all the six systems

of Indian Philosophy agree is that the '*conscient being*' in the body does not have *only one* birth but, instead, it has a number of reincarnations. This means that *the self*, which is the conscient being in the body, does not die when the body dies nor is it born when the body is born but rather the truth is that it existed before the body and continues to exist after the dead body is disposed of. In other words, it is beginningless and endless in time, i.e., it is *eternal* and *immortal*. And, a logical conclusion of this is that the self or the soul is an entity that is different from the body.

The self carries its *samskaras* with it

All systems of Indian Philosophy also agree that the actions done by the self, the soul, the *Ātman* or the *Purusha* leave behind them some tendencies, inclinations or personality - traits. These are called *Samskāras*. These remain there in the form of latent or dormant memories and work as matrix for future actions. These influence, at a sub - conscious or unconscious level, the thought-pattern, the outlook, the attitudes, the behaviour, the vision and the goal of every human being. These appear in the form of acquired virtues or vices and, thus, enlighten or vitiate a person's total life- style, mannerism and ways. Some say that these *Samskāras* are embedded in the soul itself whereas others say that there is a *causal body* in which the soul is encased and the *Samskāras* are stored in that causal body which is very subtle and is invisible to our eyes-of-flesh. The *Samskāras* also goad and motivate for an action, or prevent and paralyse a soul from doing an action, though the current factors also have their own force of motivating or preventing. When a soul gives up a body, it takes the *Samskāras* with it on its journey into the next body. The *Samskāras*, initially, determine the personality - traits and the state of happiness or sorrow of the 'self' in the new body. The *Samskāras* explain why there is the difference in the personality - traits and state-of-mind of two babies born to the same parents even as twins. The *Samskāras* also explain that *the self* existed before it came into this body and that it is an entity different from the body. The *Samskāras* also mark the distinction of

one individual from the other and explain the vast diversity among human beings.

Peaceful and Divine in their original nature

All the systems of Indian Philosophy declare with one voice that the soul, or all the souls, are peaceful and divine in their original nature and the present differences in their qualities, habits or nature, whether these are real or apparent, are due to the *Samskāras* acquired during their earthly life. They point out that if the souls are awakened from ignorance (*Avidyā*), enlightened by means of Divine knowledge of the self, then their divine potential can flower and they can break the shackles, formed by the Karma, and can get liberated from the vices or the Evils and the *Samskāras* formed by the Negativity and can, finally, have Release, Liberation, Salvation, Freedom, Redemption or Emancipation from the afflictions of *Māyā* and from sorrows and sufferings.

Thus all the systems of Indian Philosophy assert that the identification of the *metaphysical self* with the *material* and mortal body is the root cause of all our negative tendencies, vices, bondages, sorrows and sufferings. They, therefore, emphasise with all the force of philosophical arguments that we must realise our original nature of Purity, Divinity and Peace and must return to it by the practice of stabilising our selves in our own *real* nature, for without that, there can be no liberation (*Mukti*) or Beatitude or Fruition (*Jeevan - Mukti*).

Firm foundation layed for self-respect and also for worth and dignity of the human individual

Even if the above philosophical theory is, by any logic, contradicted, it has, undeniably, the potential of building an un-ending reservoir of self-respect and an unshakable foundation for belief in the dignity of the human being whatever be his present (acquired) nature. *And, self-respect is the quality or the value that gives a person a strong feeling of self-confidence and the ability to stabilise in a state of courage and to sustain one's strength of character and will. Respect for others gives the basis to relate to others, maintaining dignity, royalty, grace, humility*

and acceptance of what others are and as they are. These, in turn, lead to trust, goodwill and co-operation and all these, finally, give Harmony to the society. So, this philosophical theory gives birth to social, economic, political, administrative and communication theories of great merits. These merits, in themselves, are not of little value and one finds that, without these, life loses its essence, meaning, message, ideal, goal, necessity, fulfilment and everything. This single belief in the separate identities of the soul and the body is not only a great morale-booster but the paradigm and the world-view based on it, change the whole outlook, attitude and behaviour - pattern of a person. Without this, not only does man get devalued, all other actions of man, including the values which we generally cherish and talk about, also get devalued. We stand or fall with this single belief in the self as a metaphysical being which is, originally, divine and is eternal and immortal and can rise to great height by the ladder of his Karma. This theory paves the path of morality for humankind. Remove this theory and the road to reality and royalty and moral norms or morality will cave in or will develop cracks and cavities.

**All the problems arise from wrong belief
about the real identity of the self**

If a person believes that nothing else but *the body is the self* and the two are not different, then he develops only *materialistic* outlook and bases his life-style on *materialistic* values. He gives utmost importance to *material* things, material attainments and to *material* goods and mundane objects. His goal is to achieve success in material pursuits by any means, whatsoever. He considers others also as objects to be used *for his material* wellbeing. Spirituality and divinity have no place in his scheme of things. He is not prepared to make **sacrifices** for the good of others nor is he prepared to have any brotherly concern for the common good of all. *Even if he talks of love, justice and sympathy, these are centered round the material aspect of these values.* So, he becomes *selfish*, ultra-competitive and even *aggressive* in his ways because *material* survival, *material* security and all things

that are of *Matter* become his main concern. He becomes *greedy* and wants to grab and accumulate even if others are deprived and are starved in this process. This gives to him an attitude of *sex-lust* also for he feels drawn towards the material body and its colours and contours. He considers persons of another gender or even the same gender as physical objects of sex-gratification. When he has accumulated material things, he develops *pride* and arrogance. He believes in the proverbial saying : “(Physical) Might is right.” If anyone stands in his way of fulfilling his ambitions for things of this material world, he becomes *angry*, feels *hatred* and *enmity* and gets *prejudiced*. **Thus, all vices are born from this wrong belief in the self as the body. All litigation, all crimes, all kinds of violations of Law & order issue forth from this *body-consciousness*. All disharmony and social, economic and political conflict also are born from this.** Bride-burning, woman-beating, child-abuse, divorce, fragmentation of the family or the society, in fact all troubles, tensions and traumas are the result of — *body-consciousness*.

Different manifestations of Consciousness

As Electricity is known by various names, depending upon its different manifestations such as *Light* in an electric bulb, *Power* when moving a machine, *Heat* in a hotplate and *Electro-magnetic* force in electronic devices, so also is consciousness known by different names according to its various manifestations. it is known as *Mind* when it manifests as thought, *Intellect* when it manifests as judgement, *Memory* when it retains, recalls or recollects the information, *Emotion* when it *experiences sympathy*, love justice etc. *Samskāras* when it manifests or rests in the form of different tendencies, and so on. These find expressions in various forms and all these have a moral dimension.

Some systems of philosophical thought consider *Mind* as the *subtle body* which is within our gross body that is made of flesh and bones. They consider *Intellect* as the body that is more subtle than even the mental sheath and they also believe in a ‘*causal body*’ which, they think, is the most subtle body. These three are encased one into the other and the soul is believed to be

encased in the causal body. These bodies are considered to be made of subtle Matter. **The truth, however is that the *Ego, Intellect, Mind, etc.*, are not material in nature but the very Consciousness or the soul-energy becomes manifest as thoughts, memory, etc, as it comes into contact with the material body.** The soul does have an aura which appears in the form of subtle body, having different brightness, depending upon the degree of its purity.

The self is an infinitesimal point of light

Some systems of Indian Philosophy consider the soul infinitesimal. They say that it is smaller than an atom. Some Upanishads have said that it is of the size of a thumb whereas others have said that there is a cosmic soul which is infinite. However, all agree that when it is in the body, the soul, as an individual or *Jiva*, is infinitesimal. **It is a point-of-light which is spiritual in its nature and divine in its original potential and is different from the mundane light.**

Philosophers and saints have written different interpretations and commentaries on the Upanishads, the Gita and the Vedanta. Shankaracharya, Ramanujacharya, Vallabhacharya, etc. are considered as great proponents of various kinds of Monism, and Madhavacharya of Dualism and Dayananda and many others have advocated plurality of souls and have said that the soul is atomic in size and is eternal and immortal and God and Matter are two other eternal entities besides the souls. Quoting from the same sources as Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya, Dayananda has pointed out where the former have erred in their interpretations. If a person applies his mind to the arguments of various schools, given for and against each other's system or interpretation and considers their arguments with impartiality, he would come to the system which Brahma Kumaris' school enunciates. One would come to the conclusion that the soul, the self or the *Ātman* is an infinitesimal point-of-Light that is *eternal* and *immortal* and has the original nature of purity and peace and that God is the Supreme among all souls and is the Parent Soul who is above birth and death and is Knowledgeful, Peaceful, Blissful,

Loveful and Almighty and that Matter is inconscient and is the third entity.

However, the above-stated fundamental philosophical tenets of Brahmakumaris are not derived from anyone of the six philosophical systems or the Upanishads even though these are supported by these systems of Philosophy and the Upanishadas and particularly by Shrimad Bhagwad Gita. The Brahma Kumaris' system does not depend for its legitimacy on anyone of the scriptures or philosophical treatises but its source is direct Divine Revelations even though its validity is confirmed by impartial reasoning and by Shrimad Bhagwad Gita and the system of Raj-Yoga.

Importance of Conscious memory and Raj Yoga

Indian Philosophy has explained the great importance of *Memory* in the effort for rise in moral quality. It has said that man's personality is greatly determined by his *conscious memory*. It has also pointed out that *man's state of mind is as the contents of his memory are. In so saying, it has made a great contribution in being selective to our learning, retention and recall in order that we may be able to lead a better life.* It has also emphasised that man should not study obscene periodicals nor be an intimate friend of people who say or do bad things. It has laid great stress on the importance of Raj-Yoga, Dhyān Yoga, Buddhi Yoga or Gyān Yoga so that man focuses his conscious mind or purposeful attention on God and His qualities so that spiritual values may fill his soul. We will, therefore, discuss consciousness in the perspective of Raj-Yoga in a separate chapter which actually is the Paper -I, presented by the author at an International Conference on Science and Consciousness, held in Athens, from January 3 to 7, 1993.



Consciousness in the light of the views of some other philosophers

Earlier, we have had a brief overview of some systems of Indian Philosophy such as The *Sāmkhya*, *The Nyāya*, **The Vaisheshika**, etc. We made very quick and short references to only some of the systems and even those also were of a very limited area of these systems. In such a condensed and concise treatment of this subject, our effort to make a few references to other systems of philosophy or to certain philosophers may not be of much merit. However, with the hope that even a very brief reference to some other philosophers would make some contribution to supplement the view expressed earlier, we will add here, selectively, the views of some philosophers in regard to the nature of the Self or Consciousness.

The Greek philosopher, **Pythagoras** considered the souls as *incorporeal* essence. He believed in the survival and re-incarnation also of souls. He also thought that the souls were rewarded or punished according to their deeds.

Xenophanes identified Mind with Perception, Thought and Powers of Will and acting. He also asserted that Mind or Thought or God is of divine essence. He said: "Only one God exists, the greatest of gods and humans. Neither in mind nor in body does He resemble us mortals. He is wholly the Eye and the Ear and wholly Thoughts, Power of Will and acting."

Anaxagorus said that *Nous*, i.e., Mind, is the most rarified or subtle thing and it has the knowledge with respect to everything and has the greatest power.

Democritus opined that the soul was atomic and was energy like (yellow-red) fire.

Socrates has very clearly spoken of the soul as different from the body. He explained that the body is mortal and the soul is immortal and is subject to some moral laws. As reported in

Phaedo (the dialogue in which Plato describes Socrates's last hours in prison before his death), Socrates said that *Mind* or *Thought* or *Reason* always pursued an *aim, purpose* or *end*. He said that man should try to live for what was best. Socrates had so strong a belief in the self as a moral entity that he preferred to take a cup of poison and die rather than run away from Athens. It is clear that he believed that soul or consciousness survived physical death and that it had a moral dimension.

Plato recognised Mind or Soul as an active principal, working to control the body. He thought that the soul had two stages of development — the irrational stage (seated in the heart or the lower body) and the rational stage (seated in the head).

According to Plato, human behaviour flowed from three main sources (1) desire, (2) emotion and (3) knowledge. He characterised soul by three signs — (1) Movement (2) Sensation and (3) Incorporeality. He said that the Mind has three parts — (1) Reason (2) Activity, Energy or Liveliness (*Thymos*) and (3) the lower appetites. He said that there is a struggle between the lower and the higher ones.

Aristotle thought that there are two parts of a soul — lower (irrational) and higher (rational) and that the *higher soul survives physical death*. Like Socrates, he also thought that moral action be done for its own sake because Virtue is its own reward.

Thus, the early Greek Philosophy seems to suggest that most of the famous philosophers believed that the Self is different from the body. Though there is not much of clarity and homogeneity, yet at least this much is clear that Pythagoras and Socrates believed in the existence of an immortal soul that continued to exist even after the body and reincarnated also.

Among other philosophers, special mention may be made of Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1225), Descartes (A.D.1596) and Leibniz (1646-1716).

Thomas Aquinas discussed philosophically many aspects of the metaphysical self and of God. From his writings, it seems that he believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body. He also said that Emotions and Will are subordinate to

intellect.

Descarte's statements "*Cogito ergo sum*" — I think, therefore I am and "*Dubita ergo sum*", i.e., even if you doubt in your existence, your doubting proves your existence. He explained that the pineal gland was the seat of the soul and , from there, the soul worked with the body as one works with a machine. He suggested inter-actionism as the solution to the body-mind contact problem. His mechanical and reductionist approach was criticised by many others later and is criticised to this day. Some even alleged that he talks of "ghost in the machine". Descarte's 'atomic analysis' of the psychic structure, no doubt, neglects the fluid continuity of experience. His idea that the soul dwells at the pineal gland may also not be correct but this does not mean that his body-mind dualism is wrong. He has argued very logically that the soul is separate from the body.

Leibniz said the soul is like a Monad or an atom. He emphasised that it is infinitesimal. He advocated the plurality of souls.

Kant teaches, by contrast, that the things in themselves are unknowable. Yet he makes strong suggestion that, as moral characters, we are ourselves things-in-themselves. He also said that, even if soul, world and God do not exist as separate entities, it is better to think on if these do exist because this approach enables to discuss and solve many problems about cosmos and the nature of Reality. His emphasis on moral aspects of soul or Consciousness promoted values in life.

Thus, we find that most of the above philosophers also believed that the soul is an entity different from the body.



Consciousness from the Spirituo-Scientific Perspective of Rajyoga

In this paper*, the term ‘*Spiritual*’ or ‘*Spirituality*’ does not refer to any particular religion nor does it refer to any religious rituals. It simply refers to one’s rational belief in one’s own identity as a *metaphysical self* which is basically different in nature from the body, including the brain, and from Matter and from all its forms. And, since one’s belief influences one’s mind-set, the term refers to one’s outlook, attitudes, values, preferences, priorities, life-style, relationships, memory-content and behaviour, all based on the belief in the metaphysical self. The term ‘*Spirituality*’ refers also to a simple *spiritual practice*, such as silent Meditation which is based on the afore-said *belief* and which strengthens one’s *moral sense*, restores one’s inner harmony and equipoise, reforms and improves one’s *outlook* and *attitudes* and also gives relaxing, uplifting, enriching and ecstatic supersensuous or extrasensory *experiences*.

Consciousness from the perspective of Raj-Yoga Meditation

Since practicals, done under specified conditions, prove a theory and give validity to, or, credibility in, a model, let us discuss Consciousness, first, from the perspective of Raj-Yoga Meditation which is like a Science-practical and has been tested by medical researchers, clinicians, psychologists, psychiatrists and health scientists.

Raj-Yoga Meditation is a profoundly deep subject which

*This chapter was, originally, Paper-I, presented by the author at the IIIrd International Symposium on Science and Consciousness, held at Olympia on Jan 3, 1993.

opens to us many deep vistas of our mind and lays bare before us vast reservoirs of happiness and bliss which, hitherto, lay hidden from our view. Here, let us consider only one very elementary and rudimentary aspect of its practice.

When a person is introduced to the practice of Raj-Yoga Meditation, he occupies his mind with the thoughts: “I am a soul; a point of consciousness; a *Being-of-Light*. My original nature is of love, piety and peace. I am a *point of self-aware light* and spiritual energy. I am an eternal being, a child of God Who also is an Incorporeal Being-of-Light and is Knowledgeful and All-Peace, All-Bliss, All-Love and also Kind, Compassionate and Loving...”

The practitioner has the above thoughts to the exclusion of all other thoughts, such as the thoughts relating to his body, friends, relatives, profession and whatever else there is in this *gross*, material or physical world. He has heightened awareness of only spiritual or metaphysical identity and, in this awareness, is the imagery of an infinitesimal *Point-of-Light*, having an aura, for the self is like that.

In this practice, he also turns his attention to God Who is the Supreme among all souls and is the Incorporeal Being-of-Light Who loves all.

When one fixes one's mind in this mental affirmation, one feels that one is at a better level of consciousness. One experiences calmness and quietude and has an exhilarating feeling of lightness. One has also the feeling of enhancement or activation of one's spiritual and moral power. When one rises from this easy Samādhi, or stage of stability and tranquillity, one feels a great inner upsurge of self-confidence, enthusiasm, noble thoughts and benevolence. One feels drawn to this experience again and again and has an inspiration to live it, to be immersed in it and to be it. There being a qualitative difference between what one used to experience in one's day-to-day life earlier and this higher meditational experience and its spill-over, influencing the rest of the day, one hears an inner voice from the deep silence, saying to him: “Well, this is life; this is the real thing; this is extremely

valuable. Why did I overlook this earlier? Wasn't it a lapse on my part or mere misfortune to miss it? At least let me resolve now not to miss it in future....” Then one goes again and again into this experience of peace and bliss. When one goes into one's daily routine, after some experience of this Meditation, with a natural smile on one's face, love in one's eyes and sincerity in one's mind, people feel a subtle change in this practitioner, for he is now more loving, more co-operative, more honest, more sincere and more efficient. He has now certain abiding principles and has a spirit of service. He has goodwill for all. Jealousy, Anger, Greed and Wasteful and Negative Thinking are reduced in intensity, longevity and range and the mood is better and stable, and the level of anxiety, fear and tension has come down if at all it is still there. If the person had some criminal tendencies before, their grip on his mind has at least been loosened. If the practitioner had the habits of smoking, drinking or drug-abuse, he has now developed a distaste in these and his *will* has strengthened so that he now feels a strong urge to give these up and has regained the confidence to do it. He finds that this practice has made him a better person spiritually, morally, socially, politically and in other respects. Those who come in contact with him, observe this influence of Meditation on him gradually or quickly taking place. **So, this experiment has scientific verification and its results have confirmation in the laboratory of life provided one practises it properly as one maintains laboratory-conditions while performing scientific experiments. This is an experiment in the Laboratory of the Mind — Gedanken as Einstein would have called it in German.**

But there is yet another side to this experiment. Perhaps, this can be tested with some scientific devices too. Change in behaviour, life-style, spiritual experience, etc. may be hard to measure with a scientific instrument but this other aspect of Meditation has been *quantitatively* and *qualitatively* measured by using appropriate *scientific scales*.

As has been reported in books and periodicals during the last about forty years or so, and is *a demonstrable truth*, Meditation has a very positive influence on our psychophysical system. **The brain-wave, the blood pressure, the muscle-tone, the blood-lactate,**

the heart-beat, the breathing rate, etc., of a person in Meditation indicate that he is in a relaxed state of mind. In fact, Meditation influences every cell of the body in a positive way and gives better immunity. It helps manage or cure many psychosomatic diseases. It liberates the mind from tension and *increases clarity of thought, efficiency, and power of judgement. It places one's relationship with others on a morally sound basis* and takes a person out of negativity and morbidity and vicious circles of various sorts — both in the *physical* and the *mental* world.

Scientific proof : Demonstrable and repeatable results

So, this scientifically, attitudinally and behaviourally tested practice shows that, while in Meditation, a person is in harmony with himself and with his body, and this influence manifests in the form of harmony with other living beings and with Nature and Environment. In other words, it proves that this is our 'natural state of being.' This experience lasts not merely as long as one is in Meditation but rather, it extends to some period beyond the duration of practice so that one constantly has, during this period, the feeling which may be expressed in these words: *"Well, this is me — the real me. I feel light and free. This is the life worth living. This is good. Oh, fine; Really fine; Very nice!"*

Now let us see, in retrospect, what were the essential constituents of the awareness or the mental affirmation during Raj-Yoga Meditation. It had the element of *non-physical self-identity*, for the practitioner said to himself, *"I am a metaphysical point of Light.* It had the *moral* ingredients as well, for it affirmed that the self, in its original nature, is *pure* or pious. It had the *emotional* content, for it said that *love* is the original nature of *the self*. It had also the *experiential* aspect, for it mentioned *peace*. It also referred to the *relationship* of the self with God, thus putting relationship on a much higher pedestal and on *non-physical* basis. Moreover, it also drew *attention* to the *values* of kindness and compassion while being aware of God who has these attributes. And, basically, the affirmation itself was *Thought, Awareness* and *Attention*. Or, it was an *activated Belief* or a *realisation* of truth. *Now, let us ask ourselves whether moral values, emotions, expe-*

rience of solace and inner peace, and realisation of Truth, are made up of Matter or its various forms of energy?

Can these be synthesised in a laboratory from any material ingredients? Can these be explained in terms of Chemistry, Physics or Biology? **When there are no external stimuli and it is only self-awareness of a metaphysical kind (for it excludes all thoughts of Matter and the material world) and this special kind of awareness results in harmony, satisfaction, sense of attainment and pleasant feeling from a non-physical source or event, or a joy of supersensuous kind, would it not be proper to conclude that the subject is a *non-physical* or a *non-material*, i.e. a *spiritual being*? If these non-physical noumena are the stuff of which the self is made, or if these are the elements of which the self is 'constituted', would it not be reasonable to conclude that the self is *non-physical*?**

If greater and greater degree of identification with the body, matter or its forms results in more and more disequilibrium and disharmony, wouldn't it be natural to conclude that the nature of the self is *non-material* and *metaphysical*? If nothing in the material world, including the world of electro-magnetic fields, subatomic quanta, computers and robots, has '*experience*', '*emotions*' or '*self-awareness*' as its core, wouldn't it be wrong to consider the self as an epiphenomenon of brain or matter? If we do not have any model as yet in Physics, Chemistry or Biology and in the matter-of-fact or the imaginary world, wouldn't it be better to accept this common-sense view, which is *experientially verifiable* and *scientifically testable*, that the *self* is a *spiritual being*?

Support from other areas of research

Especially when we have evidence from the investigated and verified cases of re-incarnation, scientifically collected and examined case-histories of Out-of-Body Experiences (OBE), Near-Death Experiences (NDE), and hypnotically age-regressed cases to support the truth that the *self survives the physical death*, and we have the paranormal and extrasensory experiences also that support this view, would it be wrong even then to think that *the self* is non-physical and that it is not an emergent phenomenon of the brain?

Clinical tests

Many clinical tests have shown that though limbic system and hippocampus are associated with our emotions, yet these are the brain-parts used for exteriorisation or manifestation only; these are not the experiencer. Researchers have been able to evoke emotional responses by applying electrodes, etc. to these parts of the brain but the subject did not feel anger or such other emotions. Only physical manifestation of *pseudo*-anger could be elicited while the subject himself laughed and felt amused at the happening.

Scientific explanation of mind-body or self-brain contact

With all the evidence available, it seems that it would be reasonable to conclude that the field of the non-physical self has its contact with the subtle field of the physical quanta in the sub-cortical region of the brain at and around the hypothalamus, thalamus, limbic system, hippocampus and the brainstem or what some researchers have called: the *psychotropic region*. It is now well-known that this region acts as a link between the psyche (Mind) and the soma (Body). It is now being increasingly realised that human consciousness is a composite entity, so to say which is homogeneously inclusive of (1) general awareness, (2) emotional experience, (3) analytical consciousness and (4) 'awareness of awareness' or awareness of all these abilities and that all these four are, in one way or the other, linked as a field to the field formed by hypothalamus, limbic system, hippocampus and brainstem, and the emotional elements were attributed to the limbic system, memory to hippocampus, and incisive consciousness or logical and abstract thinking to the cortical region, but now it is known that all these also are linked to Hypothalamus which controls, through the pituitary (the Master Gland), all the endocrine glands and also the autonomic nervous system and the homeostatic functions.

If even now someone says that the self or the Consciousness is an emergent phenomenon of the brain and that our thoughts,

like the energy quanta at the subatomic level, form a field, one would have to answer the following questions:

**Questions, addressed to those who consider
mind as epiphenomenon**

- (1) *How do emotions, experience and the moral sense emerge from the brain or any other physical base and what, in the first instance, does make it a plausible thesis that these non-physical noumena arise from the physical phenomena?*
- (2) Do we have any mathematical equations, physical laws or chemical formulas that can explain Emotions, Experience of Love and Joy or Moral tendencies?
- (3) If the thoughts are like quantum phenomena or if they have emerged from the brain, what form should our Meditation or Yoga take? What should our Affirmation now be? Should it be: "I am a quantum phenomenon, I am a jumble of dancing particles...?"
- (4) Does the hypothesis or the theory that Consciousness is a quantum phenomena or has emerged from the brain, explain the extrasensory perceptions, the paranormal phenomena and the parapsychological and emotional experiences?
- (5) Does the model, based on the hypothesis that Consciousness has emerged from the brain or the brain-body combine, explain what is *the goal of life* or what meaning life has and what is *the place of man* in the scheme of things or in the drama of life?
- (6) Has Meditation, based on the belief that Thoughts and Emotions are quantum phenomena' been ever tested by someone? If they have been tested, what result on the body and mind have they produced?

If the answers to the above questions do not provide us with *a better model* and better results, then it would be more scientific to continue to have faith in the truth that Consciousness is a *non-physical, non-emergent* entity.

A sound identity for sound humane relationships

Further, we find that human existence has a network of relationships. At present, these relationships are based on various kinds of identities. Man, to-day, identifies himself with his body, family, language, country, race, community and so on. **All these multifarious identities exert their pulls on him and each one of these demands loyalty.** Not only does this result in confusion and conflict in man's own mind and give him moments of trauma and torment but it works as a great *disintegrating factor*: *The relationships built on these identities that derive their legitimacy from the association of Consciousness with that which itself owes its existence to something material, has not been able to lead society to a system where there is abiding peace, wholesome harmony and lasting amity.* It has not uplifted man from narrow considerations, it has tied man into many knots — one upon the other. It has not liberated his mind and given him a wide horizon of thinking, into which all directions can merge but, on the other hand, it has built many walls of separation which put artificial limits on his love and conscience and do not let his spirit free so that it could fly with freedom.

Now compare this with the understanding that the self or the Consciousness is a non-physical entity and that its relationship with all other human beings is of *brother souls* since all are immortal children of God. **It will be found that one feels that the blinkers or hoods of ignorance have been removed, all kinds of fanaticism have fled away, narrow-mindedness has gone and one feels that one belongs to the whole family of humankind. Even though one knows one's nationality and language, etc., yet one now has the knowledge that integrates and prevents an explosion or implosion of society into innumerable bits. This concept and feeling of world-brotherhood is the only *uniting force* that can harmonise the society into one whole and generate *genuine concern* for each other and stop human energy from being frittered away on perpetrating violence and many other kinds of mad frenzy.**

A challenging question

“Is there”, one may ask, “any other sound and matter-of-fact basis for our society to have a feeling of universal love and goodwill and mutual concern? How can any theory, that is built on the

hypothesis that the self has emerged from Matter at some stage, give a sound pedestal to human relationships?” The world can never become a good place to live in nor can our society be a better one without love which is the sap or the blood and the essence of life, and there can be no lasting love without this spiritual root. The tears of the poor cannot be wiped dry nor can the agony of the deprived millions be extinguished nor can the diseased, the weak and the aged be looked after well if our attitude is not humane and the reservoir of love has become dry. But which other social model, except the one based on spiritual relation of *world-brotherhood*, can infuse a spirit of love? This question of relationships is very crucial and the answer provided by the belief in a metaphysical soul has the strength enough to demolish all other hypothetical foundations for human relationships.

One should realise that all our political and economic systems, all talk of Human Rights and Rule of Law have a bearing on human relationships. All history also is connected, in some way, with human relationships.

So, life as it is, cannot be understood except in the context of relationships. And, relationships cannot have a sound and valid base without considering the self as *metaphysical*, i.e. *spiritual*.

All knowledge is for life

After all, knowledge is for life, for joy, for happiness, for elimination of pain and for problem-solving; So, whenever we have a bit of new information or a new theory, we should test it with this touch-stone. We should examine it from this point of view and see whether it will help build a better society and a better world order. We should see whether it will promote values and better relations and happiness or it will lead to a worse situation and will unleash forces of disintegration and immorality?

If we find that this belief in a metaphysical self passes this test, or would pass this test better than any other current concept, belief or theory, then it is better to hold it at bay at least as long as we do not have a better concept.

Further, we should see whether the theory would equip us with such knowledge and build such attitudes as would enable us to face various difficult situations and problems in a better way.

For example, we should ponder whether it would bring peace and tranquillity to our mind or it would result in emotional turmoil or instability, wavering moods, floundering *will* and collapse of Values in face of tests.

Divine Guidance and Help and people's blessings

It has been found to one's tremendous advantage, on the basis of continuous experience, under many testing situations, that Raj-Yoga Meditation, practised sincerely, brings **God's guidance and help** which has immense value. One can relate many experiences, from one's own life, of such events in which God, the Best Friend or Best Guide, Himself blessed the practitioner with love and care and revealed the solution to a tricky situation or a hard problem.

Also, the practice of Raj-Yoga Meditation enables a person to be so loving and co-operative that his colleagues and kin, or friends and relatives, bless him for his pleasing and helpful manners, and even his professed adversaries, later, change their stance and attitude into one of co-operation and help.

Thus, we find that not only is the belief in metaphysical nature of Consciousness based on truth but it promotes moral values and better relations and a better world order and equips a person with such attitudes and knowledge as enables him to have better mind-set and to come out better in face of difficult situations.

This understanding answers scientific questions better

Some scientists raise a valid question. They say that, since so many bits of information come to our brain through our senses every instant, the situation in our brain is comparable to a chaos or a catastrophe and there can be many probabilities as to the final outcome. So, the question is: how, in such a situation, do we have a **unified mind**? They suggest that, since our mental states are abrupt and are events at micro-level and are unpredictable, so the Catastrophe Theory would apply to this situation of quantum phenomena. They consider thoughts like quanta. But if we consider that, in this situation, there is a *metaphysical energy* particle in

the brain which has a particular background and outlook and attitudes and that forms *the point of reference*, then, perhaps, we could appreciate that it is this *self-conscious particle* that determines the final result in the form of a particular decision, etc.

Another question generally is from the point of view of split-brain and split personality phenomena. In these cases also, if we think that it is the metaphysical self which uses, sometimes, one, and, sometimes, the other hemisphere or that this metaphysical self, sometimes, expresses one emotion and, sometimes another, then we will be able to appreciate better that this thesis about *the metaphysical* self answers such questions, better than any other theory.

One point that supports our explanation of ‘split thought’ is that two opposite thoughts do not occur at the same moment nor two opposing emotions or experiences manifest at the same instant.

In the light of the above, it seems fairly valid to believe in soul as a *metaphysical particle* that is *self-conscious* and is related to all other humans *as a brother* and has, therefore, some responsibility for the well being of all for observing some essential ethical values.



Consciousness from a Religio-Spiritual Perspective

(A part of author's Paper-II, presented at the International Conference on Science and Consciousness)

Before Science came on the world-scene as an organised and formalised branch of knowledge, such as we have to-day, Consciousness, under the nomenclature of *Self*, *Soul*, *Mind* or *Psyche* was discussed by Religion, Philosophy and Ethics. In its earlier stages, even Psychology and Ethics also were part of Philosophy and, so, the nature, the form and the states of consciousness and also the soul-body connections were discussed in Religion and Philosophy only. So, I have discussed briefly the nature of the Self or Consciousness, first in the light of Religion and then in the light of Science. I have already discussed it from the view-point of Indian Philosophy. In a separate part, I will discuss it from the point of view of Psychology.

Nature of Self or Consciousness from the perspective of religions

Man had been asking himself, for a period of about 2500 years or so— of which we have some reliable record — the pertinent question: ‘*Who am I?*’ He wanted to solve *the riddle of the self*. He also wanted to know the difference between himself as a conscient entity and the material world, of which the self was conscious or aware. He further wanted to know whether the thoughts, Will, memory, emotions, habits, tendencies, etc., had emerged from his physical system, including his brain, or these were the characteristics or functions of a separate entity. By solving this riddle, he wanted to discover the meaning of his existence, his place and role in the cosmos and also the cause of sufferings.

We find, from a study of the history of Religions and Philosophy, that, originally, the main purpose of man's search - after-the truth was to know the self so as to get ultimately released from all kinds of sufferings, and, presently, to lead a life of good actions and to have an experience of peace and bliss. Man has had also the curiosity to know if there was another Conscient Being, who was much superior to and mightier than him, and was the Creator and the infallible Guide and he wanted to have mind-to-mind communication with that Being.

The core of Religious and Spiritual thought

Starting from Brahmā or Adam and acquainting ourselves with the inspirations, contemplations and reflections of the Vedic and Upanishadic seers and sages, the Biblical saints and the Founders and Prophets of various religions, we find that there is a vast diversity among various religions, and within the same religion, on many important religious themes, including the question, relating to nature and form, etc. of Consciousness or self. The revelations or the doctrines, enunciated by the Founders of religions — the Sermonizer of Bhagwad Gita, Zoroaster, Abraham, Buddha, Mahavir, Moses, Christ, Mohammed, Nanak, Dayanand and others differ widely from each other. However, a careful study of these would lead us to the conclusion that there is a core which is common to all. Here are the beliefs, common to all or most of them.

All the religions and the spiritual philosophies which have their roots in India, including *Buddhism and Jainism*, believed in the reincarnation of soul, according to its past *Karmic account and its sanskāras* though they have different concept of *Nirvāna* or *Mokhsa*.

Buddhism, Jainism and other religions, have said that soul has a moral dimension. These religions believe in the plurality of souls as Sankhya school of philosophy does. They have laid great emphasis on inculcating moral qualities in the self and on having experience of the self through Yoga-Meditation. Though they have different systems of Meditation yet all these have almost a common moral code and almost all are based on the belief that

Consciousness is a metaphysical entity. They also believe that the base of moral values is the belief that the self is a spiritual being and that it survives physical death and reaps the fruits of its actions in this or the next incarnation. Shrimad Bhagwad Gita, which reflects the essence of all Indian scriptures and philosophies, clearly states that the body is like the dress of a soul which the soul gives up at the time of death to put on a new one so as to have a new birth. The Gita and all the Upanishads and schools of philosophy, as said before, clearly state that the soul is immortal and cannot be destroyed by any of the elements of Nature or by Time. They all emphasise that the soul can get liberated only through right type of consciousness-training, in the form of divine knowledge, moral values and virtues and practice of Yoga Meditation.

Christianity also strongly believes in the existence of the soul and the Supreme Soul. **St. Augustine** (354-450 A.D.) attributed all human actions to the soul. Considered the three faculties — memory, Imagination and Will — as parts of the unitary soul.

It has been pointed out by many writers that Christianity also believed in re-incarnation in its early days. It was during the period of Constantine that an Anathema was issued against this. But, quoting many references from the Bible, and also on the basis of research, many Christians believe in re-incarnation. Furthermore,

All religions believe:

1. That there are sufferings in this world and these sufferings have some cause; the cause of these sufferings is man's violation of some laws and, among these laws, are also *the moral laws*.
2. That man's actions and intentions which violate moral laws are called 'bad', 'evil', 'vicious' or 'sinful' actions, intentions or motives and these emanate from *ignorance*, illusion, delusion, defiled nature or willful violation.
3. That man has *awareness* (including *self-awareness*) and the abilities of *thinking*, *cognition*, and *rational faculty*, which vary from person to person and these faculties give him the

- ability to see that there are *good* as well as *bad* or *evil* actions with positive or negative results respectively.
4. That man has *the will* or *the desire* and the faculty of *judgement* and, therefore, he is responsible for his actions, for he can choose between good and bad.
 5. That man has the ability of *feeling* and *experiencing* and also the emotions and, if he desires to be liberated from sufferings and from the experience of pain, and aspires for happiness, he should exert his *will*, and give up the evil and imbibe in him what is good or virtuous.
 6. That man has the ability *to learn, to retain* and *to recall* or *recollect*, i.e., he has the ability, called '*Memory*', and he should, therefore, learn the truth about the self, the world and the Creator and should remember his true identity and use this ability (Memory) in a right and virtuous way.
 7. That he has the ability *to realise* his identity as different from other things and persons and to consider *the self* as an individual or a **person**.
 8. That this individual, which has awareness, Will, memory, etc., has also the '*ego*' or the '*I-ness*' which is the feeling of his identity as the 'self'.
 9. That, while in the body, the soul has certain altered **states of consciousness** in the form of wakefulness, sleep, bliss, intoxication, swoon, coma, etc.
 10. That this individual self has the ability **to relate** with others and it may thus have various affinities, bonds, relations, associations, etc. A person should not do actions that result in bondage.
 11. That *the self does not die* with the body, for, it has to reap the fruits of its actions even after the body dies and is disposed of. So, the self, also called the soul, *Ātman* or *Ruha* is, by its very nature, *different from the body* which is constituted of the elements of Matter.
 12. That the soul has an aura or a field or certain sheaths round it and the field exerts its influence on Matter.
 13. That the *moral qualities* and *the experiences* like peace, bliss,

- love, etc. pertain to the realm of soul.
14. That the soul does not have mass or extension like the Matter and is *indivisible*.
 15. That the soul is a **traveller from another world**, called *Brahmlok, Parlok, Satyalok, Avyakt, 'Highest Heaven' or Fifth or Seventh region-on-high* into this world, where the basic moral law of action is that, *sooner or later, "you will reap as you sow"*.
 16. That this self has *a goal or a purpose*, namely the attainment of liberation from all sufferings and attainment of perfection and complete and ever-lasting happiness.
 17. Some say that the soul resides in the heart whereas others say that it is *in the brain*, in *Bhrikuti or Trikuti, Ājnā Chakra or Brahm Randhra* and it is from there (i.e., the brain) that it influences the heart and also every cell through its field, acting upon the nuclei of the hypothalamus and the thalamus and the nervous mechanism, connected to them.
 18. The theistic religions further believe that there is a **Supreme Soul**, God or a Parent Soul, who is above physical birth and death and is *Incorporeal* and above all sufferings and is the only Knowledgeful, Peaceful and Blissful and Almighty *Being-of-Light*.

Consciousness from Spiritual or Religious Perspective

If we put together all the above basic beliefs or precepts at one place, this coherent statement would emerge: 'In every human body, there is a soul or a self which has self-awareness, consciousness, Will, cognition, rational sense, emotions, memory, ego or 'I-ness', ability to experience, and to relate to others and have various affinities and bonds and to survive after it leaves the body so as to settle the accounts of its actions; this entity, by its nature, is a metaphysical entity and the souls are higher or lower in respect of their moral stature and, according to the theistic religions, there is also a Supreme Soul. Also, according to some religions, the soul takes another body after it leaves one body and, according to some others, it does not reincarnate but it continues to exist and get reward or punishments. It does not die.

Qualitative change by practice of this precept

This precept has been put into practice by thousands or millions of individuals over the last at least two millennia and it has been found that this brought qualitative change in their life. They were able to transform their unsocial or evil tendencies and to attain self-control and peace and solace. They became considerably free from worries and felt mostly liberated from wasteful and negative activities and, by their own practical life, they inspired many others. Moreover, they had what is called 'religious experience' or 'spiritual ecstasy' which is very different from the sensory experience and which they valued as the greatest attainment that life offered.

Also, the above belief-system had, for them, the potential of explaining many phenomena and solving many questions, relating to life which cannot be explained by other belief-systems.

It had also the capability of liberating man from narrow loyalties and from fissiparous tendencies, based on one's identity with race, region, language or community and, in its place, it gave the concept of the bigger family of humankind. It also gave man higher responsibility as a moral being.

The practice of Yoga, Meditation, Prayer, Positive Thinking, etc., based on the belief in the soul, gave man lot of mental relief from stress and energised and inspired him greatly and illumined his mind to an extent, with positive and creative thoughts.

Of course, those who were not sincere in their belief and practice and were only ritualistic and body-conscious, without any self-control or discipline, they behaved as fanatics and religion stood defamed mainly because of them, i.e., because of lack of transformation in their behaviour and habits. But if we do not mix up religion with pseudo-religion, we will have positive opinion about Religions which gave man the belief in the identity of the self as different from the body.

This concept has consciously or unconsciously been the basis of society

On the whole, we may say that the above basic understand-

ing about the self or the human soul has been the basis of the society and its various systems. This has given to the society some basis for moral and human values and has also provided the concept of world-brotherhood with all its accompanying moral, social, economic and political implications, provided one cares. *If this concept, precept or tenet, namely that souls are moral beings, responsible for their actions and that they are metaphysical entities, who survive physical death and reap the fruits of their actions, is taken away from our conscious and subliminal mind, then the whole present-day moral, social and legal structures would become shaky or they would crumble down because they would not have any firm and enduring basis for worthwhile values, such as love, mutual concern, sympathy, compassion, co-operation, service, honesty, etc.*

We give an example of how the belief in a *non-physical self, as a moral being*, forms the basis of all laws. As we all know, only a person, who has committed the crime should be held responsible and be punished. To punish *someone else* for a crime is against all canons of legal and social justice. A father cannot be punished for the crime of a son nor can a son be punished in place of his father. Now, the biological sciences tell us that, in a period of seven years, all our body-cells are replaced by new ones so that, after every seven years, there is another body in the place of the one that was there earlier. The whole body-chemistry undergoes change during a period of seven years. So, if a person has committed a crime and has gone into hiding for seven years, he could claim freedom from all legal action against him by saying that the person (in this case, *the body*) that was there seven years before, who had committed the crime, is no more existent and that he (the present body) is *only a successor* of the former and is, therefore, a different person. But, we know that, in practice, Law does not spare him on this ground. It punishes the culprit even if he is traced after many decades because, sub-consciously or unconsciously, it is felt that the *conscient person* (the soul) is the same even though the body is totally changed. The law takes note of the *conscient being* and not of the body only that changes after every seven years.



Consciousness or Self

From the Perspective of various Sciences and Spirituality

If we think deeply on the nature of Thought, Emotions, Will, etc., we will come to the conclusion that these are metaphysical in their nature, for *Thought is not quantifiable* as various forms of Physical or Material energy are measurable. *Not only has Thought no mass but it can cross all barriers of time* and can go into the distant past and far-off future. Thought has a *moral dimension* also which various forms of (material) energy do not have. According to Physics, speed of light is the ultimate or the highest in the universe but *the speed of Thought is very much higher so that it cannot be measured. In fact, Thought is the basis of all measurements. Light takes about eight minutes to travel from the Sun to the Earth but Thought takes only a small fraction of it. Other forms of energy, such as Light, Heat, Sound, etc. cause sensations but Thought it is that feels the sensations or prevents them from causing sensations. Sound takes the form of words and melodies but it is Thought or Mind that understands the meanings of these words and appreciates the melodies.* Thus, Thought is altogether a different kind of Energy — a **spiritual energy. it is not chemical, physical or mechanical energy.**

Thoughts, Emotions, Will, etc. are not the epiphenomena of the brain even though they use various parts of the brain for their manifestation. We may be able to record, with the Electro-Encephalogram (EEG), the brain-waves and categorise them into Alpha, Beta and Delta and know from these whether a person is in a state of restfulness, wakefulness or in a state of drowsiness, sleep or tension but **the EEG does not enable us to contact the Thought, rather it is the Thought which makes use of the EEG to know the state of thoughts.**

Similarly, the emotions, such as love, kindness, compassion, astonishment and enthusiasm and the feeling, such as joy or grief, etc., are not the attributes or work of Matter or its forces. Specific part of the brain is used for their manifestation and exteriorisation but it is a separate metaphysical Being *who has* these

emotions and experiences. This has been scientifically concluded by experiments by such well-known brain-surgeons and researchers such as Penfield.

Likewise, *Will* or *Wish* also is not the attribute of something material because it envisages *a goal* and determines *a plan* to achieve it and, finally, when a wish or a desire is fulfilled, it is the person who says: 'My wish is fulfilled'. It is not the wish which says: 'I am fulfilled'. Clearly, the wish is different from the person whose wish it was. *Wish* is an urge, a feeling, a state, a condition, an inclination or a function of a metaphysical *person*.

Is not Thought, etc., an epiphenomenon of the brain?

Some people say: Thoughts, Emotions, Will, etc. are not material in their nature but when the material elements get together, in a particular manner, into a particular combination and state, then consciousness or Thought, by itself, emerges in the brain and body. This view, however, is not correct because *brain, like other material things, is an object of Thought: it neither thinks nor is it a generator of Thought. All material things, without an exception, are the objects of enjoyment but the enjoyer is different from Matter and material things.* The conscient soul is the *user* or *the enjoyer*. As has been explained in Chapter-1, material things do not exist *for their own use but for a conscient being*. For example, a bed exists not for its own sake but for a man or a woman.

Again, brain and material elements, in simple or combined form, cannot transgress laws of Physics, Chemistry or Nature, According to law of Physics, a reaction is always equal to the action and, even in the unbalanced equations in organic chemistry, the laws of conservation of Mass and Energy are not violated. But, these laws do not apply to Thought and Emotions which shows that they are, by their very nature, different from Matter; they are non-physical. We give an example that would illustrate this point:-

Suppose a person has gone to a religious gathering and, there,

he listens to a religious discourse. Now, according to the laws of Physics and Chemistry, the voice of the lecturer should go to the auditory areas of the cortex of the listener and get decoded there and the reaction of the voice should not go much further than the energy of the original words or sound. But we find that not only does the listener pay *attention* to the discourse, of his own free *Will*, but he *thinks* over it deeply again and again in order to find answer to many questions which the discourse has raised in his mind. That shows that not only does the action in the form of lecturer's voice produce a reaction in the form of electrical impulses but also it goes much further, for it invokes the *Will*, invites the *attention* and provokes *the action* of the listener. **The reaction, in this case, is not equal to the action; it goes much beyond the well-known equation of Physics. Obviously, there is a metaphysical entity which uses its *Will* and *Attention* and exercises its power of *Decision*, etc., so that the original stimulus has extended far beyond its expected range and has triggered not only *bio-chemical* and *biological* processes but has also stirred up the metaphysical abilities which do not belong to anything material.** But, if still someone says that the Consciousness has a material origin or that it emerges from the brain even though it is non-physical, then *he has to explain how a non-physical entity can emerge from something physical. If he doesn't, then he will be raising more questions than he would be solving.* As far as we know, no one has, upto now, been able to explain how consciousness can emerge from Matter when the former is *qualitatively* and *functionally* different because it has *emotion, experiences, purpose*, etc. while Matter, and things made of Matter, do not have these.

What Karl Popper said about consciousness as an emergent product?

Even the famous philosopher of science, Karl Popper, who considered Mind as an emergent product of brain, admitted *that his this belief was of no explanatory value.* Said he: **“From an evolutionary point of view, I regard the self-consciousness or mind an emergent product of the brain. It has no explanatory value, and it hardly**

amounts to more than putting a question mark in a certain place in human evolution.”

**Do altered states show that consciousness
is an emergent product?**

2. Some people say that if and when we alter the brain, the mind or consciousness is also altered and this shows that Mind is a product of Matter. For example, if due to some accident, speech centre of a person’s brain is damaged, the person is unable to speak. Similarly, if and when certain drugs are injected into the body of a person, the moods and states of consciousness of that person are altered. On the basis of these arguments, they say that the consciousness is an *emergent phenomenon*; it is a product of the brain. *But the argument does not hold good if one keeps in mind that brain is the mechanism used by the non-physical self and, so, if the mechanism is damaged or altered, the user cannot function normally.* In order to make this point clear, let us give the example of a person who records his transactions, stocks and accounts on a computer. *If his computer has been damaged or destroyed, he would not be able to function normally. But that does not mean that if the computer is damaged, then the user also is damaged and the computer and the user are one and the same.* Similarly, if the soul cannot function because of damage to the brain, it does not mean that brain and soul are the same.

**Does analogy of a computer show that
consciousness is material?**

However, there are eminent scientists and technocrats who would say that Consciousness is not distinct from brain. They say that ‘Consciousness’ is the name given to the intelligent functioning of our brain which is like a super-computer. For example, Marvin Minsky of M.I.T. who is a leading figure in computer research, says that a computer with “The general intelligence of an average human being” will soon be created. He further says that “The machine will be able to educate itself. In a few months, it will be at genius level. A few months after that, its power will

be incalculable”. Later, “If we are lucky, they (the machines) might decide to keep us as pets.” It seems that the reason for his this statement is that he considers only ‘*intelligence*’ as the characteristic of Consciousness. He seems to overlook the fact that human intelligence is always accompanied by emotions, experience, purpose, relationships, etc. There is a lot of difference between the human intelligence and the artificial intelligence of a computer which is programmed by a human being and is the creation of human intelligence which is the programmer and which has experience also.

Another, such expert, Professor Arthur Harkins, a Director at the University of Minnesota, says that, by the year 2000, people will be getting married to robots and society will begin to ponder the definition of “human”. Now, are not such views funny! Isn’t the emotion of love (between a husband and a wife, for example being clearly overlooked?

Obviously, such scientists do not ponder that our *Will, Emotions, Desires, Experiences, Values*, etc. are the very essence of what we call ‘humanness’. It is not *mere intelligence* which is the distinctive feature of human-being but these other abilities also inseparably accompany intelligence in a human being. So, their misconception allows them to suppose that machines and computer of sufficient sophistication can become conscious! *They fail to realise that their such view will confuse people about their place in the world, and about their goal and would undermine further the human values and will also destroy the traditional institutions in the society.*

Opinion of Eugene Wigner

On the other hand, there have been scientists, like the Nobel Laureate Late Eugene Wigner, who said: “There are two kinds of reality or existence; the existence of consciousness and the reality or existence of everything else. The latter reality is not absolute but only relative.” Wigner said this because the measurable things and phenomena are known to man only because he has consciousness.

"Consciousness is not a material force" said Thomas Huxley

Even Thomas Huxley, who strongly promoted Darwin, has said: "I understand the main tenet of materialism to be that there is nothing in the universe but matter and force; and that all the phenomena of nature are explicable by deduction from the properties assignable to these two primitive factors...It seems to me pretty plain that there is a third thing in the universe, to wit, consciousness, which...I cannot see to be matter or force or any conceivable modification of either".

"Consciousness does not come from neurophysiological synthesis," says Sir John Eccles

Similarly, Sir John C. Eccles, in the book *Self and its Brain*, says: "The experienced unity (of consciousness or Mind) comes not from a neurophysiological synthesis, but from the proposed integrating character of the self-conscious mind". Eccles has said this while discussing how many messages coming to various brain centres through the ears, eyes, nose, skin, etc. simultaneously are synthesised and decoded so as to make a composite picture or a sense out of them all. He is of the firm opinion that this is done by the self which is not an epiphenomenon of the brain.

Penfield's experiments show that consciousness is not an epiphenomena of the brain

Further, Penfield's research also has shown that even massive removals of cerebral cortex do not seem to completely abolish awareness but small lesions in the brainstem produce irreversible coma. Penfield has also shown that in 'anecephalic monsters', i.e. in those persons who are born without any cerebral cortex, there are states of wakefulness and sleep alternating each other and the person can smile and cry also but it cannot understand or speak because the cerebral hemispheres are not there. So, it shows that though the two hemispheres are responsible for higher thought - processes and understanding the language-code, etc., yet these are not the seat of consciousness. *Penfield performed many experiments by stimulating various sites or points*

on the brain. For example, he stimulated the motor cortex and produced the bodily movements, such as the movement of a hand, but it did not produce any conscious effects. He came to the conclusion that consciousness is located near the Hypothalamus and the Brainstem and is not an epiphenomenon of the brain.

Mind-Body contact takes place in the brain

This finding also explains the question of Body-Mind connection. We have already said that some Religions say that the soul dwells in the heart whereas others say that the soul dwells in the brain at a point called *Bhrikuti* or *Trikuti* or *Ājna Chakra*, which is in-line with the mid-point between the eye-brows. Many have said that the soul is infinitesimal; it has no extension and is *indivisible*. So, it could be understood in the light of the research done by Penfield and others that the soul has its field in the proximity of the Thalamus, Hypothalamus-pituitary-combine and the limbic system and the brain. Here, it functions through the Sympathetic and Pra-sympathetic nervous system and the Pituitary, which is the Master gland. As is now well-known, all the body-functions, including that of the heart, are controlled and conducted from here.

Brain-death and not stopping of heart-beat shows disconnection

In the olden times, people could judge the presence of life and the soul by feeling the beats of heart. They could also feel the effects of one's emotions easily by feeling one's heart. So, they could easily come to the conclusion that the soul dwells in the heart because the stopping of the heart-beats signalled the physical death. But now, in the light of the medical research, it is amply clear that it is the *brain-death* which is the major proof of the death of a person's body and, so, it could be understood because of these other factors also that actually brain is the seat of the soul which, of course, has a field.

Experiments on “the clinically dead”

Above, we have given some clarification about the non-physical nature of the self or Consciousness and have given evidence from various disciplines of science which support the truth that the self, the soul or the Conscious entity, in every human body, is a *non-physical* one and it is not an epiphenomenon of the brain. This truth, which is common belief of all religions, is supported by the research, conducted on ‘*the clinically dead*’ or what has now come to be known as *Out-of-Body Experience*. The name of Dr. Raymond A. Moody, MD, in this field, has become fairly well-known, for he did the pioneering work. Dr. Moody conducted research on three kinds of cases: (i) those who were resuscitated after having been pronounced clinically dead by doctors, (ii) those who, because of accidents, illness or serious injury came very close to death and (iii) those who, as they were dying, told their experiences to other people who were then present and, later, these people reported their death experiences to Dr. Moody. Dr. Moody studied about 150 such cases and constructed a model of death-experience. These are described in his book, *Life-after-Life*. ***All these things point to the truth that the soul, the self or the conscious entity does not die with the body but rather survives after the body has been disposed of. In these ‘Near-Death-Experiences’ or ‘Out-of-Body’ Experiences, people report that they observed their physical body and events relating to it from a perspective outside of the body.*** Although a percentage of these cases are unreliable yet extensive and intensive research in this field leads conclusively to the truth that the soul survives the death of the body and is different from the body and the brain.

Visions of the Supreme Soul

*These cases also give evidence about the existence of the Supreme Soul or the Parent Soul because many persons reported that, at the point of death, they saw a **Being-of-Light** which was of the form of **an Orb-of divine Light** and which gave the experience of a **loving Parent** and then they saw, in quick succession, the picture of their past acts as one sees events shown by a movie.*

Cases of Research on Re-incarnation

Research has also been scientifically done in the cases of children who gave accounts of memories of their past lives. Ian Stevenson, Head of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Virginia, USA, has done very extensive and thorough-going research in this field. He investigated more than 2000 cases, from all over the world, of children who claimed that they had lived before their present life. Though some cases were false and fabricated yet investigation into many cases confirmed their veracity. Ian Stevenson investigated the details of the place and people as the children had described and also the details about the dead persons which the children claimed to have seen. He came to the conclusion that there was ample verification and confirmation of all these. He was, therefore, convinced that the conscious self can travel from one physical body to the next after one body has been destroyed.

Research in the field of Hypnotic Age-regression

Recently, lot of research has been done in the field of Age-regression. Though it has been found that, in some cases, the mind of the hypnotically regressed persons tends to fabricate illusion and, therefore, the statements of all the subjects are not acceptable, yet there are many cases that have been verified, as for example, the case of an American woman in Philadelphia who, under hypnotic regression, manifested the personality of a Swedish farmer and spoke fluent Swedish though investigation about her showed that she had no previous contact with any Swedish in her life. Dr. Helen Wambach, Ph.D., among many other researchers, has done remarkable work on the experiences of rebirth and past lives through the method of hypnotic regression. He regressed about 750 subjects back to the moment of death in their previous life and then to the moment of their entry into the present body. He took many subjects into numerous past lives. After going through his book, one comes to the conclusion that there definitely is a metaphysical entity which takes rebirth after giving up one body. The soul is not only non-physical but is a

traveller that moves from one body to another and also, as many, under hypnosis, saw, from 'The World of Souls' to this world.

Explanation of unified experience in the light of Theory of Relativity and the Data-processing theory, etc.

One special characteristic of our Mind or Consciousness is that we always have *a unified experience* though we are being constantly bombarded by innumerable data or bits of information. Let us see whether our view that there is a metaphysical soul, ensconced in the brain, helps explain this or it is a hurdle?

According to Einstein's Theory of Relativity and his *gedanken* (experiments in the mind), any space-time event can be viewed from an innumerable number of reference-points, each giving rise to a different result, a different interpretation or a different experience.

In the light of this, let us take up the view of the scientific community, to-day, in regard to the messages received in our brain. These messages, fed into our brain by our various senses, lead to something like numerous space-time electro-magnetic events. These space-time electro-magnetic events, at particular moment, are numerous because we receive simultaneous messages from the eyes, the ears, the nose, the tongue, etc. So, according to Einstein's afore-mentioned theory, there should, at one point of time, be *many experiences*. Further, since our frame of reference will affect our measurements of the location, speed, direction, mass, length, momentum, energy, frequency, etc. of each one of those events or objects, *our experiences should be innumerable*. But, contrary to this expected result of *gedanken* (thought experiments) we always have *one unified experience*? The question is why and how do we have a *unified* experience?

We further know that our observations and, therefore, our conclusions, based on those observations, are also coloured by the difference in our measuring apparatus and also by our attitudes, beliefs, past experiences, prejudices and even by our desires. *So, taking all these factors into consideration, if there are the numerous simultaneous electro-magnetic events in our brain, and so many are the frames of references, then our experience*

could not have been '**one**' as it really is. Since our experience is always **one and unified**, it would be reasonable to conclude that there must be a **single point of reference**, working as a co-ordinate origin, to which our experience owes its **one-ness or uniqueness**. The universal fact that we always have **only one unified experience** is a clear evidence of the truth that (i) there is **only one co-ordinate origin** which works as our reference-point and (ii) that there is **only one set of attitudes and beliefs** which lead to the '**one-ness**' of our perception or experience. What else can be this **one co-ordinate origin** which also has **one set of beliefs and attitudes**? Conclusively, there must be a metaphysical point, namely '*the soul*'.

Even if we have never observed this point or metaphysical particle which works constantly as one single frame of observation and reference, it becomes necessary to recognise the existence of such an entity, for this explains why we have a **unified** experience. This entity is *the soul*. It is this which has beliefs, attitudes, past experiences, etc. *Without accepting its presence as a point of metaphysical Light, our experiences and their unified nature cannot be explained.*

Explanation of unified experience vis-a-vis Quantum Mechanics and Catastrophic Theory

Now let us think over the question of '*unified experience*' vis-a-vis the Quantum Mechanics and the Theory of Chaos or the Catastrophic Theory.

Quantum Theory deals with different energy states that a system can occupy. This branch of Physics helps us to understand the behaviour of atoms and sub-atomic particles, etc. This theory tells us that whereas we can predict the behaviour of large objects in large areas, such as an aeroplane or a cow, we cannot predict tiny changes at the micro level in small areas. We cannot give exact details of time, energy, momentum, position, frequency, etc. at the micro or the atomic and subatomic level because *our every act of measuring disturbs the system or the event that is under observation*. At that level, we cannot say when or which

thing will occur. We can describe *the probability only* of a particular activity because the events at the micro level are *abrupt as a catastrophe* such as occurrence of an explosion. The special kind of theory in the branch of mathematics that deals with such abrupt and catastrophe-like events and explains in terms of probability is called *The Catastrophic Theory*.

Now, the events in our brain that take place due to the bombardment of the information-pieces, hurtled by our senses, are compared because of their abruptness and complexity, to a situation of catastrophe or anarchy or a calamity. There is a kind of a storm or explosion of information in our brain and, as a result of this, there can be a vast range of probability due to there being a number of ways we can approach that information or to the problem posed by that information and, so, there can be a number of possible decisions, and, as a result of it, there can be a number of mental states that can occur. *Despite this tremendously vast range of possibilities, there is an abrupt decision, sometimes or often taken instantly. How does this happen? So, the pertinent question is: 'Who determines or What determines as to how to look at that flood of information and how to react to it or what will be the approach and what do we want to experience?' The scientists say that, because of the afore-mentioned reasons, all our mental activity corresponds to the changes in the quantum energy states which the Quantum Mechanical equations would describe in terms of probability, using the Catastrophic Theory.*

Further, the Quantum Mechanics and the Catastrophic Theory tell us that these mental events, which are like the micro-quantum phenomena, *would always be unpredictable*. We cannot say with any degree of certainty what course of action the Consciousness or Mind of a particular individual would take. In other words, an individual's action to us *would always be uncertain*. But, we all know that, in actual practice, we can pretty well know it if we know what are a person's usual choices. After all, everyone of us has some *fixed habits*, tastes, inclinations, choices and way of thinking and deciding and even when we deviate from our usual choice, we do so because of certain other *fixed* factors of our nature.

So, a plausible explanation could be that, even if the quantum-level or micro-level forces or bits of information in the form of electrical impulses trigger our decisions and mental states in random leaps and quantum - jumps of our consciousness, their results are not frustratingly un-predictable; these decisions, mental states and courses of actions are determined largely by our 'samskāras', tendencies, motives, habits, prejudices and choices and by our Will. And the Will and the Samskāras and the tendencies, etc. reflect the presence of a non-physical or metaphysical entity that triggers our thoughts and decisions into definite direction and course of action.

The concept of soul strikes a balance between free will and determinancy

Those who are strong supporters of the Quantum Theory and the Theory of Catastrophe, suggest that their view-point increases the scope for *a free will* and demolishes the belief that we are in a fairly or totally deterministic world. True, but the presence of a soul does not place any hurdle in this. On the other hand, it strikes a fair balance between the two view-points. It accepts that the situation due to numerous messages and bombarded information is, no doubt, *abrupt* and offers *many choices* but the proclivities, hopes and aspirations, level of understanding and, above all, the *samskāras* of the metaphysical being, the soul, act as the *determining factors*, else the decision could not be taken abruptly or *instantly*. And, we know from our own or others' experiences that whenever there is confusion and wavering of Mind and whenever the decisions are not taken quickly, the reason is that the person has *a number of interests* rather than *one* particular interest and he has *a dual personality with sets of opposite samskāras* which shows that these are *the determining factors*. And, these are the characteristics of the individual souls — the metaphysical entities. Thus, the Quantum Theory and the Theory of Catastrophe, when rightly applied, support the truth about the existence of a *metaphysical being*, called the soul, in the brain, rather than reject it.

**The soul as an eternal point of energy *vis-a-vis*
the Law of Entropy**

According to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, every action or inter-action, *within a system*, results in less and less available energy and in greater and greater disorder or disorganisation.

This Law can be explained by the example of petrol used in a motor vehicle. When the petrol is in the tank of the vehicle, its molecules are in a much more ordered state, for their composition or their chemical bonds are intact. But when the vehicle moves, the petrol molecules turn into vapour and their chain or chemical bond is broken apart and it combines with the oxygen of the atmosphere and forms carbon dioxide gas. Thus, the energy that was stored in the form of chemical bonds of the petrol molecules is released and scattered in all directions and cannot now be restored in its original state. Also, there is wear and tear of the vehicle and the system is moving towards greater and greater disorder. Since Entropy is the measure of disorder within a system, we can also say, that '*the system* is moving from a lower to a higher entropy'. 'The term '*Higher entropy*' means that there has been great loss of energy and there would now be lesser amount of energy available for use. '*Low Entropy*' means that there was small loss of energy and so there is still '*greater part*' of energy available for use. *So, the Entropy Law states that every action leads to higher entropy.*

Since, according to this law, less and less recoverable and usable energy will be left in a non-living system as a result of every action and more and more would be the disorder, there will, at one stage, be a state of anarchy and very great loss of energy so that, ultimately, the universe will meet what is called '*the Heat Death*' because of higher and higher entropy and loss of heat.

Now scientists say that this Second Law of Thermodynamics would be operative on any system and, so, if the soul is a store of conscient energy, it would gradually lose its available energy and would reach a stage of death, so to say, or it will have una-

available energy. These scientists also say that the belief that the soul is *eternal* and *survives the death* of the body, violates the Law of Conservation or the Law of Entropy in Physics.

What these scientists say is true in one sense only. The Entropy Law is inviolable in a *non-living system* only and that too if the system works in a *linear fashion*. The Law may not be applicable, and if the system works in a *cyclic fashion* and is a *living system*, then the energy-loss may even be reversible. Let us explain this statement: And, if the system works in a cyclic fashion and is a living system, then the Entropy Law may not be applicable.

When we look at the conscious activity, we find that, often, if not always, our conscious behaviour tends to move to a state of greater order rather than to disorder or confusion which the Second Law of Thermodynamics or the Entropy Law would envisage. **At last, we notice that, if we have the right knowledge of consciousness and also of its functioning, we can intervene and stop degradation which we see in a non-living system. We can also bring back our conscious system to its original state or level of order.** It may be useful to give here the example of a car and its driver. It is true that less and less energy would be available when the car is driven and the petrol molecules would split up and would get transformed into other states and the energy-loss would be unrecoverable because of the linear progression towards entropy (higher and higher loss of energy). But the driver, who is a conscient being, would learn more and more by experience and his mental state would have greater order. In other words, his ability or skill of driving would improve. So, at the level of consciousness, greater and greater order would result, leading to lesser entropy or even to zero entropy if the person marches towards perfection.

The example, given above, is not a solitary one. We clearly see that while the degradation is increasing in the material universe, we experience greater order in research and exploration and sophistication. What was once considered as impossible, has now been made possible. People have now made great advancement in Science and Technology and this has led to high system

of accuracy and precision. We notice that, when a person has the knowledge of a certain system, he can bring change and restore the original order. **This shows that there is a conscient entity on which the law of Entropy does not work in the linear fashion and this conscient entity, called the soul, can return back to its original state of highest order by means of the knowledge of how its consciousness works. What we have to do is to know our aim clearly and to remove our ignorance which is the cause of disorder. All this takes us to the conclusion that consciousness is a non-physical entity.**

In the context of the Law of Entropy, the scientists also allege that, if Consciousness is a non-physical energy, then its various forms, such as Thought, Reasoning, Intention, etc. would not be able to act upon the synapses in the brain because, by their nature, the two are different. While the former (consciousness) *is metaphysical*, the latter *is physical*. The former *has no mass* whereas the latter *has mass*.

In regard to the above, we should remember that there are probabilistic fields of quanta which carry neither mass nor energy but which, nevertheless, can exert effective action at the micro-level. Even so, the soul's field, or the field of Consciousness, can act on probabilistic synaptic events in the manner similar to the probability-fields of quantum mechanics.

Sir John Eccles, who was awarded Nobel Prize for his work, and who has made valuable contribution to the understanding of human brain and its functions through many books and also through BBC T.V. series, has published another book, titled '*How the Self controls its Brain*'. In this book, he has explained in a more forthright manner, his thesis that there is a conscious and spiritual self, distinct from the brain. In this book, he has explained in great detail, the mechanism of mind-body interaction. He has said that, when a neuron signal reaches the synaptic knob or bouton, only one of the vesicles may discharge the whole of its contents. He says that the probability of this happening is only 0.25 or one-in-four. He considers this probability as indeterministic quantum mechanical effect. Eccles says that the self influences the brain processes by increasing the probabilities of discharge (exocytosis) in all of the 100,000 or so dendrites or

boutons. Eccles co-researcher, Friedrich Bock, Head of the Department of Nuclear Physics at the Technical University of Darmstadt, has done the necessary calculations and these suggest that the quantities of energy, distance and time involved are sufficiently small for quantum mechanical effect to be significant and conservation laws would not be violated. And, at the same time, increasing the probabilities of discharge of neurotransmitters (exocytosis) in about 100,000 boutons would macroscopically affect brain processes and *the self* would thereby be able to influence the brain to realise its intentions.

While Eccles 'explanation of how the signals go from one to the other neuron and into the synaptic cleft and how the discharge of neurotransmitters takes place is very well explained in detail' yet his explanation of the influence of *the self* on the 100,000 or so boutons is not explained clearly. Moreover, his explanation of the mind-body interaction at the level of neo-cortex also seems to have some weaknesses. Instead, if we consider the aura or the field of *the self* interacting with the bio-electro-magnetic energy field near the hypothalamus-pituitary-limbic system, that would provide more palpable explanation.

**Soul is re-charged or re-energised by Meditation
and Entropy is reversed**

We should also keep in mind the fact, based on experience of the practitioners of yoga, that when they stabilise themselves in the awareness of the self as a metaphysical being and establish a conscious love-link with God, they feel energised. They feel re-charged with spiritual energy even as a battery is re-charged by linking it to a source of electricity. This experiment can be done by anyone, maintaining the conditions necessary for it. This leads us to the conclusion that *mental (psychological) action*, done by the soul, does not result in loss of energy or in greater entropy.

**Recycling of negative energy into positive energy
reverses Entropy**

What happens is that if the soul does *a morally bad action*,

its positive energy is converted into negative one. The negative available energy now increases. If the soul returns to positive thinking or to Meditation, is able to re-convert the negative energy into the positive one even as we recycle certain material things.

Also, by the practice of Yoga-Meditation, the spiritual field of God or the Supreme Soul acts upon the field of the soul and this helps the process of transformation of the soul so that it now is able to recover the positive energy which now becomes available to it for use.

Further, if we keep in mind that the events of the world are not linear and that the Time is cyclic so that there comes a point of the cosmic order when the Time Wheel, having completed one cycle, takes the turn of the position from where it started, then we will be able to understand that, even in the material world, the Entropy would be restored to zero.

Cases of split brain

Since the year 1960, till date, many surgical operations have been performed to treat cases of severe epilepsy. The operation involves separation of the right and the left hemispheres of the brain by cutting *the corpus callosum*, which is composed of about 200 million nerve-fibres and nerve-cells which normally function to transmit information between the two hemispheres and co-ordinate their motor activities also. This cutting of *corpus calosum*, which serves as bridge between the right and the left hemispheres, cured wholly or partially, the patients suffering from severe epilepsy. The reason for '*splitting the brain*' was that it was thought that the damage or disorder in one hemisphere would not produce disorders in the other because all direct connections for transmitting information between the two had been cut. Roger Sperry of California Institute of Technology was awarded a Nobel Prize for doing leading work in this field. He and others discovered many noteworthy facts in the cases of split-brain patients or in patients, in whom one of the hemispheres was surgically removed.

To understand the changes caused by these surgical operations, called *commissurotomy*, it would be necessary to know that *the left hemisphere of the brain is connected with the right side of the body and the right side of the body is connected with the left side, except that the right hemisphere is connected with the right nostril and the left hemisphere is connected with the left-nostril. It would also be necessary to know that the left hemisphere has the speech centre and it also does the specialised functions of reasoning, abstract and analytical thinking, cognition etc. whereas the right hemisphere is associated with the aesthetic, i.e. the appreciation of music and beauty of form and colour, etc., and with emotions; it does not have centre of language-decoding or verbal expression.*

Following are some of the facts that came to light by performing some peculiar tests on split-brain persons:-

A 'split-brain' person was shown certain neutral geometric figures to his right and left eyes, which means to his left field and right field because each eye is connected with the opposite hemisphere. Suddenly, a pin-up shot of a nude figure was shown to the *left eye* which is connected with the *right hemisphere*. The person was asked as to what he was seeing. The person said that she saw nothing or that she saw only a flash of light. But when the person was replying thus, there was, on her face, a grin. In the next couple of trials, the person also blushed and giggled. These signs on the face showed that the person knew what she had seen and was intentionally giving a false reply. When the person was asked: "Why are you grinning if you have seen nothing or if you have seen just a flash of light", the replies of the person indicated that the right hemisphere had no idea at this stage as to what it was that had brought the grin on his or her face but its emotional effect got across.

We have already said that *the right nostril* is connected to the *right hemisphere* and *the left nostril* to *the left hemisphere* unlike other parts of the body which are connected with the opposite brain-hemisphere. Roger Sperry performed certain tests using the odours. When an odour was presented to *the right hemi-*

sphere through *the right nostril*, and split-brain person was unable to name the odour but he or she could tell, by some suitable reactions, whether it was pleasant or unpleasant. For example, if the odour was unpleasant, the person would express this by a grunt but he or she could not say whether this odour was of onions or garlic or of decayed materials. But, in this case also, *the feelings* through *the right* hemisphere got across *to the left*, i.e. the speaking hemisphere.

There were also other tests performed by Roger Sperry. In one test, he showed photos of some persons to a 'split-brain' person, exposing the photos to his *left eye* and, thereby, to *the right brain*. He showed the photos of Hitler, Castro, President Nixon, etc. and asked the patient to express his or her approval (or pleasure) by thumbs up and disapproval (displeasure) by thumbs down. The patient was asked to indicate his or her emotions by thumbs up or thumbs down because the *right* hemisphere, to which the photos were presented, has no speech centre or centre of verbal expression though it exteriorises the emotions. When the photos of Hitler and Castro were shown, the patient put his or her thumb down, when the photo of Nixon was presented, the patient wavered for a while because, in those days, the famous Watergate scandal was on. Suddenly, the patient was shown his or her own photo, the patient again gave a thumbs-down response but the patient also had a distinct sheepish self-conscious grin. This led Sperry to conclude that the right hemisphere does reflect '*self-consciousness*' and it also thinks in terms of *moral values*, for, without this how could it have put thumbs down when the photos of Hitler and Castro were presented and how could it have expressed a grin when his or her own photo was shown?

On the basis of the data available from the above tests, some scientists think that there is not one but there are two persons in the brain, each one using one hemisphere. They say that, if the same person were using both the hemispheres, it should be able to know what is happening into the other hemisphere.

But a deep thinking would lead us to the conclusion that this is a wrong opinion. The fact is that the right hemisphere has no

speech centre and, so, the conscious self *cannot express* what is happening. If it were to make use of the left hemisphere to express the event, then it would lose its contact with the right hemisphere because the *corpus callosum*, which was the channel for information-transfer, has been cut. However, the expression by means of a grin shows that the *self-aware person* is there. So, why not conclude from this that there is only **one self-conscious person** but, sometimes, it acts through the right and sometimes through the left hemisphere. However, since the hemisphere which has speech centre, is different from the other hemisphere into which the odour is being fed or to which the nude photo is being presented, *one same self-conscious person (soul)* cannot express the feelings as it used to because the connected parts have been severed and there is not only no transmission of experimental information from one to the other but also the centre for verbal expression too has been disconnected.

We can see that, even in normal life, we, sometimes, seem to do two activities at a time. For example, a person may be driving his car and, at the same time, discussing some problem with someone seated by his side. The reason why we see these two actions being done *simultaneously* is that mind or consciousness is *metaphysical and infinitesimal* and it takes almost *no time* to use one hemisphere and, almost instantly, the other hemisphere and, in case one of the hemispheres has been disconnected and removed, to use the parts of the hemisphere to which the electrical impulses are feeding the information.

Confirmation of the above view that there is only one person

Sperry had performed tests on the left hemisphere also of the split-brain persons. For example, he flashed to the *left* visual field (connected with the *right* hemisphere) the word “eraser” and the person was asked to search it out from a collection of objects, using only the touch with the *left* hand. The person correctly located the ‘Eraser’ but when he or she was asked to name the object he was holding in his left hand, he was unable to do it. Doesn’t this imply that when the word ‘eraser’ was flashed before his left eye, the right hemisphere was able to understand it

so that it *correctly located* it and held it up in his or her left hand but the person *could not utter* the name because the speech centre was in the left hemisphere?

Moreover, the following findings confirm the afore-stated view-point:-

1. Even after removal of the hemisphere, a person is alert, responsive and intelligent and a casual interaction with such a one would not reveal that he or she differs from the rest of the humanity because of commissurotomy, i.e., the surgical operation separating the two hemispheres though there are certain deficiencies noticeable because the sensory information that goes to one hemisphere is not passed on to the other hemisphere. Since one hemisphere can do without the other, this clearly shows that neither of the two hemispheres is the seat of Consciousness of Mind though both of these are used by Mind.

2. It was observed that when the left hemisphere of a patient was totally removed for treatment of a large brain-tumour, despite the loss of language capability, which is known speciality of the left hemisphere, the patient had all signs of intelligent and active behaviour. *It is clear enough that the right hemisphere is capable of sensory and motor action even in the absence of the left hemisphere which, until only a few decades ago, was strongly considered to be the seat of the soul or Mind.*

Some questions or arguments with a touch of humour

Also, if there were two self-conscious persons — one in each hemisphere, then the person in the right hemisphere should, perhaps, object to the removal of right hemisphere and, similarly, the person in the left hemisphere should object to the removal of that hemisphere because they would feel that it is being ousted or done away with or is being put out of employment.

Moreover, any emotion expressed, after commissurotomy should be half the emotion as compared to what it was when both the hemispheres were intact. But this is not so.

All these tests, therefore, not only show that there is only

one 'self-aware' person (soul) in the brain but also that the soul is seated neither in the right nor in the left hemisphere but is outside of these, having its field spreading over hypothalamus, thalamus, brainstem and the limbic system. It also shows that 'self-awareness' is not an epiphenomenon of the brain but rather 'Consciousness' is metaphysical in its nature.

The split personality phenomenon

The split personality phenomenon is different from the split-brain phenomenon because, in the latter, the two hemispheres had been disconnected by commissurotomy whereas, in the former, no such surgery has been done and the doctor treating the patient thinks that there are more persons than one in the brain.

The case of Miss Beachamp may be cited in this context. Morton Prince, her psychiatrist, says that there were several alternating personalities that manifested in her and he was faced with the problem of finding which was the real Beachamp that he should preserve so that the others be either integrated or they become extinct. He (psychiatrist) says that some of these personalities expressed deep anxiety that they would get extinguished because of the psychiatrist's treatment. Moreover, those several personalities confronted each other and they also expressed their own selfish concerns and their views, opinions and value-systems. Sometimes they pursued different goals even and they displayed different 'wills'. They tried even to change each other's views and also to bargain with each other. So, some people think that there is not one point of Consciousness in the body but there are many points of Consciousness. However, on the basis of complete study, one would conclude that **there is only one person though the same person manifests different or multiple personalities. For example, during one such attempt, when two different personalities were bargaining with each other, the patient said: "Are you guys trying to make two people out of me?"**

Further, Bernard Williams, a psychiatrist, says that the fear of different personalities that they would be extinguished by the

psychiatrist was unjustified. He says that when Miss Beachamp was cured, “They spoke freely of herself as having been Beachamp-I and Beachamp-4. The different personalities seemed to her to be due to very large differences of her moods or states. She regretted those moods and said: “After all, it is all myself.”

Thus, it is clear from the scientific evidence and its proper interpretation that the soul is a *metaphysical* being, seated in the brain and that two hemispheres are neither its seat nor are there separate ‘Consciousnesses’ in them. On the other hand, there is only one self-aware being who, seated near hypothalamus, coordinates the two hemispheres or uses each one of them as the case may be.



Consciousness or Self and Some Systems of Psychology

Earlier, in other chapters, we have discussed Consciousness with reference to Science, some systems of Philosophy and some Religions though in a very sketchy and selective way because the scope of this Paper did not permit any exhaustive discussion on some or all of them. We only pointed out some such salient features of some of them as related to our present discussion.

Since Psychology also discusses 'Consciousness', we will now take up very briefly the views of some eminent psychologists and well-known schools of psychology and see how they can help emerge a unified view.

Behaviourists school of J.B. Watson

J.B. Watson analysed and explained human behaviour in terms of reflexes and reflex arcs. He banished *self* or *soul* from psychology and advocated a materialistic-mechanistic model. No doubt, some kinds of human action can be explained in terms of reflex actions but no one can deny that human beings have *Will*, *Judgement*, *Choice*, *Goal*, etc. and all actions cannot be analysed according to Watson's model of reflex arcs. *Motivation* and *Valuation* do play an important role in human behaviour but Watson deliberately disregarded these factors. After all, man is not a robot which does what it is made for doing. Man has *will* and, therefore, he has a *moral dimension* to his actions which the machines or robots, based on reflex action model, do not have. So, Watson's mechanistic model does neither explain 'Consciousness' nor our real 'identity' or goal. Also, by neglecting the moral aspect, Watson's school created a crisis in moral values. In fact, his explanation can be a part of somatology or Reflexology

but not of psychology, for it does not throw any light on *psyche*. The belief in a spiritual or non-physical self explains Consciousness, Will, Motives, Values, Goals and also Reflex actions better and helps promote values in the society.

Gestalt School of Psychology

The main tenet of the Gestalt school is that our perception of an object is in the *total context*. We perceive anything in its *whole configuration* (gestalt aspect). Obviously, this system is opposed to Watson's system of perceiving an object in parts, and seeing how each part works in relation to other parts without viewing the object in the total context. Thus the Gestalt school came into existence as a protest against Watson's atomistic-mechanistic model and, in contrast to the latter, is called the *holistic* (wholistic) model.

The Gestalt school states that *Ego* is distinct from other objects with which or with whom it comes into contact. They think that Ego is a complex structure, composed of several sub-systems, all in contact with each other in the manner in which deeper levels are in contact with the upper levels or with the surface in a system. The Gestalt system says that, at the core of this complex system, lies the self which is enveloped by other layers which are in communication with it and are thus organised into one whole. Because of this surface-depth organisation and communication between various sub-systems and the Ego, there is an underlying dynamic unity.

It is strange that the Gestaltists overlook that what they call '*the self at the core of the Ego*' is none else but *the soul* and that various levels or subsystems are nothing else but soul's own matrices or springs of perception and manifestation, namely Mind, Intellect, Memory, Sanskārs, etc. These are various abilities, faculties, past memories, acquired habits, beliefs, etc., of the soul. **So, the self or the soul is the permanent background of all experiences and it is the soul which brings unity to all permanent background of all experiences and it is the soul which brings unity to all perceptions. It is the soul that co-ordinates and synthesises all the data and gives the holistic view.** It is the soul that brings communication between various

subsystems or levels because these sub-systems are, in fact, various strata or functional energy-grids of the soul. However, it seems that, since the general trend of thinking in the days of Watson and the Gestaltists was not to bring in soul in their theories, the Gestaltists deliberately avoided or missed taking cognisance of this important fact underlying *unity* and communication. This school of thought says that the ego has ‘the self’ at its core but it leaves all the questions about the nature of the self, saying that it is a complex question. It is thus an inadequate theory but it does recognise that there is a self at the core.

Hormic Psychology of McDougall

Hormic theory says that all active striving is towards *a goal*. *It is the fundamental human nature that all human actions are goal-oriented*. But the theory does not discuss who is *the subject* or *the person* that fixes a goal for his actions. Further, if anyone has a goal for his actions, it implies that (i) he has the ability of *understanding* the goal, (ii) *selecting* it from out of a number of choices before him, (iii) *judging* the merits and demerits of various choices, for then only he can select, (iv) *focusing attention* on the goal, (v) retaining it in his *memory*, for then only he can direct the series of actions consistently towards that goal, (vi) having *foresight* or a *vision* of the future, for then only can one continue to do actions to achieve the goal, (vii) *finding meaning* and purpose of his actions, (viii) having *sense of values* as to whether the means he is adopting are good or bad and (ix) having a *Will* for action and also (x) *feeling* for the result. Obviously, all these abilities are not *material* in their origin or their nature. This shows that *the self* dwelling in the body, is a *non-physical* being. But the hormic theory does not discuss all these.

Instincts point to the existence of the soul

McDougall says that there are certain innate propensities, called ‘*instincts*’. Each such instinct is a native spring of energy and is, at the same time, a channel of energy. McDougall calls these ‘*the hormic energies*’. He says that these instincts combine

together to form a complex impulse for action what may be called 'disposition' and the instincts and disposition form 'personality'. He considers *Mind* as an organisation of these innate propensities, instincts, dispositions or personality-traits. However, he does not touch the questions as to how there can be a 'personality' without a 'person' and what is the source of the hormic energies or instincts? For example, he considers 'curiosity' as the instinct that serves as energy and also as energy-channel for knowing but he does not discuss as to who wants to know and who learns and how and where is the knowledge stored? Moreover, he talks of dispositions but he does not deal with the question as to who forms these 'dispositions' and how these can be modified without bringing into the concept a permanent being who has the ability to know and to acquire disposition.

Again, McDougall uses the term 'horme' to refer not to any particular instinct but to a general urge or a dynamic force that impels for action. But he does not say anything about who feels that urge. If that urge is for acquiring a thing or for doing an action that has a goal, then who feels that urge. If that urge is to do an action that has a goal, then there must be an intelligent being and a non-physical one who has that urge because that permanent being must take that urge to its culmination or goal.

Furthermore, McDougall does not account for the combination of separate instincts around the same object. Let us give an example to illustrate this point. Someone has the instinct to acquire certain things. This is the instinct of acquisition and collection. The goal having been set, this person faces many obstacles in the fulfilment of his desire to acquire. He now has the instinct to fight (the obstacles). Now the question is how these two instincts combine towards the object or the thing? How can the unity of Mind be explained unless the unity of instincts is explained? This unity cannot be explained by 'the object'. It must be explained with reference to a more fundamental entity, i.e. the subject within. The instincts combine because the goal has been set by one same person and these various instincts pertain or belong to that same person too. So, unless we bring in this concept the existence of a person who is the substratum of unity, how can we explain human instincts or their combination or unity

or the human behaviour?

McDougall also speaks of sentiments. He says that ‘*self-regard*’ is an instinct and also the *master sentiment* that harmonises and integrates various sentiments and the human personality. But, as has been pointed out earlier, each instinct being separate from all others, cannot unite unless there is a uniting factor. If ‘*self-regard*’ is that factor, then the question arises as to who is *the self* that has the *regard* for itself and what is the basis for self-regard? Unless we consider self as a divine or a *spiritual* entity, different from the mundane, how can there be the ‘*regard*’ for it? Moreover, ‘*self-regard*’ cannot be the action of a non-conscious entity; it can be the action of only a conscious and a self-aware being. So, acceptance of ‘*self-regard*’ as the principle that *integrates* human personality itself means that *the self* is a non-physical conscious entity.

Then again, McDougall says that instincts have no origin in time. This points further to the truth that the instincts rest in the eternal and immortal soul which is a spiritual entity. McDougall’s theory would have gained adequacy and great validity if he had said that the *timeless* and *un-originated* instincts inhere in the soul and that the sentiment of ‘*self-regard*’ also rests in the self, i.e. the soul, which is the eternal spring of energy from which the instincts arise and into which they merge.

The Theory of William Brown

William Brown says that deep analysis of psychic or mental phenomena cannot be conducted by observing the surface mind. In order to study Mind in depth, one has to make enquiry further and further back in time, for that provides with greater wealth of material. So, indirectly, his theory lends support to the belief in the existence of the soul as the *non-physical* self which has further and further and further past and will also have a future and would never cease to exist.

James Ward’s dynamic theory of the self and of subject-object duality

James Ward says that, in all experience, there is a subject and object duality. The object, whether it is real or imaginary,

presents itself to the subject. *It is the subject which experiences the object. This subject is the self.* James Ward says that this subject has *individuality* and *permanence*. It has several concentric zones. One zone is of appetites and of feeling, the other is of ideation, memories, hopes and aspirations. The other is of imagining and desiring by the self. The centre of these concentric zones is the *inner self*. *It is the self that brings inner unity between these zones of feeling, ideation, memories, imagination, desire, etc. by virtue of its thinking, willing and permanence. It is the self that has the concept of being a person.* Thus, the views of James Ward clearly point out that he believes in the existence of a conscient, permanent self or soul. He calls this the *Pure Ego*. The concentric zones are the ‘psychological selves’ which also present themselves to this Pure Ego. The Pure Ego is distinguishable from all the objective self-images also. This Pure Ego is the real self.

William James’ doctrine of Mind as the Stream of Consciousness

William James has said that Mind is a stream of consciousness. Each thought joins the next-thought and melts into it and there always remains a *personal consciousness*. **This personal consciousness owns that which occurred just before, takes it up into itself and transmits whatever it realises to the successor thought. Thus, because of this continuous *personal consciousness*, the unity of thoughts and experiences is carried on by the passing thought and experience.**

James has further said: “The passing thought then seems to be the thinker; and though there may be another non-phenomenal thinker behind that, so far we do not seem to need him to express the facts”.

It is obvious from James’ views that he realises that though one thought disappears giving place to, or melting into, the next thought, yet there is an underlying ‘*personal consciousness*’ that lends continuity to experience. He also thinks that there may be a non-phenomenal thinker behind the continuous chain of thoughts. *But, he has not applied his mind adequately to see whether this*

'personal consciousness' is the non-phenomenal thinker. If it be so, then one has to believe in the existence of a permanent self which is the 'non-phenomenal thinker' and is also the 'personal consciousness', both-in-one, called the soul.

Further, James considers the self as possessing three 'constituents' (1) material one, (2) social one and (3) spiritual one. He says that there is a kind of rivalry among these and two of these have to be suppressed to make one of these actual. He speaks of these three constituents as three selves and considers that there is, besides these three, a '*pure ego*' which is the *inner principle of personal unity*. **It is very strange that William James rejects the view that the self has a metaphysical identity and yet he believes that there is a 'pure ego' behind these that works as an integrating force behind the separate experiences. Infact, 'pure ego' is another name for the soul and the three constituents, considered by James as three selves, are the three major or main fields of the soul.**

Furthermore, when William James discusses *Will*, he tells us that he feels that, in certain cases, the volition exhibits the *intervention of another entity*. This entity is not explainable in terms of elements preceeding the decision but is altogether different. Thus, James cannot explain *Will* adequately in his theory. He could do this if he had realised that this intervening entity is nothing else but the soul which may have two different or opposite volitions, one intervening into the exhibition or expression of the other.

In later years, William James was influenced, to an extent, by the psychological system, enunciated by G.W.H. Myers and, as a result, he felt inclined to believe in the metaphysical self which Myers termed as 'transmundane energy'.

G.W.H. Myers' theory explaining transmundane energy

Myers felt that, beneath the conscious processes, was the subliminal consciousness. He introduced subliminal consciousness in his concept because many problems of dual personality and parapsychological phenomena and the questions that came

up when subjects were under hypnosis, could not be explained without it. He believed that through the subliminal door, the transmudane energies operate within us.

Obviously, this concept of transmudane energy and subliminal consciousness are other names for the transcendental, i.e., non-physical self and *sanskāras* respectively.

These ideas of Myers were highly appreciated later by many psychologists, including William James who said this about Myers idea: “*the most important step that has occurred in psychology because he has revealed to us the unsuspected peculiarity in the constitution of the human nature*”. James own study of telepathy, clairvoyance and supernormal phenomena convinced him of continuation of sub-conscious and also of the conscious life, due to a non-physical entity.

Sigmund Freud’s Psychology of the Conscious, the Pre-conscious and the Unconscious

Freud says that there are three inseparable regions of Mind or consciousness — (1) **Conscious** (2) **Pre-conscious** and (3) **Unconscious**. The contents of the unconscious cannot be brought to consciousness in accordance with our inclination because they are subjected to active repression.

He makes a tripartite division of self into *id*, *ego* and *super ego*. ‘The id’ is the primitive, undifferentiated basis of mental life. It is the fundamental, oldest and largest layer. It is the primary source of psychic energy. It can never be completely explored as it remains at the unconscious level. We cannot give any positive description of *id*. We can know it from a study of the dreams and from the neurotic symptoms.

Freud says that *Id* is a chaos, a caudron of seething excitement. Instincts fill it with energy. It has no organisation and unified will. Its logic is that of emotion and not of reason. It knows no value, no morality.

Another thing about *Id* to which Freud draws our attention is that the *Id*-processes have no relation to the idea of time and are beyond any external influences. He emphasises that **man can do little to alter his future or destiny by working itself out of the depth of**

his own mind. Because of this nature of the *Id*, Freud thinks that there is dormant unhappiness in man's life.

About *Ego*, Freud says that it grows out of *Id*. The pressures of environment or the external stimuli make it act as an executive of consciousness. *Ego* is only partly conscious. He calls that part of it which is not conscious as **pre-conscious** because though it is latent yet it can come to conscious level. It can easily come to conscious level by recall or pressures of environment. Let it be explained a bit more clearly. Freud says that the state of consciousness is very transitory. An idea which is now at the conscious level, may not be so a moment later. But it can come again to the conscious level under certain conditions or due to certain stimuli. Where was the idea in the interval? We can say that it was latent but was also capable of coming up to conscious level. Freud calls it: '*Pre-conscious*'.

The **super-ego**, in every individual, is a refined version of the *Ego*. It is watching, judging and punishing the individual. It persuades the impure to become pure and perfect. It puts moral restrictions on the individual's desires and actions.

Freud says that small children are 'amoral' i.e. they are not involved in any moral considerations. They have pleasure-seeking wish and are free from any moral do's and don'ts or inhibitions. It is the parents which impose restrictions on their free nature and introduce moral consideration in their lives by expressing appreciation of certain kinds of acts and disapproval of other kinds.

We have said earlier that Freud thinks that the *unconscious* of a person can be known by knowing his dreams because desires, that are repressed or disowned during the day, come up in dreams during the night because then they are free from the censor's repression. Freud has mentioned four mechanisms of expression of dreams during sleep. These are (1) Dramatisation (2) Condensation (3) Construction of new and mixed images and (4) Displacement.

The question, however, remains as to how *continuity* of

thought-processes and *unity* of experience can be explained? *In order to explain that, Freud says that the entire working of the mind — the thoughts and the experiences — are various manifestations of one fundamental unconscious dynamic urge. He gives to this unconscious dynamic urge the name: Libido.* Talking of Libido, Freud said: “We have always suspected that, behind the multitude of small, occasional instincts, there lies something much more serious and powerful. These instincts change their aim by displacement — by passing energy of one instinct to the other”.

After much thought, Freud concluded that there are two fundamental instincts - (1) *Eros* or ‘*life-instinct*’. The basic aim of ‘Eros’ is to preserve, to build up. (2) The other instinct is *Thanatos* or ‘*death instinct*’ which represents tendency towards dissolution of the living substance and its return to a state of inanimate matter. Freud gave the name ‘*Libido*’ to the total energy of *Eros*.

Explaining further the nature of ‘*Libido*’, Freud says that it is the *sexual energy* but not in the literal sense nor has it to do with man’s or woman’s organs of generation or reproduction. ‘*Libido* is affection in general. Freud considers *Libido* as the unifying source.

He says that Id is the greatest reservoir of Libido. According to him, the initial state is an undifferentiated ego-id. He considers Libidinal energy as entirely ‘narcissistic’, i.e. directed not towards others but towards the self. He thinks that there is a primitive ego in the infant. Because of it, he identifies wholly with the world. Later, it takes the form of self-love, i.e. it becomes ‘Narcissistic’ in nature. Freud says that this narcissistic form of Libido is our original disposition, it is not the self but the starting point from which we attain the duality of self. He further says that love for an object is only a devious means of self-love.

It is clear from Freud’s above-stated views that *Libido* is not the self but rather Narcissistic form of *Libido* leads to devious means. Thus, the question about *the self* remains unanswered in Freud’s theory. Further, Freud admits that there is need to explain how the manifestation of different instincts or thought-processes and experiences attains *unity* and *continuity*. For this, he brings into his theory, the concept of *Libido* and says that *Id* is the greatest reservoir of *Libido* and, about

id, he says that it is chaos or a cauldron of seething excitement. But he does not explain how *Libido*, which has its source in *chaos* and leads to *Narcissism* — which leads to ‘*devious means*’ — can be a *unifying factor*.

How is there ‘unity’ and ‘continuity’ without a persistent being?

Freud also suggests that it is *Ego* that tries to synthesise the contents of *Id* and the *Super-ego*. But he also says that the *Ego* grows from out of *Id* which is *anarchic*. So, how can such an *anarchic Ego* synthesise and create unity? Freud answers that *Ego* does this by modification imposed on the *Id* by the external world. The question is how can the external world or external objects bring unity? Freud says that **the objects** supply stimuli to the *Ego*. This answer does not resolve the difficulty because the stimuli by their own nature, stand in need of unification and interpretation. Interpretation and unification can be done by a **subject**, not by the **objects**. The unorganised, primitive *Id* also cannot organise and synthesise nor can it be done by the *Super-ego* because that is an agency of censorship, reward or punishment. Thus, Freud could not explain how there is unity and continuity in thought and experience.

It is clear that the unification must be the function of the *Ego*. But the *Ego*, as defined by Freud, cannot be the agent for unity because he considers *Ego* as a development of *Id* which, by its own nature, is chaotic.

It is strange that Freud considers *Id* as the source of life-energy and also the matrix of psychic life and yet he fails to see that this *chaotic* reservoir or cauldron of seething excitement cannot be the source of unity. He should have thought that either there is unity in the *Id* or he should have considered *Ego* — connected with but not derived from *Id* — as the agent of unification. It is a basic fact which everyone must realise that **Unity is the pre-supporter of all psychic events and processes. It underlies all mental events and is not their product.**

‘Eternal Conflict’ and ‘Narcissitic State’, discussed from the Spiritual Perspective

One special feature of Freud’s psychological theory is that, according to it, *there is dormant unhappiness in everyone’s life. Freud says that man can do very little to liberate himself from the ‘Id’ and the ‘Libido’.* He believes that man is born to conflict. Thus, his view is pessimistic and very disappointing. Also, it is not realistic because we can see happiness too. If unhappiness were man’s destiny, then why should one make efforts to liberate the self? The very attempt shows that it is possible to achieve happiness. It might have been realistic for Freud because he neither knew nor practised Yoga-Meditation and had no revealed spiritual knowledge. He became positive to yoga too late in his life.

According to Spiritual Knowledge or Spiritual Perspective, what Freud calls ‘*Id*’ is the collection of a person’s *sanskāras* that can be changed by realising our real identity and practising soul-consciousness and Yoga intensely. *In fact, all the feelings of unhappiness and also the Narcissistic state, etc., are due to ‘body-consciousness’ and can be changed into happiness and spiritual love respectively by practice of soul-consciousness.* The ‘*Id*’ or the reservoir of *sanskāras* was, originally, not anarchic or ‘a cauldron of seething excitement’ but has become so due to a constant state of body-consciousness over a long period of time. ‘*Ego*’ is a person’s ‘*Conscious Mind*’ and ‘*Super-ego*’ is his ‘*Conscience*’ or the moral voice of the original pure state of the self. **To believe in the existence of the state without believing in the existence of the *self* whose state it is, or to believe in the existence of the collection of the result of *doings (id)* without believing in the existence of the *doer* whose *doings* these are, is, to say the least, a philosophical blunder or an oversight.** Again, to believe that the child is all *id* and has neither *ego* nor *super-ego* is again to miss an important truth, for the *ego* and the *super-ego* of the child begin to manifest as the child’s organs of expression grow and these expressions show that the *ego* and the *super-ego* pertain not totally to *the present* but do have some streaks of *the past* and some components which

have not been learnt *now* but come from the *by-gone period* and had been waiting to find chance for the organs to grow so as to make manifestation possible. And, both these, rightly understood, are indirect evidence of the existence of the *self*. To sum up, we can say that, since the child has not yet grown enough to express himself, the child's mind appears to be all - *id* because he manifests his *sanskāras* only. Considered in this light, one cannot deny the existence of the metaphysical *self* or the *soul* whose past doings the *id* reflects or whose present actions it affects.

Oedipus Complex and Cathexis, viewed from Spiritual Perspective

Even what Freud calls child's attachment with the mother, can be explained on the basis of 'body-consciousness' which means identification of the *self* with the body and awareness of the body on that basis. Freud says that when a portion of the *Libido* is detached from ego, it seeks a love-object to which it becomes attached. He calls this attachment *Cathexis*. The first object of *Cathexis* of the infant is the child's mother. He further says that when *Libido* is fixed on the mother, it loses its mobility; the *cathexis* does not move towards others. This gives rise to what is called, classically, 'The oedipus complex'. This complex and also the *cathexis* cannot be attributed to any other cause except that the *Self* or the *Soul* gets attached to the body and relates to others on the basis of awareness of the body.

Super-ego and Age-long Values discussed

An important point of Freud's psychological system is the concept of *Super-ego*. Freud says that the child has no *Super-ego*. According to him, *the Super-ego* of the child is built on the *Super-ego* of its parents. Thus the *Super-ego* becomes the vehicle of tradition and of all the age-long values which have thus been handed down from one generation to another or from one Age to another. Speaking in this context, Freud says that the *Super-ego* of an Age or epoch of civilisation has its origin similar, in this respect, to that of an infant as individual. Christ was the Father-

figure of his era and that Age had the Super-ego of Christ. In this respect also, Freud is not totally correct. *In fact, in so theorising, he contradicts himself because, according to his own theory, the child's 'Super-ego' is built on that of his parents; so, Christ's own 'Super-ego' must have been built on that of his father or father and mother. If that be so, how can then a new Age dawn and a new Super-ego emerge on the world-scene? Christ's Super-ego can be explained better by bringing into the concept the belief in the existence of a soul. Christ was a holy soul that descended into this world. He spoke and lived in line with his Super-ego and others felt inspired by him. Without believing in the existence of a soul, different from the body, even the dawn of a new Age can not be explained.*

Spiritual review of child's Ego and Super-ego

Freud says that *id* is the primal matrix from which the *ego* and the *Super-ego* evolve by progressive differentiation. It is the seat of elemental or primary urges. Thus, the child is all - *id*, but, with a parental *ego*; child's own *ego* gradually emerges.

Instead of saying this, it could be said from the Spiritual Perspective, that, initially, the child has a reservoir of its own *sanskāras* but, as he grows, comes into contact with his parents and with others, observes, learns, adopts some ways and rejects others and is influenced in the process, he builds his own *ego* and manifests it. This kind of learning, influencing and strengthening of his personal *ego*, exerts some hold over his *sanskāras* (*id*) also and, curbing the fantasies or transforming the negative urges, it expresses itself the way it has newly learnt, accepted and adopted.

So, it cannot be said that there was no *ego* in the child; the correct thing would be to say that it began to manifest itself gradually with added strength and new influences. **But, granting for a while that there was no *ego* earlier, the existence of the *id* is a proof of the existence of the *self*, for, else *whose* 'anarchic state' it represented, *whose* seething excitement this cauldron contained, *whose* 'dormant unhappiness' it had in it? *Who* sees the dreams, *who* has the wish that is repressed and *who* represses that wish and *who* decides to repress it? And, after all,**

these are not physical actions; these pertain to the realm of thought and one must, therefore, decide *who* is it that thinks, feels, remembers, desires and has or has not the happiness of a kind.

Signs of change in Freud's views about Yoga, etc. later

It is worth recording here that Freud ultimately confessed, though it was too late in his life, that he thought it necessary to recast his views on the basis of his study of the occult phenomena such as 'telepathic dreams', 'thought-transference', 'clairvoyance', etc. He got some information about the practice of yoga-meditation and the states of trance or ecstasy which one felt when one practised yoga. He also became aware of how yoga-meditation brought about modification. If he had a little longer life or earlier exposure to yoga-meditation, he would have, perhaps, broadly announced his belief in the existence of soul.

Explanation of opposite instincts

Freud thinks that instincts are the drives and the energy and that, of all the instincts, 'the *Eros* instinct' and the '*aggressive instinct*' are fundamental and that all other instincts are included in these two. He believes that, sometimes, the opposite instincts also act in co-operation so that even the child's *love* towards his parents is not free from an admixture of *aggressiveness*.

Even these beliefs of Freud should suggest the presence of the soul which has both these instincts and has the same goal for which it uses these two contradictory instincts also in co-operation with each other in order to achieve its goal. Else, where do the instincts spring from and in whom do these contradictory instincts abide?

Personal pre-history also suggests existence of soul

Personal pre-history is another aspect to which Freud draws our attention. He says that the individual's first identification with his parents is very important. The *Super-ego* of a grown-up individual has the pre-history embedded in it. Even this aspect of *Freud's theory should suggest the existence of an entity in the*

body that is continuously there from early infancy till his death and that can 'organise', record and recall all the events, experiences and conclusions as one single person. It is the metaphysical self or soul that has this continuous existence because the body-chemistry, body-physics and personal physiology change. It is that one person who is interested in retaining and utilising those experiences to realise a goal. Researches show that the child is influenced by the parents and the environment even when it is yet in its mother's womb. Experiments of hypnotic regression also bear witness to the truth that there is a self that has existed even before this body. Further, if we observe minutely the behaviour of a child, we will find that the actions and the behaviour of the child do not only reflect his *libido* or *id* of the present life but also these exhibit certain virtues or vices acquired by it in the past life or lives. Then, how can the existence of *soul* or permanent *self* be denied?

Adler's Individual Psychology

Before we make a critical appreciation or review of Adler's school of psychology, let us first refresh our mind with some of his relevant fundamental concepts:

Adler's school of psychology says that every individual is *unique* and *organic whole*. His personality is *undivided* and *indivisible*. All the actions, reactions, impulses, movements, etc., are uniquely his. They reflect that individual's personality or attitude toward's life.

Feeling of insecurity and urge for superiority

Adlerian Psychology is based on this fundamental observation and statement that every individual is born in this world, feeling incomplete and unfulfilled and having a deep sense of inferiority. Adler thinks that these feelings of incompleteness and inferiority are blessings on man, for these urge him towards fulfillment, security and conquest. If man did not possess these feeling of incompleteness, insecurity and inferiority, he would have succumbed before the assault of the powers of Nature.

Continuing on the above theme, Adler says that **the most fundamental human urge is the striving for superiority**. This impels man to rise, to conquer, to achieve. He says that this impetus from minus to plus never ends. Constantly, there is, in man, the urge to move from below to above. Thus, he believes that the urge and the striving for superiority or from minus to plus is basic and, truly, this urge is the intrinsic necessity of life. It is a pre-preponent dynamic principle. He says that what appear as separate drives are, in fact, not separate because they receive their power from this basic urge — the urge for superiority.

All actions of every human being have a goal

Adler further says that **the psychic life of man is determined by his goal. It is the goal which marks the line of direction for all his movements and his way of life**. No human being can think, feel, will, dream, without all these activities being determined, continued, modified and directed towards an ever-present objective or goal. Whether a man moves in a normal way or a neurotic way, the clue is provided by the goal which enables us to understand the hidden meaning behind his acts. In this connection, Adler also says that man is motivated more by his expectations of *the future* than by his experience of *the past*.

Adler's agreement with Vaihinger and Kant about fictional goals

Adler had taken a hint from the philosopher Vaihinger. Vaihinger advanced the thesis that man lives by *fictional goals* which actually have no counterpart in reality. Yet these fictional goals enable man to deal more effectively with reality. Vaihinger thought that the fictive activity of mind is an expression of the fundamental psychic forces. He considered fiction as a merely auxiliary construct as scaffolding is while constructing a building. Though this scaffolding is demolished afterwards, it serves a purposes and lends support in constructive activity. So also does the fictional goal. It enables man to rise high. It has a productive value. Thus, Vaihinger thought that all life is built on fiction and

he stressed the creativity of mind in fiction-making.

Kant, who also had taken a hint from Vaihinger, had said that our ideas, like soul, world and God do not represent any objective realities which could possibly be known. But he added that, nevertheless, we are aided in our enquiries in different fields of study, such as psychology, cosmology and theology, if we proceed as if there were such objects as soul, world and God. Kant gave this the name: '*heuristic fictions*'. So, some like to call Vaihinger's ideas on fiction-making the '*as if*' justification of the ideas of reason. Adler was impressed by these ideas of Vaihinger and Kant.

Adler's psychology of fictional goals and life-style

Taking hint from Vaihinger and Kant, Adler believed that man behaves as if an ideal goal or norm was set to human activity. **Adler believed that every individual has a fictional goal in his mind and this goal enables him to consider himself as superior to his present difficulties and thus to overcome the present state.** In his school of psychology, *the fictional goal* is thus a device of the individual to free himself from the inferiority feelings. This fictional goal does service to him as it compensates him for the inferiority-feeling.

Adler further says that, in order to achieve this fictional goal of superiority, man adopts a certain pattern of living. He conducts himself in certain ways. This way of living or pattern of conducting himself is what Adler calls "the style of life". This 'style of life' is unique to every person. Every individual has his own 'style of life' which acts as the whole; all other actions, thoughts, etc. are its parts.

Adler's emphasis on social interest

Adding to this, Adler says that the goal is determined not merely by the inferiority felt by the individual but also by '*the social interest*' of the individual. **Social interest is innate to every mind. It is social interest that makes an individual to respond to the world-reality and it also modifies a person's goal.** It is there in everyone as inherent potentiality but one has to develop it by conscious efforts.

Adler lays much stress on ‘*social interest*’. He says that we cannot be completely without *social interest*. ‘Social interest’ is a source of great compensation to an individual for weaknesses in his nature. *In fact, the normal development of a person consists in a perfect balance between the striving for superiority and social interest, and a close observation will reveal that all mal-adjustments are the result of an inadequate social interest and a restricted sense of belonging.*

Fundamental differences between Freud and Adler

Thus, there is fundamental difference in the psychological views of Adler and Freud about the human self. According to Freud, the personality, the behaviour and the problems of the individual are rooted in the instinctual cravings, that arise from his *id*, and also in his infancy. But, according to Adler, all these arise from his individual *sense of inferiority* and in his efforts for achieving superiority in order to compensate himself. Further, Freud believes that *Libido* or sexual energy is the motivating and sustaining force behind all individual behaviour whereas Adler thinks that *Libido* may or may not be the motivating force, for the main driving force is individual’s *style of life*. Adler thought that the urge to rise from below to above, or from minus to plus, or the assertion of the self to develop the personality and to gain superiority, was the most important factor.

Again, Freud divided the self into *Id*, *Ego* and *Super-ego* on the one hand and *the Conscious*, *Pre-conscious* and *the Unconscious* on the other hand. But Adler differed on this, for he thought that this kind of division fails to recognise the *unity* and *continuity* of psychic aspect of life in all its expressions. He emphasised that the individual’s *style of life* represents *unitarily* all his strivings. He also thought that there was no antagonism between *the Conscious* and *the Unconscious* and, so, *the Ego* was not always in the difficult position of having to face the outer world and to please the *id*, and the *Super-ego* also at the same time. Thus, Freud thought that man was born in conflict and was always in conflict. Adler explained that the self was a *unitary being*, having the potential of self-development. Adler always gave primary importance to *life-style* which, according to him, grew out of the difficulties the individual faced in early life and

also out of striving for a goal of superiority, chosen by the self. He emphasised that an individual *assimilated all experiences* also according to his *style of life* and he did not experience a situation as it actually was but according to a private scheme of appreciation. Thus, there was no impersonal and *purely objective* experience but it was also *subjective*.

Adler said that every psychological event was due to the manifestation of self's '*will-to-power*' or *craving for superiority* and in all the events, *Life-style* was a psychic unit and common sense or the *social feeling* was another factor.

Having given briefly the fundamental and salient features of Adler's psychology, which are relevant to our present subject, let us make an attempt at its appraisal insofar as its concept of *Self* or *Consciousness* is concerned.

Who is this individual that has all these?

Adler speaks of (1) the feeling of inferiority, (2) the striving for superiority, for position of power or for achievement of self-development, (3) selecting a goal to which all actions of an individual are directed, (4) having social interest and modifying one's goal in the light of that interest, (5) having a style of life that includes one's goal, social interest, thoughts, behaviour, etc., (6) assimilating all experiences according to Life-style, (7) having a scheme of appreciation that is subjective, and (8) the will-to-power. He starts his whole thesis with the belief that the individual is *one whole* and is undivided and indivisible. **But nowhere does Adler explain, in definitive terms or clearly and adequately as to the identity of the self or the nature of Consciousness. He does not say anything as to who has the feeling of inferiority, who strives for superiority to compensate the self, who selects a goal, who has social interest and who is this undivided and indivisible individual? Who is it that has the abilities to feel (inferiority), to strive (for superiority), to select (a goal), to have a motivation (or social interest), to find meaning in life and, thus, adopt a particular style of life and so on? Who is it that has the Will and that assimilates the experiences in order to utilize these for a goal? Naturally, it must be a conscient being whose existence is 'continuous' and persistent so that it remembers the past, thinks of the future. It is this Conscious self that maintains unity and continuity of experience. This is the**

individual self, that is undivided and indivisible, which means that the selves are plural and each one has a different potential. It is this unitary self which has the Unconscious and the Pre-conscious, not as separate entities or separate compartments but as an organic whole though having different levels.

What was the original stage of the self?

Again, Adler talks of the feeling of inferiority and the striving for superiority. This means that, by setting for itself the goal of superiority, the individual rises high. *So, the question is that, if an individual can rise to a position of superiority, power or excellence, then its present position or feeling of inferiority must be the result of a fall from some past position of superiority, for, the position of fulfillment is its original and natural state, else why should it strive to attain it? All things and beings aspire and strive for returning to their original state which is always considered higher than the present one which urges them to strive. Else, where does the Urge come from and why?* So, Adler should have pointed out that every individual must have had a past and its existence in the past must have been, once upon a time, the position of superiority from which it slid down and to which it now aspires to rise back again and that is why the 'urge' is there. Also, if every individual, to-day, has a feeling of inferiority, everyone must have had a feeling of fulfillment at some time in the past. So, that period of time or Age also must have been superior to the present era. In other words, all individuals move down from the Golden Age down to the Iron Age. Adler, however, has no clue to all this and, therefore, he does not talk of this.

He ought to have explained why the individual has a feeling of inferiority and when and how did he fall to this position which he considers a blessing?

What led the soul to a fall to have the feeling of inferiority?

Adler also does not say as to what led to the self's sliding down from its position of strength, superiority and excellence to the present

position of inferiority, insecurity and craving for compensation. As Freud does not explain why every man's *id* is anarchic, why there is inner conflict from the very start, why the child gets attached to the mother, why there are 'Narcissistic tendency' and the 'oedipus complex', so also Adler does not explain the cause of the *feeling of inferiority* and an individual's present state nor does he give a clear concept of what is the description or nature of the goal of superiority. If he had thought over these questions, which are basic to formulation of his theory, he would have been led to the firm belief that there is a *soul*.

Furthermore, the spiritual perspective of Consciousness wants to combine reality with fiction. It says that what seems to be fiction to-day can become fact tomorrow. So, a person should strive to become completely divinised in order to attain a higher stage in the Golden Age or in Paradise which, according to the description, seems at present, to be a fiction but is very much a fact. So, if a human being lives on fiction as Vaihinger contends and as Adler believes, then he should keep before the Consciousness a goal that is *a realisable fiction*, i.e., an attainable but very high goal. *But he must also understand that there is a being that knows that there is a difference between fiction and reality and, intentionally, selects a fictitious goal to reach the real goal as a tactic. This being, whose aura can be seen as an oval-shaped light, is an indivisible point-of-light.*

Freud has unnecessarily created a never-ending conflict by saying that an individual mind is rooted in submission to instinctual cravings of the *id*. Adler has suggested that we can end this conflict by having a proper *life-style*, goaded by a high *goal*. The spiritual perspective also asks us to have a *Sāttwic* life-style and an inspiring high goal. But it does all this by giving, first, a clear identity of *the self* or *Consciousness*.

However, Adler's school of psychology is close to the spiritual perspective of Consciousness which says that the selection of a high goal is very essential for giving to man a proper direction to his drives. The spiritual perspective also asserts that there should be consciousness-training by providing to *the self* the objective of becoming deity from an ordinary person.

Analytical Psychology of Jung

Let us, first, take note of the salient features of Jungian system as related directly or indirectly to our subject here.

Jung tried to formulate his system of psychology in consonance with the principles of physics so that psychology can be explained in scientific terms. From this point of view, he said that *Libido* is **psychic energy**. He said that '*the psychic energy*' is fundamentally different from the physical energy and neither of these can ever be converted into the other. **He also repudiated the notion that Consciousness or Mind is the epiphenomenon or the emergent phenomenon of the brain.**

He said that *Libido* is not a cauldron of anarchic impulses which are later co-ordinated or channelled but it is 'undifferentiated vital energy' which finds expression through innumerable channels. According to him, it would not be correct to say that it is sexual energy because it sometimes manifests as self-assertion, sometimes it strives for *superiority* or *position of power* and, sometimes, in the form of sexuality also. It may manifest in the form of biological activity and also spiritual activity. It is the reservoir and the fountainhead of all these. **It is very dynamic and may express as desire, social interest, passion, love, joy or any other human activity. It is the driving strength of our own self or soul.**

Jung further said that when this energy is only in potential form, then it manifests as the '*state*' or '*condition*' and, when it expresses as a wish, feeling, striving, etc., then it is in the form of '*a force*' and all these forces together are '**energy**'. The amount of energy invested in any one of these elements, i.e., expressions, is called '*the value*' of the component, i.e., feeling, striving, etc. Thus, Value is the measure of intensity or degree.

Law of Conservation of Energy, applied to psychic energy

Basing his psycho-dynamics on two principles of physics, namely '*The Principle of Equivalence*' and '*The Principle of Entropy*', Jung says that no *psychic value* can weaken or disappear without being replaced by another of equivalent intensity. For example, if the desire for one object decreases, an equal

amount of desire is directed towards another object. The amount thus expended appears elsewhere in the system. Thus, the energy remains undiminished or constant. Only the goals change. This happens according to '*The Principle of Equivalence*' which is also known as '*the Law of Conservation of Energy*' or '*The First Law of Thermodynamics*.' Jung applies this to psychic energy.

In answer to the question "What happens when a desire is repressed"?, Jung says that, in the case of repression, Energy lost by Consciousness passes into *the Unconscious* and activates its contents. When it activates the contents of *the Unconscious*, it may provoke disturbances, dreams, neuroses, psychosis, etc.

Jung further says that *the psychic energy is 'a relatively closed system'*. He emphasises the word '*relatively*'. In an absolutely closed energetic system, the differences in intensity are gradually reduced to an even temperature. After the point, further energy-change stops. The system then comes to a total stand-still in the form of death or cold. But in a '*relatively closed system*' of psychic energy, the distribution of energy seeks an equilibrium. What happens is that a weak part in the system improves its status by getting energy from a strong part. In this process, it creates a tension in the total atmosphere. Whenever any one part or aspect of it improves its status, i.e. its intensity, a conflict or a strain occurs in the psyche. If, on the other hand, an even development of all the constituents of the psyche takes place, then the result is harmony.

Freud had said that *the Principle of Entropy* leads ultimately to death. He had said that all instincts lead to energy-loss and, therefore, to higher entropy. But he had also postulated that there are two basic instincts, one called '*eros*' and the other '*death-instinct*'. Jung, on the other hand, hypothesised that there did not 'exist two contradictory instincts or forms of energy; there is only one basic psychic energy and what is called '*death-instinct*' is also a manifestation or phenomenon of that energy. He said that *Libido* was not only the energy of life and Will but it also willed its own destruction.

Discussing *the Law of Equivalence* and the Law of Entropy,

Jung has also said that stirring up the contents of the *Unconscious* can act as great springs of psychic energy. It can even act as a force of transformation and bring back the psychic forces into progressive direction.

Intuition

Jung expressed his views on the question of *Intuition* also. He said that *Intuition* came up from the realm of the *Unconscious* and is a very important function of it. Freud was not sure about the source and nature of *Intuition* but Jung drew special attention to it and thought that it was a sort of 'a teleological sense.' As is generally known and accepted, *Intuition* gives a quick perception of possibilities of facing, solving or using a situation or of doing actions in order to achieve a particular goal and then one reaches a conclusion without being consciously aware of reaching those conclusions and without making hard efforts. *Intuition* enables a person not only to have quick conclusions but also take initiative, create new things and new designs, to formulate new theories and enter new areas of human endeavour.

Collective consciousness

One important thing, discussed by Jung is about *Collective Consciousness*. He distinguished it from individual or personal consciousness. He says that if we take into account only the present life of an individual, then this period of life being a limited one, we would expect the contents of *his Unconscious* also very limited so that it would be possible to empty it or exhaust it by some method. But psycho-analysis of an individual leads us to the conclusion that the contents of *his Unconscious* are very much more and many of them are such that one life-time, i.e. the present life, cannot explain them because these never were in *his Consciousness* in this life nor were all these acquired in the present life. So, Jung thinks that personal *Unconscious* has a large mass of *non-personal* and collective experiences of the community, the nation, the race or the humankind. He believes that the Collective Unconscious has layers upon layers of past experiences, lasting

over ages. He considers this *Collective Unconscious* older than personal Unconscious. He thinks that it is the mother of all forms of Consciousness. *The Collective Unconscious* is neither derived from 'ego' nor is 'ego' derived from it. He calls the components of *the Collective Unconscious* as '*The Archetypes*'.

The Archetypes

From the point of view of Jung's psychology, our Archetypes are like the photo-negatives in our *Unconscious*. Some of these are of living persons and are in our *Consciousness* whereas others relate to the person in the past and are in our *Unconscious* and are resurrected into the Conscious Mind even as negatives are developed to get clear pictures. For example, '*the archetype of the mother*', which is in *the Unconscious*, produces an image of a mother figure which is then identified with the actual mother. The baby inherits a pre-formed conception of a generic mother which determines in part how the baby will perceive his mother.

Jung says that one finds *Archetype* for himself from Mythology, Religion, Politics, Novels, Cine Films, etc. These appear in a person's mind when he is faced with a situation and has to react to it. Jung thinks that these represent the valuable experiences of a person's contact with, or exposure to, special and typical persons in the past and thus are record of the wisdom of the ages. Jung says that the Archetypes 'sometimes' appear in our dreams and also as supernatural figures. The number of the Archetypes is limited because one has come into contact only with limited number of typical figures. Some people have even their gods and devils also.

Persona and Personality

Jung says that man's Conscious personality consists of ideas that are directly connected with his ego. The Conscious personality is based on the Collective Psyche also because, generally, a person tries to do such actions, or at least tries to appear to be doing such actions, as are approved by the group, community, nation or society to which he belongs. So, his 'personal con-

sciousness' has, embedded in it, 'collective consciousness', i.e. ideas recommended collectively by small or big groups also. Jung says that, speaking overall, it is not his actual personality but he has adapted it as a matter of convenience and so as not to offend the people. It is thus a reflection of the ideas and opinions of the people rather than of the person himself. He thus takes a form to show to the public but, in reality, he is different. Jung calls it 'persona'. The word 'persona', in ancient Greek, means: 'the mask' worn by an actor. Jung says that one has to free oneself from these masks in order to live his real personality. Jung said that this can be done by 'Individuation'.

A spiritual overview of Jung's psychology in order to explore his ideas on the self

Jung has clearly said that *Libido* or *Psychic Energy* is not an epiphenomenon of the brain and is different from the physical energy. He has also added emphatically that *Libido* is not sexual energy nor does sexual energy goad all human actions. He has said that *Libido* may manifest in the form of self-assertion, striving for superiority or even for spiritual progress. This means that Jung considers *the self* as distinct from the body and the brain and believes that it is energy. But he has not clearly stated as to where *the self* or *Consciousness* is located in the body and where the mind-body inter-action takes place. We have stated earlier that it takes place in the area of the hypothalamu- pituitary- limbic system- brainstem combine and that the self is an infinitesimal point of non-material light that has an aura and a field.

The existence of the samskāras and intuition also confirm the existence of soul

Discussing the psycho-dynamics of the psychic energy, Jung has said that the psychic energy is '*a relatively*' closed system' and that the psychic energy works according to the Law of Conservation, and the energy moves from *the Conscious* to the *Unconscious* and then rises back into the Conscious. The system of Easy Raj Yoga, enunciated earlier in this book, also states that the

soul is an eternal and immortal point of energy and that the soul-energy does not reach a point of 'death', so to say, because what actually happens is that the energy in the form of thought, desire, feeling, etc., is changed from positive to negative or *vice-versa* and can be changed back into original form. In other words, it can be said that the psychic energy is put to good or bad use and is then recycled back to its original form. It becomes impure from pure and is purified back to its pristine state. It also goes from *the Conscious* to *the Unconscious* and, when stirred by some stimulus, or by Yoga-practice, it gets transformed and transferred back. So the recycling restores the apparent energy-loss and one returns to the state of zero entropy. Changing the *samskāras*, sublimating the emotions and re-charging the soul's energy-field by connecting it to the Supreme Soul solves the question of Entropy*.

About the *Intuition*, Jung has said that it is a thought that comes from *the Unconscious*. He considers it as a sort of '*teleological sense*'. According to Raj Yoga, however, this is only one of the sources of *Intuition*. *The Unconscious* or the *Samskāras* are a huge storage of past experiences and, suddenly, a thought springs up from there and enters into *the Conscious* mind like a flash. It is like the age-old wisdom coming to our help. **The other source, however is God. The yogis experience a kind of a Divine Help or God's guidance. They suddenly feel that a thought-wave has come from above. This golden thought is free from any vice or negative tendency and strengthens the Will, brings clarity to the mind and comes without any striving on the part of the yogi. It gives a kind of a joy and one feels that it is not at all due to any conscious effort on one's part but has come as a divine grace by telepathic means. This also is the inner, subtle proof that *Consciousness is a being* or a person and can have a person-to-person link with the Supreme Soul who also is a Person.**

'Collective consciousness', 'Archetypes' and the concept of 'persona' also confirm the existence of soul

In regard to the '*Collective Consciousness*', Raj Yoga explains that *the Consciousness* that abides in our present body has had a number of re-incarnations in the past and, in those re-incarnations, it had many experiences. In those earlier lives, it came

*Eccles has explained it differently in his latest book. The author will discuss his views more clearly in a subsequent comprehensive book he intends to publish.

into contact with many persons, communities, groups of people, etc. All those experiences lie in the soul in a dormant form which means that there is a reservoir of past experiences which forms *the Unconscious*. This *Unconscious* is not a separate entity but is continuous with *the Conscious*. The existence of *the Unconscious* or the store of past dormant experiences also shows that *the Consciousness* or *Soul* is not an emergent phenomena of the brain and that *the Self* or *Consciousness* is an eternal and immortal spiritual entity.

The existence of the *Archetypes* also in our *Conscious* and *Unconscious* confirms that the self is different from the brain and that it had many existences in the past which are the cause of all these influences, impressions and latent memories of typical persons. The existence of Archetypes in our psyche cannot be explained by considering the self or *Consciousness* as an emergent phenomenon of the brain. These can only be explained on the basis of the existence of *Consciousness* as an eternal being.

The concept of '*persona*' and '*personality*' also can be explained on the basis of a *Consciousness* as a *permanent being*. Actually, what has happened is that, during its journey in this world, in the form of one incarnation after another, *the soul* has become defiled. It has lost its luster and its original moral stature. Yet there is a latent impression of its past great moral height in the soul and also in the society. So, the society also expects certain high moral standards and the self also feels impelled to have the original high moral form. Because of these inner and outer pressures, *the self* does the adaptation. It makes an outward show, though inwardly it no longer has those qualities. Raj Yoga system requires a person to practise Yoga-Meditation and to work for internalisation of moral and spiritual values. The process of Yoga-Meditation empties the Mind of the negative thoughts and residual past experiences (*sanskāras*) and to achieve what Jung wants to achieve through what he called '*Individuation*'.

We will like to close here without discussing the important findings of parapsychology because of the limited scope of this Paper*. The phenomena of telepathy, premonition, morphologi-

cal resonance, etc., etc., greatly support the Spiritual Perspective of Consciousness. But we will not discuss the paranormal experiences of Visions, Third Eye, Divine Trance, etc. here which lend great strength to spiritual perspective.

Summing up, we can say that the Self or Consciousness is a *metaphysical infinitesimal point-of-light* which, originally, had purity and peace and which lost some of its moral luster as it passed through various incarnations and became ignorant of its real identity and got also the negative influences of others. This understanding about the identity of the self will restore moral values to the society and generate the loveful feeling of the mankind being a family, and the practice of Yoga-Meditation, based on it, would end all conflict in our mind and also help to re-establish a better society.

*This chapter is a part of Paper II, presented by the author at the IIIrd. International Symposium on Science and Consciousness at Olympus in Greece.



Epilogue

Identity Crisis

It is good to suggest to the people that they make sincere efforts to effect transformation in the self, to improve their relationships with others and to do service to others. If they make commitment for this and implement an action-plan of their choice in this direction, it would definitely be a step forward towards a Better World. After people have taken a step for the betterment of the world, they will feel further impetus for taking longer and quicker steps in that direction.

But while this strategy for bringing about a Better World has its validity and effectiveness, let us not forget that the major break-through in man's efforts for self-change comes when he knows his real identity. The present world-crisis, which is generally known as the *crisis of values* is, in fact, a deep *crisis of self-identity*. The crisis of values also has resulted from the loss of the knowledge of the real identity of the self. The whole tragic situation around us is due to loss of identity. While man has discovered many "lost" continents on the globe, this 'continent of the self' has yet to be discovered or re-discovered by everyone of us.

Thus, man has first to be made aware of the truth that he has, in him, a certain potential of divine qualities or a core of human values and that these qualities or values, within him, have gone deep down in the sea of *the Sub-conscious* and *the Unconscious Mind* and have now to be brought again to the surface, into the light, and have to be used as the keyboard for actions. **Man has also to be given a realisation of the truth that, with the cremation or burial of the dead body, man's all deeds — good or bad — done by him during his life-time, or the abilities and qualities acquired by him over a period of time, are not all lost. Neither do man's good actions go unrewarded for ever nor do his bad actions go unpunished. Though man's body dies, the soul lives on forever and for ever and takes another and another incarnation until it attains its final liberation and retires for a period of time to plunge into happy activities again, prompted by its own will. Unless and until man realises that, in truth, he is an eternal being, a soul, a being-of-light, and that so are other beings, his outlook and his attitude towards all others does not undergo a total change. When, however, he realises his real identity, he takes new '*spiritual birth*' so to say. His life-style and his mode of thinking and actions undergo a left-**

about-turn For, man now thinks that he is not made of dust nor is he an animal but, in his own true nature, he is *a being-of-light*, pure, peaceful and upright originally. This realisation brings an attitudinal change in him and he now feels that he has not to give up his social life but only to be his *real self* so as to lead a life of peace.

When man thus knows his real identity, then an improvement in his self and in his relationship with others takes place automatically and naturally even as day follows night. In that new state of awakening or altered state of consciousness, he naturally thinks of being good and doing good. He has then a natural and constant inclination to do service to others also.

So, we may adopt whatever strategy we think is suitable for a particular country or a group of people but let us keep in mind that, sooner or later, we have to give to all those who come in touch with us the knowledge of the real identity of self, for, without this knowledge, there is no going nearer our goal.

One has so many relationships in the corporeal world, what then is one's difficulty in, or objection to, having a relationship with God? *If one says that he does not believe in God and does not know Him and that he knows only Morality, Goodness and Kindness, let him understand that God is the very embodiment of these and that, if he believes in Goodness, Kindness and Morality, he already believes in God even though indirectly. Let him realize that qualities always exist or rest in some person or entity; they do not have any existence, independent of, or separate from, these. So, Goodness, Kindness and Morality also rest in someone at their peak point and that someone is called God.* These qualities are the characteristics of a conscient person. So, God is a conscient Person though He is *Incorporeal Being-of-light* As such, we do have some relationship with Him as we have relationship with others, for we are not in a vacuum.

In fact, all morality has its sanction from God. If one removes God from his consciousness, his moral sense does not rest on any sound and firm foundation. God is the Fountainhead of virtues and high values. We, therefore, in our own interest, ought to know Him and have very loving relationship with Him. The knowledge

of the identity of the self and of God will enable man to rid himself of the present crisis.

When we have given the knowledge of the real identity of the self, only then can we facilitate a love-link between *the self* and *the Supreme Soul*. Without this mental and emotional link with the Creator, it is very difficult, if not impossible, for a person to sustain *the self* in divine qualities or ethical values for long. **Let us note this secret and sacred truth that our relationship with God is the most important thing. If, to us, that relationship does not matter, then nothing really matters. That, in truth, ought to be the first relationship from which all other relationships should receive 'The substance' (or call it whatever you may) of love, divinity and unity. If one cannot maintain a faithful and loving relationship with God, take it for granted that he cannot really maintain a worthwhile, worthy faithful and enduring relationship with anyone.**

