CHAPTER V

HUMAN INDIVIDUAL AND EMANCIPATION

SECTION I

MARX ON MAN - REAL AND TRUE
The central problem with which every social thinker deals, is the man and it is not an abstract man, but the concrete human individual. Marx and Nimbarka both think about the human individual and endeavour to solve the problem of individual, keeping him on the solid ground of earth. Both uphold the view that the existence of human individual in the society is a concrete existence and not a dream. Both notice the suffering condition of the human individual and want to trace the way-out of his crisis. Both hanker after the perpetual peace and a condition in which one's free development does not cause other's sufferings. The search of Marx and both Nimbarka aim at a region where the barriers of nationality, sects or castes cannot hinder the universal fraternal feeling of all individuals.

Marx thinks about man as real, corporeal man, who exhales and inhales in the forces of nature standing with his feet firmly on the ground. He is a natural being endowed with natural powers. He is an active natural being. Natural forces exist in man as tendencies and abilities-
instincts. As a natural, corporeal, sensuous, objective
being he is a suffering, conditioned and limited creature,
like animals and plants. When Marx says that man is a cor-
poreal, living, real, sensuous being, he means that man
has the real sensuous objects of his being, that is, he
can only express his life in real sensuous object as out-
side him. (1) When Marx says that man is a natural being
he means that man essentially needs nature outside him.
A being which does not need nature is not a natural being.
Hunger is a natural instinct of man and for the satis-
faction of this need man needs nature outside him. A
non-objective being is a non-being. (2)

(1) To say that man is a corporal, living, real, sensuous,
objective being full of natural vigour is to say that
he has real, sensuous objects as the object of his
being or of his life, or that he can only express his
life in real, sensuous objects. - Economic and Philo-
sophic Manuscripts of 1844, Karl Marx Frederick Engels-
Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 336, Progress Publishers,
Moscow, 1975.

(2) A being which does not have its nature outside itself
is not a natural being, and plays no part in the system
of nature. . . . . A being which is not itself an object
for some third being has a being for its objects, i.e.
it is not objectively related. Its being is not objec-
tive. - Ibid, p. 337.
Thus Marx finds a close and inseparable connection between nature and man. Man isolated from objective world appears to him as non-being. To be a living natural creature he must need natural objects outside himself for the satisfaction of this natural needs. The life of man consists in the inorganic nature. "Nature", Mark thinks, "is man's inorganic body - nature, that is, in so far as it is not itself human body. Man lives on nature - means that nature is his body, with which he must remain continuous interchange if he is not to die. That man's physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature". (3)

Man, appears here as the part of nature and intimately connected with nature and universality of man consists in the fact that the more universal is the sphere of inorganic nature on which he lives, the more universal a man becomes and the universality of man completes in the universality which makes all nature his inorganic body. Here nature not only means the direct means of life, i.e.

food, cloth and dwelling etc. but also the material and instrument of his life activity. (4)

The natural objects such as, plants, animals, stones, air, light etc. make a part of human consciousness, being an object of natural science or arts, which makes the spiritual inorganic nature of man and thus, in the realm of practice they constitute a part of human life and human activity. (5) Human activity becomes universal by the intimate connection of these natural objects in a universal way.

(4) The universality of man appears in practice precisely in the universality which makes all nature his inorganic body - both in as much as nature is (1) his direct means of life and (2) the material, the object, and the instrument of his life activity. - Ibid, pp. 275-76.

(5) Just as plants, animals, stones, air, light etc., constitute theoretically a part of human consciousness, partly as objects of natural science, partly as object of art - his spiritual inorganic nature, - spiritual nourishment which he must first prepare to make palatable and digestible - so also in the realm of practice they constitute a part of human life and human activity - Ibid. p. 275.
But man is not merely a natural being, he is a human natural being. As soon as there are objects outside man, as soon as he is not alone, he is another reality than the object outside him. As soon as he is another reality to the object outside him, the object has him for an object. To Marx, really existing means to be sensuous and to be sensuous means to be an object of sense and also to have sensuous objects outside oneself and what is more striking to Marx is that "To be sensuous is to suffer". (6) A non-sensuous being is nonbeing and unreal. Man as a real, corporeal being is essentially a sensuous being and every sensuous being is a suffering being and for the feeling of this suffering man appears to Marx as a passionate being. Passion is the essential power of man. (7) He is a being for himself - a species-being. He has to confirm and manifest himself both in his being and in his knowing and this differentiates him from other species. (8)

(6) Ibid, p. 337.

(7) Man as an objective, sensuous being is therefore a suffering being - and because he feels that he suffers, a passionate being. Passion is the essential power of man energetically bent on its object. - Ibid, p. 337.

(8) But man is not merely a natural being: he is a human natural being. That is to say, he is a being for himself. Therefore he is a species-being, and has to confirm and manifest himself as such both in his being and in his knowing. - Ibid, p. 337.
The living concrete human individual is the point of departure of Marxist philosophy. He does not want to set out from imaginary thesis. Man always appears to him as real man. Life, to him, is not determined by consciousness, rather consciousness is determined by life. Consciousness is always regarded as the consciousness of human individual. The phantoms created by the imagination of the brain necessarily direct the material life-process, and so mortality, religion, metaphysics and all the rest of ideology as well as forms of consciousness corresponding to these no longer retain the semblance of independence. For the distorted function of imagination, man can have no history and no development. But by developing their material production and material intercourse men alter their actual world and also their thinking and the product of their thinking. The sole concern of Marx is, thus, the man, not in any fantastic isolation and finity but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of development under definite conditions and in this sense Marx points the direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, and his philosophy which is matter of earth to
heaven, (9) and when the actual life processes instead of imagination come into view history ceases to be a collection of dead facts, and it is the first premise of the Marxist concept of man.

Man is an independent being. It means that he does not owe its existence to something else other than himself. "A being", Marx views, "only considers himself independent when he stands on his own feet; and he only stands on his own feet when he owes his existence to himself". (10) A dependent being lives on the grace of another. His dependence completes when he owes him not only in the maintenance

(9) In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here it is a matter of ascending from earth to heaven. That is to say, not of setting out from what men say, imagine, conceive, not from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at man in the flesh; but setting out from real, active man, and on the basis of their real life-process. - The German Ideology, ibid, Vol. 5, P. 36, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976.

of his life but also in creation of his life. But Marx rules out every possibility of the so-called myth of creation. (11) Human being, to him, is a product of the species-act of human being. So even physical man owes his existence to man. (12) Unnecessary continuation of the absurd question regarding creation seems to Marx, a product of abstration and he asks to abandon this meaningless abstraction. (13)

As nature and man are intimately connected with each other so also the society and man are connected. Marx

(11) The creation of earth has received a mighty blow from geognosy - i.e., from the science which presents the formation of the earth, the development of earth, as a process, as a self-generation. Generatio aequivoca is the only practical refutation of the theory of creation - Ibid, pp. 304-05.

(12) ...it is certainly easy to say to the single individual what Aristotle has already said: You have been begotten by your father and mother; therefore in you the mating of two human beings - a species-act of human beings - has produced the human being. - Ibid, P. 305.

(13) I say to you: Give up your abstraction and you will also give up your question. - Ibid.
views the human individual always keeping him in social framework. According to him, "just as society produces man as man, so is society produced by him." (14) Man is both a product of society and its maker. The nature exists as the foundation of the human existence only when man lives in society, only when he is a social man. Only when man's existence is for the existence of other and other's existence is existence for him, then his existence becomes natural existence; and only then his existence becomes human existence. Society is the complete unity of man with nature. (15)

Man is an active agent. Activity in the scientific sense, means the activity which is performed in the direct community with other. So every human activity must be social activity. Man's existence consists in this social activity. So when a man makes something for himself he makes it for society. The activity of the individual's consciousness appears to Marx as the theoretical existence of a social


(15) Thus society is the complete unity of man with nature - the true resurrection of nature - the accomplished naturalism of man and the accomplished humanism of nature. - Ibid.
being, and the general consciousness of the individual is a social fabric, although in distortion the general consciousness appears as an abstraction from real life and as such, confronts it with hostility. (16)

The individual, as Marx holds, is a social being, and the manifestations of his life are an expression and confirmation of social life. Marx points out the similarity of individual-life and species-life in this context. Man's individual-life and species-life are not different. The mode of existence of the individual is a more particular or more general mode of the life of the species, or the life of the species is a more particular or more general individual life. Man confirms his real social life in his consciousness of species and the being of the species confirms itself in species consciousness and exists for

(16) My general consciousness is only the theoretical shape of that of which the living shape is the real community, the social fabric, although at the present day general consciousness is an abstraction from real life and as such confronts it with hostility. The activity of my general consciousness, as an activity, is therefore also my theoretical existence as a social being. - Ibid, pp. 298-99.
itself in its generality as a thinking being.\(^{17}\) Man is a particular individual as well as the totality - the subjective existence of society. He exists in the real world both as awareness and real enjoyment of social existence and as a totality of human expression of life. His particularity makes him what he is, a real social individual.\(^{18}\)

\(^{17}\) In his consciousness of species man confirms his real social life and simply repeats his real existence in thought, just as conversely the being of the species confirms itself in species consciousness and exists for itself in its generality as a thinking being. - Ibid. p. 299.

\(^{18}\) Man, much as he may therefore be a particular individual (and it is precisely his particularity which makes him an individual, and a real individual social being) is just as much the totality - the ideal totality - the subjective existence of imagined and experienced society for itself; just as he exists also in the real world both as awareness and real enjoyment of social existence, and as a totality of human manifestation of life - Ibid.
Marx is a radical thinker. Marxism is naturally a humanism but humanism of a specific kind. His difference lies in his radical thinking. He wants to grasp a matter by the root which leads him to begin his journey from the concrete man. Man is the point of departure of his humanism. In his Introduction to "Contribution to Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law" Marx holds the opinion that "To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But for man the root is man himself.... The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that man is the highest being for man, hence the categorical imperative to overthrow all relations in which man is a debased, enslaved, forsaken, despicable being". (19) The radical character of Marx's thinking bears the stamp of a special revolutionary outlook.

The concept of Individual in Marx's thinking devoids of any superhuman origin. Religion, in which man is alienated from his real nature, is an object of criticism to Marx. He never thinks man keeping him in the

ultra-human place. Man is always the man in the social
ground of earth. He is the maker of his destiny. Religion
is his creation. (20) This radical standpoint leads Marx
to the revolutionary outlook.

Marx sees the human essence which differentiates
man from animals in the process of production. In the
process of production, man proves him as a conscious-
species being. He observes that animals also produce
but they produce immediately what they need for them-
selves. They produce "one sidedly" but man produces
"universally". Animal produces only in response to its
physical needs but man produces even when he is free
from physical needs, and in this free production the
true human essence reveals. The animal's product belongs
immediately to its physical body whereas man can freely
face his products. The animal only makes things according
to the standards and needs of species it belongs to,
but man knows how to produce for every species. After all,

(20) Man makes religion, religion does not make man ....
Man is no abstract being encamped outside the
world. Man is the world of man, the state,
society, - Ibid, P. 175.
man can produce in accordance with the laws of beauty. Thus, in the process of production the species-nature of man is clearly revealed. Production is the basis on which every aspect of man's life develops. In the process of production, the objective world becomes the world of man's essential power - the human reality. The reality of his own essential powers becomes for him the objectification of himself. In this objectification he confirms and realises individuality. (21) Man can be distinguished from animals by religion or by anything else but they begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence. By the production of their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their material life. Marx thinks that the mode of production must not be considered simply as a matter of reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals, rather it is a definite form of expression of their life.

(21) On the one hand, therefore, it is only when the objective world becomes everywhere for man in society the world of man's essential powers-human reality, and for that reason the reality of his own essential powers that all objects become for him the objectification of himself, becomes objects which confirms and realise his individuality. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, Ibid, p. 301.
What individual is, coincides with his production, both with what he produces and with the manner of his production. (22)

Marx understands human individual always in terms of society and production. He also sees the ideal relationship between man to man in terms of production. He thinks that if man produces in a human way he becomes gainer positively in two ways. His production can help himself at the same time his fellow man. In his production when he objectifies his own individuality he can satisfy himself by realising that his product satisfies the human needs and it corresponds to the need of another man's essential nature. Human individual, in the mode of production can become the mediator between the man and the species and his work can be felt by his fellow man as a completion of his essence and in this way the individual can be confirmed in the thought and love of his fellow man.

(22) Hence what individuals are depends on the material conditions of their production, - Karl Marx Frederick Engels - Collected works, Vol. 5, p. 32, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976.
Thus, in the expression of one's own life and activity, the other can realise, his own essence. (23) It is the universal man, an ideal individual of the Communist society, not the crippled real individual of the capitalist system, who is alone in a position to fully realise the features that make up the "essence" or his nature.

Communist revolution as prescribed by Marx is directed to human emancipation and human emancipation again needs the transformation of real manship to true manship for its consummation. The self-interested and self-alienated man of the bourgeois system is the "realman". He is the "egoistic individual" and the man in the communist society whose personal interest losses its identity in the social interest is the "true man". (24)

(23) In the individual expression of my life I would have directly created your expression of your life, and therefore in my individual activity I would have directly confirmed and realised my true nature, my human nature, my communal nature. Comments on James Mill, Elements d'economie politique. - Karl Marx Federick Engels - Collected Works, Vol. 3, P. 228, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975.

(24) The real is recognised only in the shape of the egoistic individual, the true man is recognised only in the shape of the abstract citizen - On the Jewish Question, Ibid, p. 167.
The "real man" in the capitalist system is the alienated curtailed crippled man. This "real man" of alienated social life is the point of departure of Marx's philosophy. But his point of arrival is the "true man" or "whole man" or "universal man" in communist society. The "true man" or "whole man" is the 'social man', he only can realise the essence of man in a true manner. (25) In the system of private property, in the class-divided social pattern only the 'real man' can be found, not the true man. The real man is particular and the true man is universal. A true man or whole man is he, in whom the nature of man is fulfilled. (26) He is the ideal member of communist society.

(25) Man appropriates his comprehensive essence in a comprehensive manner, that is to say, as a whole man. Each of his human relations to the world - seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thinking, observing, experiencing, wanting, acting loving - in short, all the organs of his individual being, like those organs which are directly social in their form. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, Ibid, pp.299-300.

(26) A "true" or "whole" man is a man in whom the 'nature of man' is fulfilled. Marxism and the Human Individual, p. 91, Megrow-Hill Book Company, edited by Robert S. Cohen, Boston University, 1970.
He is free from the alienation with its various form, and thus, makes himself a species-being. He is the ultimate point of human emancipation. Marx rightly observes: "Only when the real, individual man re-absorbs in himself the abstract citizen and as an individual human being has become a species-being in his every day life, in his particular work, and in his particular situation, only when man has recognised and organised his 'forces propres' as social forces, and consequently no longer separates social power from himself in the shape of political power, only then will human emancipation have been accomplished". (27) "Liberation", Mark conceives, "is a historical and not a mental act, and it is brought about by historical conditions". (28) The individuals can be free only to the extent the social conditions permit him. Every historical period gives rise to definite social types of individual. Social transformations create a new social environment. The communist revolution is directed to such a social environment in which the free development of individual presupposes the free development of all.


It also directs to the positive abolition of private property which enables the real appropriation of the human essence by and for man. It is a complete return of man to himself as a social being. It is true solution of the conflict between man and nature and man and man. It is the freedom from alienation. So the emancipated human individual in communist society is, according to Marx, a social being, in the true sense of the term. Even his every sense becomes social. (29) His enjoyment also becomes other’s appropriation. The organs become social organs. He is completely transformed into a human being, completely different from crude non-human alienated being of the bourgeois system. Individual’s need and enjoyment consequently lose their egoistic nature. Every one becomes human or social.

(29) The abolition of private property is therefore the complete emancipation of all human senses and qualities, but it is this emancipation precisely because these senses and attributes have become, subjectively and objectively, human. The eye has become a human eye, just as its object has become a social, human object — an object made by man for man. — Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, Karl Mark Frederick Engels — Collected Works, Vol. 3, P. 300, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975.
SECTION - II

NIMBARKA ON INDIVIDUAL
Nimbārka is a realistic thinker, but his realistic approach is impregnated with a spiritual note. In his scheme, human being does not appear only as a flesh and blood entity. He is something more. In his thought individual or jīva is a self-conscious ego (aham). The 'I' is not something which is ultimately unreal, but it is real - the very essence of human being. Nimbārka treats human being in his philosophy as human soul. As such, it is not solely the body of flesh and blood, neither the mind nor the intellect; it is a part of the Supreme Reality. It is atomic in size.\(^1\) In this system one Supreme Soul manifests itself in various names and forms.\(^2\) The human being is one kind of this manifestation. So he is a part of the Supreme Reality as the waves of an ocean. This of Nimbarka receives its support from the Brahma-sūtras of Vāḍrāyana.\(^3\) While explaining these sūtras Nimbarka

\(^1\) anum hi jīvam. - Daśa-ślokī, Published by Dr. Amar-Prasad Bhattacherjee, Asian Printers Press, Calcutta, 1973.

\(^2\) ekam rūpaṃ bahudha yah karoti. - Kāṭhopaniṣad 2.2.12.

\(^3\) Brahma-sūtras - 2.3.42 - 44.
holds the opinion that the individual soul is nothing but a part of the Supreme Soul. (4) Here part does not signify a portion, rather signifies power. Individual soul is a power of Supreme Soul. (5) And as a part of Supreme Soul, the individual soul is both different and non-different from Brahman. There is a relation of natural difference and non-difference (svābhāvika bhedābheda) between individual soul and Supreme Soul. As there is a relation of natural difference and non-difference in between waves and ocean, in between rays and sun, in between leaf of the tree and the tree, in between a particular town and the whole country, there is a relation of natural difference and non-difference between individual and Supreme Being. (6)

(4) paramātmano jīvo'mśah - Brahma-sūtra 2.3.42

(5) amśo hi saktirūpo grāhyah "esa parasya śaktih jīvo' lpaśaktirasvatantrah" iti śruteh - Brahma-sūtra - 2.3.42, Vedāntakaustubha, P. 236, Vrindavan edition, 1932.

(6) Vide Vedāntapārijātāsaurabha on Brahma-sūtras.
3.2.27 - 28.
The wave is not completely different from the ocean and not also completely non-different. There is a relation of both difference and non-difference. Similarly, the part and the whole are neither completely different nor completely non-different. The difference between individual soul and Supreme Soul is natural, eternal and real. The individual soul is the subject of ignorance while the Supreme Soul is never subject to it. Human being is an enjoyer of results of works done by itself, while the Supreme Soul is free from it. Though the Supreme Soul embraces every individual finite being, He is ever untouched by pleasure and pain of the individual. (7) Every human being has definite name and form but the Supreme Soul is without name and form. (8)

(7) jîvasya paramapuruṣaṁśatve ānāṁ sukhaduhkhāṁ nānubhavati, yathā prakāsadiḥ svāṁsagataguna-dosavarjīto bhavati. - Brahma-sūtra 2.3.45, Vedāntapārijātasaūrabha, P. 237.

The power of comprehension of the individual human being is subject to contraction and expansion but that of the Supreme Soul is never subject to such increase or decrease.\(^{(9)}\) While the latter has power to create, maintain and destruct the world, the former does not. Nimbārka and Śrīnivāsa take great pain to maintain the difference between Infinite Soul and finite being by astounding logic and scriptural text as well.

In spite of this attempt to make a distinction between finite individual and Infinite Supreme Soul, the champion of Nimbarka school endeavours to point out the non-difference of individual and Supreme Soul. Since the Supreme Reality embraces all the animate and inanimate objects their non-difference cannot be ignored. If their mere difference is admitted then the scriptural passages like "tattvamasi"\(^{(10)}\) etc. would not carry any sense. As one cannot deny the

\(^{(9)}\) evāmbhūtasya jīvāsādhaṛanādharmaśyaṁanityasyāpi saṅkocavikāsau bhavataḥ. - Brahma-sūtra, 2.3.28, Vedāntakaustubha, P. 228, Ibid.

\(^{(10)}\) Chāndogya Upaniṣad. 6.8.7.
non-difference of a part and whole, in a similar manner one cannot refuse to accept the non-difference of individual and Supreme Soul - a whole of all finite beings. As the rays have no separate existence apart from sun, the individual souls also have no separate existence apart from Supreme Soul. It is a fact that the relation of identity takes place between two non-different relatum. This relation of identity is possible neither in an absolutely single object, nor between two absolutely distinct objects. Śrīnivāsa in his Vedāntakaustubha affirms that the relation of identity is possible between the effect and its cause, the attribute and its substratum, the power and its possessor, i.e. only between two things which are both different and non-different. 

(11) So the Supreme Being,

(11) dvayoḥ padārthayoh kenāpi prakāreṇabhede sati
tādātmyalakṣaṇaḥ samhandha upapadyate, na gavāś-
vayostādatmyamupapadyate. na caikasyapāśvasya
tādātmyamupapadyate, api tu kāryakāraṇayoh
guṇaṅguṇinoḥ śaktiśaktimātorbhinnabhinnayoh padā-
rthayoreva tādātmyasambandhaḥ. - Brahmasūtra 4.1.3,
as the soul of human being\[^{12}\] is non-different from him, but the human soul as a part of the Supreme Soul is different from Him. Hence, both difference and non-difference are equally fundamental and natural. The relation of Brahman and human being is a relation of natural difference and non-difference.\[^{13}\] A Nimbārkaist views an individual as an eternal human being as it is a part of eternal Brahman. As such, jīva or individual is ever free from the cycle of birth and death.\[^{14}\] The Nimbārkaist recognises jīva as

---


\(^{13}\) ubhayavidavākyānām tulyabalatvāt jīvaparamātmanoḥ svābhāvīkau bhedābhedaḥ bhavata ityṛthaḥ. - Brahma-sūtra 2.3.42. Vedāntakaustubha, P. 236, Ibid.

a knower as also knowledge by nature. While explaining the
nature of individual the great Nimbārka in the opening
verse of his Daśaślokī mentions jīva as "jñānasvarūpa". (15)
Individual is essentially pure consciousness but not un-
conscious passive matter. As he is comprehension by nature,
he is also a comprehensor. (16) Though the knower and its
quality of knowledge are equally knowledge, yet both knower
and its quality of knowledge belong to different categories
and thereby distinct from each other, simply because one
is the substratum and the other is quality. As a drop of
water fallen in ocean does not loss its separate existence
because it has distinct form of its own similarly knowledge
accrued in the mind of a knower does neither loss its
identity nor merge in its substratum, who is also essen-
tially knowledge by nature. (17)

(15) jñānasvarūpaṁca hareradhinaṁ sārīrasaṁyogaviyogaṁyam /
anum hi jīvaṁ pratidehabhinaṁ, jñātṛtvavantāṁ
yadanatamāhuḥ ∕ - Daśaślokī, Asian Printers,

(16) ahamarthabhūta ātmā jñātā bhavati. - Brahma-śūtra
2.3.18. Vedāntapārijātasaurabha, P. 223.

(17) jale nikṣiptajalam bṛinnatvenāvasthātum arhati,
sāvayavadrayatvāt pārthivarajāmśi nikṣiptapārthi-
varajovat. - Vedāntaratnanaṁgaṇṭa, P. 33, edited
by Amlokaram Sastrī, Vrindavan.
The individual human being, according to Nimbārka, is an enjoyer also. He enjoys the results of actions performed by him. He is an active agent, and as an agent he is liable to enjoy the results, good or bad, of his action. When one performs one’s duty in a disinterested spirit one becomes free from the law of Karma (action), and is capable to enjoy the supra-mundane delight. But the action which one performs in selfish interest leads one to rebirth. This does not contradict the view that the individual soul is without beginning and without end. Actually, the material body of the individual is subject to the genesis and annihilation but not the soul itself.


(19) tayoranyāḥ pippalam svādvatti - Mundaka Upaniṣad - 3.1.1.1

(20) sarīrabhāve janmamaranayorbhāvītvāt. - Brahma-sūtra 2.3.16.
Being the part of the Supreme Soul each and every individual is essentially equal. But although individuals are equals from spiritual standpoint, this system does not ignore apparent diversity of body, sect, sex and the like. (21) This ultimately helps the Nimbārka school to maintain the theory of unity in diversity and diversity in unity.

Jīva or individual as Nimbārka conceives, is not independent. He is essentially under the control of Supreme Soul or Brahman. (22) Śrīnivāsa in his comments on Vedāntapārijāta-saurusabha proclaims that the agentship of the individual soul proceeds from the Highest as its cause.

(21) "svargakāmo yajeta, śudro yagñe nāvakālpataḥ ityādyanjñaparihārāvupapadyste jīvānāṁ brahmāṁsatvena samatve'pi visamaśārīrasambandhāt.- Brahmasūtra 2.3.47, ibid. p. 238.

(22) tajjīvasya kartṛttvam paraśāhetorasti "antaḥ praviṣṭaḥ śāstā janānāmi" tyādi śruteḥ. - Brahma-sūtra 2.3.40, Ibid, p. 234.
The Supreme Being alone makes one, whom he wishes to raise up from this world, do good deeds. He alone makes ones whom he wishes to lead down, do bad deeds. (23) But the Highest Being does not direct the individual to perform act according to His sweet will but he always directs the individual to perform the actions, good or bad, in accordance with his previous deeds. The Highest Being also determines the birth of the individual according to the deeds previously performed. Not to speak of more, the life-style of an individual also is directed by his own Karma, otherwise all prohibitory scriptural texts would carry no sense. (24)

(23) parāddhetubhātuṣṭājjīvasya kartṭṛtvamasti ... na svātan- tryenetyarthabh kutaḥ? esa hyeva sādhu karma kārayati tam yamebhyo lokebhya unnīśate, esa evāsādhu karma kārayati tam yamebhyo lokebhīṁ dhoninisate, antāḥ praviṣṭih śāṣtā jānāṇāṁ ya ātmānāṃantaro yamayati" tāyādiśruteḥ. "sarvasya cānaṁ hṛdi sanniviśto mātaḥ smṛturjñāmamapohanañcē" tismṛteśca. - Ibid, Vedānta-Kaustubha.

(24) vaiṣamyādidosanirāsārthastu sabdaḥ, jīvākṛta- karmāpekasāḥ pro'nyasminnapi janmani dharmaśdikām kārayati vihitapratissāddhāvaiyarthādibhyay - Brahma-sūtra 2.3.41, Vedāntapārijātasaubhā, P. 234.
The champion of Nimbārka school contends that one Supreme Being manifests Himself in various names and forms — in diverse conscious and unconscious objects. This school believes that diversity is in a position to make the unity meaningful. The eye sees, ear hears, nose smells, the tongue tastes, leg walks, and the hand works. As different organs are meant for respective works, questions of good or bad does not arise here, similarly different individual may engage themselves in different works. But that does not indicate the merit or demerit, virtue or sin of the individual concerned. Actually the question of equality or inequality, and good or bad appears only in the relative level. The Taittirīya Upanisad emphatically proclaims that he who knows the ultimate truth realises that performance of good or bad action is the same. We engage a definite organs of our body to some act which seems to us dirty and engage the another to perform an act which seems to us pious. We never think one organ bad and the other good. Similarly, the Highest Being engages someone

(25) etām ha vāva na tapati. kim aham sādhu na'karavam.

kim aham pāpam akanavam iti. sa ya evām vidvān

ete ātmānam sprñute. — Taittirīya Upaniṣad

2.9.2.
to some action which seems to be bad and engages other to action which seems to us good. But the respective individuals are not evil or virtuous to the Highest Soul. Everybody is similar to Him. A Nimbārkist further proposes that individual soul is ever untouched by mundane joy or suffering. He is purely bliss by nature. It is not the soul but the mind that feels happy or sorry by getting undesired objects or losing the desired objects. In fact, mind becomes sorry or joyful. But human being is not mind. Mind is an organ. It is nothing but waves of thought which creates something good or bad. The individual always remains above all this. But in the standard world he identifies himself with the mind and considers the feeling of the mind as his own. This identification is a result of ignorance. As a matter of fact, every individual suffers from the result of his action, he is rewarded or punished according to his deeds. Good action results in good effect and bad action in bad effect. It is the law of Karma on which the social discipline is based, and the Supreme Being cannot be accused of engaging one to good deed and to other to bad.\(^\text{(26)}\)

Time seems to be appropriate to mention here that the Nimbarka school of Vedānta philosophy does not overlook the diversity which is the keystone of the universe. If we consider our whole body as the universe and different sense organs as the different individuals then it appears that as the job of the different senses are different to make the body a harmonious complete whole, the jobs of the different individuals are different to maintain the harmony of the universe. If the different senses want to perform the same kind of act it will mean the death of the body. So will be the case if all of the individuals become identical. Diversity is necessary to make the unity meaningful. If we examine the whole matter with a minute and concentrated impartial intelect it will appear to us that all the sense organs of an individual are guided by the mind, the mind by egoism, the egoism by intellect, intellect by the individual soul, and behind the individual soul there is the Supreme Soul. As the different parts of a watch only can work when it is springed up, the individual soul also is in a position to function if and when he is guided by the Supreme Soul. Thus, with all emphasis at its command, the Nimbarka School asserts that the whole universe is governed by one Supreme Soul under whose proper direction and grace, and by the virtue of the good result
of previous deeds and practice of the principles projected by Nimbārka an individual, who hankers after earthly pleasure, proceeds to a higher state where he cannot remain satisfied with the mundane enjoyments and hankers after higher happiness and thereafter he attains the state of mumuksu and wants to be liberated from the bondage of Karma and ultimately reaches a state when he overcomes the narrow barriers of egoity and blossoms forth into a emancipated human individual a human individual similar to Highest or Whole Being.

(27) jīvātmānastāvadvividhāḥ. baddhamuktabhedhāt tatra-
baddho māmāṇādikarmavāsanākārkāryabhūta devatiryyāgadhane-
kavidhāsarīratatsambandhiṣu ātmātvātmīyābhimānadā-
rādhyavanto baddhāḥ. tatha bhūtaśca dvividhāḥ.
mumuṣububhukṣubhedhāt. tatra mumuksavya adhyātmyādi-
vividhasāmsārikādādhānubhavajātaklesavattaya
viraktāḥ santaḥ samsārānmokṣamāchava iti, te’pi
dvividah- bhagavadbhavāpattilakshanamuktikāmaḥ
nijasvarūpāpattikāmāśca. vaisāyikānandamicchvo
bubhukṣavāḥ te’pi dvividah. bhāviśreyaskā nitya-
samsārinaśceti. - Vedāntaratnamānjusā, pp. 109-11,
edited by Amolakaram Sastrī Vṛindavaṇ, Vikram Yr.
1998.
Emancipation, as Nimbarka conceives, is the attainment of similarity with the Whole Being both in nature and quality. (28) In the state of freedom an emancipated being realises his individuality, (29) he does never lose his identity or merge with the Whole Being but shines forth in all its brilliance and purity for all time to come.


(29) jīvo'rcirādikena mārgenā param sampadya svabhāvikenā rūpeṇāvirbhavatiti "param jyotirūpasampadya svena rūpeṇābhīnispadyate" iti vākyena pratipadyate, svenetiśabdāt. - Brahma-sūtra 4.4.1, ibid, p. 422.
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Though Marx and Nimbarka differ in regard to the treatment of the essence of individual, yet their theories ultimately reach the arena of humanism. Communist revolution is directed to human emancipation that needs the transformation of realmanship to truemanship for its consummation. The real man of alienated social life is the point of departure of Marx's socialism, and his point of arrival is the trueman or wholeman. Actually Marx's philosophy centres round the theory of man. Man is the pivot round which the entire philosophy of Marx moves. Marxism is humanism. Marxist describes it as a real humanism although we prefer to recognise it as a radical humanism. Likewise Karl Marx, Nimbarka, an advocate of the spiritual socialism, lays a special emphasis on man and society, and proposes to make a relation of faith, love and intimacy between man and God — the finite Being and the Whole Being. Indeed, dvaitādvaitism is also humanism, but humanism of a specific kind. Nimbarka's philosophy is a journey from the ordinary self-confined man to an emancipated man — from bondage to freedom, where an individual overcomes the narrow barriers of egoity and realises the universal
interest in place of personal interest and ultimately blossoms forth into a perfect human individual - an individual similar to Whole Being. This system tenders advice to posterity to be aware of the needs of the human heart, its inborn spirit of religion and its sense of living fellowship with other. While Marxism is radical humanism, Nimbarka's humanism is spiritual humanism having a realistic tone. Inspite of this difference the character of humanism of both Marx and Nimbarka is associated with the conception of the human individual. Actually humanism — in every form — takes man and a revolt against the dehumanisation of life as its point of departure, its starts with love of man and a sense of distress at men's dehumanisation, and reaches the state of freedom where and when the man realises universal interest as his own interest. The author takes the opportunity to express the view that humanism signifies a system of reflections about man that regard him as the supreme good, and aim to guarantee in practice the best conditions for human happiness. Within this broad humanistic framework there are rooms for Marx's real humanism and Nimbarka's spiritual humanism as well.
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An analysis of the foregoing pages leads the curious reader to the conclusion that a grand synthesis of the principles enunciated by Marx and the postulates projected by Nimbārka is in a position to usher in a new society, in which man will exercise his rights without the danger of interference or encroachment; and a perfect understanding will exist between all members. While Marx, the pioneer of communist movement, feels it necessary to change the conditions that regulate the life-style of the individual by changing social pattern, Nimbārka, a spiritual socialist, advises to change the society through the realisation of equality of all diverse individuals. But on close scrutiny it reveals that both Marx and Nimbārka build up their concepts on the foundation of humanism. Standing on the solid ground of earth both search for a society in which all the members of society would be in a position to realise the unity in diversity. Since in the present social structure a particular class always makes an attempt to get greater privilege and to exploit another class both Marx and Nimbārka search for a class-less ideal society, which one's prosperity will not prevent other's progress. No one does not deny the fact that to make the world a happy fraternal home approach of communism is a
demand of the day. But in India as the spiritual socialists fix their full attention to attain the highest truth and knowledge, the basic needs of man are almost ignored, and thereby this spiritual socialism fails to awaken the people at large. While the Marxian Communism is successful enough to draw the attention and attraction of the people in general, it also fails to meet all sorts of demands of the people of the day. Marx envisages a society which will emphasise industrialisation and consequently, greater resources will be available for equitable distribution. While industrialisation is necessary for progress of a nation, the dream of equitable distribution cannot be brought into consummation unless spiritual upliftment of the man takes place, and he is lifted above the limitations imposed by exigencies of the ordinary world. Nimbārka supplies the formula in regard to this upliftment.

Since a society is considered in the perspective of education and since education determines the goal to which a society wants to reach the dissertation takes a great pain in formulating the educational policy for a better society. Today a large section of the people are being exploited by the self-interested ruling class. To abolish this exploitation a radical change is the demand
of the day, and this change may not see the light of the day, until the oppressing ruling class is replaced by the class-conscious poor mass or the proletariat. Marx announces that education will give rise to the Communist outlook in the minds of the proletariat to properly guide them not to follow the foot-prints left by their predecessors. A state-controlled and state-organised educational programme is in a position to meet the needs of the people at large. But mere material prosperity fails to guarantee man's entire satisfaction. The thesis with all emphasis at its command points out that an absolute dependence on spiritualism and wholesale rejection of industrialism and technological development means the economical stagnant of the country, and the complete surrender to industrialism and the total rejection of spiritual culture leads to a spiritual death of the nation. Marx advocates an Education through which the personality of man can be developed and man can confront the obstacles arranged by force of capitalism. While the type of Education envisaged in Marxist philosophy takes note of physical personality alone, the type of Education projected in Nimbārka
philosophy admits diverse dimensions of personality and starting from the lowest tier of physical personality arrives at the highest tier of spiritual personality. No measure taken to ameliorate the suffering of the man can be successfully implemented unless faith in values can be restored. Nimbarka speaks of this restoration and envisages a new type of value-oriented education that can unfold the numerous possibilities of the man, including his divine possibility. A proper combination of educational policies projected by Marx and Nimbarka can, therefore, uphold a complete composite educational thought.

The problem of alienation that stands on the way of the development of a society also comes up for discussion in the dissertation, and it records how Marx and Nimbarka view the problem and advise the guidelines to overcome the situation from their respective platforms. Marx deals with the problem of alienation from practical point of view and prescribes a rational way-out which is revolutionary in character. Once private property comes into existence, it becomes the powerful means to perpetuate alienation. So Marx wants to abolish private ownership for human emancipation. The thesis provides considerable space for Nimbarka's view how blissful aspect of Supreme Reality draws the attention of and attraction of
a man, as a result of which he becomes indifferent to other aspects of Supreme Reality, - his true nature, and this ultimately makes him detached from the conscious aspects of the Absolute. This attachment to bliss and detachment from consciousness result in self-alienation. But after a thorough search it announces that the doctrine projected by Marx may be necessary, but not sufficient. The abolition of ownership, as Marx conceives, fails to eliminate alienation in toto. Even after the abolition of private property different conditions may cause some other forms of alienation. The inhuman qualities like greed, avarice etc. may lead one to acquire the commodities of life not only to meet the needs but to store also. For the complete human emancipation from all types of alienation it is, therefore, necessary to abolish the exploitation of man by man and to restrain the mind as well. As one cannot deny the economic needs, so one cannot refuse to accept the necessity of the removal of inhuman qualities. Marx thinks of external insecurity and suggests remedies for putting an end to it. Nimbārka takes of internal insecurity and advocates principles that are in a position to combat this insecurity. And internal insecurity is more dangerous than external insecurity. All this leads a curious reader to jointly
apply the methods projected by the Marx and Nimbārka.

The dissertation also presents an animated discussion in regard to the impact of religion on society. Though early Marx does not find any contradiction between religion and human development, rather considers it as a means of development of a society, later Marx views religion as almost the chief force of enslaving man. Marx's love for freedom and rationality and hatred for oppression of man by man make him engaged to criticise all heavenly and earthly gods. Marxism rejects religion altogether, because it is likely to foster dependence on gods and put an end to individual freedom so necessary for generation of wealth as also to accept inequality due to birth and economic status as something sacrosant in nature. This, unfortunately, ensues from a wrong notion of religion.

Religion, as Nimbārka conceives, is a process by which man can maintain himself and his relation with others, and at the same time can manifest his latent possibilities to the fullest extent. In this sense, religion and philosophy are identical and possibly both lead the man to fulfilment in the way education leads to it. This magnificent religion of man fosters a spirit of mutual respect and tolerance and instead of
causing a sense of inequality, induces a feeling that all are children of immortality and consequently are equals.

The thesis also expends substantial energy to throw light on the theory of man and its affairs - the central problem with which the principles enunciated by Marx and Nimbārka are closely associated. Marx's socialism starts from self-interested and self-confined real man of the bourgeois society and arrives at universal man, - an ideal individual of the Communist society, who is alone in a position to fully realise the features that make-up the "essence" or the nature. Philosophy of Nimbārka also begins with man and his distress, and aims at a state reaching which he overcomes the narrow barrier of egoity and blossoms forth into an emancipated human individual - an individual similar to Brahman or Whole Being. Philosophy of Marx and that of Nimbārka both ultimately enter the arena of humanism while Marxism is radical humanism, Nimbārka's humanism is spiritual humanism having a realistic tone. But as humanist both Marx and Nimbarka join their hands and revolt against the dehumanisation
of life, and tender advice to posterity so as to lead them to the state of freedom where and when an emancipated human individual would realise his essence in its full splendour.