CHAPTER – 6
COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION

By making a systematic and critical study of the moral theories of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan discussed in the preceding chapters, we are able to illustrate a comparative study on the views of good life advocated by these thinkers. On the basis of this comparison we would be able to determine what actually good life is. Aristotle describes the concept of good life from the age of Greek system, Mill emphasizes on the moral philosophy of nineteenth century British philosophy and Radhakrishnan represents the attitude of contemporary Indian philosophy. Thus all these three thinkers express their views from the three different ages emphasizing a critico-creative attitude towards the concept of good life in conformity with their predecessors. These philosophers advance their views in the light of their own lived experience without blindly follow the predecessors which are full of creativity. Our exposition of the moral and philosophical thought of these thinkers has made it clear that they show a deep appreciation of the problem of good life. We have seen that they do not generally make attempt to evolve a new and novel system of thought though they try to reinterpret the concept of good life in their own way in order to make it intelligible to modern readers. These philosophers have tried to show that the concept of good life is not simply based on faith or scriptural revelation and is not merely product of speculation, but it is fully supported by logic and reason. Aristotle discusses his views of good life by evaluating and criticizing the views of Socrates and Plato. In case of Mill it is seen that though he is influenced by the views of Jereme Bentham and James Mill, he gives new interpretation on the concept of good
life. In the same manner, though Radhakrishnan’s good life is same as Hindu views of life, he adds some new criteria for good life, and because he is not a dogmatic follower of Hindu tradition, his view is full of lived experience.

Good life, according to Aristotle is the life of happiness, of the virtuous activity of the soul. Happiness is defined with reference to the function of man i.e. happiness is a life guided by the rational faculty of man. Thus, it is an activity of soul in accordance with virtue and virtue is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean relative to us. Virtue is conceived as human excellence. For Aristotle, the attainment of good life is the main purpose or telos of human existence. Actually, it is eudaemonia in Aristotle’s language which is usually termed as ‘happiness’ or human flourishing. Happiness is not a subjective feeling or satisfaction; it is an objective achievement of excellence. It is the intrinsic end of human nature grounded on rational activity. It includes both deliberative practical activity and theoretical intellectual activity for its own sake. The highest happiness is speculative activity, an activity which takes the form of contemplation. The life of contemplation is the highest, the most continuous, the most pleasant, the most self-sufficient, the most intrinsically worthwhile way of life. Life is to be understood, not in terms of its elements and origin alone, but in terms of its elements and origin alone, but in terms of its ends. So his treatment of human life is the most illuminating part of his philosophy. Like other thinkers, he is interested, not in the radical remolding of life, in what might be, but in understanding life as it is and will be. He is concerned to see man’s life in the world and to explain it, not to change it into something else. In ethics, Aristotle begins his study with the norms, standards, the ideals of Greek culture and Greek tradition, moderation, self-control, intelligence, justice and right.
The very core of Aristotelian attitude towards the conduct of man’s life is this insistence that we must start with what we find it hand and perfect the tendencies that are actually there. Good life may be seen too dignified for a mere human being and indeed, man will enjoy such a life not in virtue of his humanity, but in virtue of some divine element in him. Intelligence is capable of perfecting animal life into the life of reason. The natural materials of living - impulses, desires, the accepted customs and ideals, and the inherited social institutions of living, the family, the slavery, the city state and its political organization can all be made excellent by intelligence.

According to Aristotle there is an important connection between the intellectual virtues and virtues of character. Practical wisdom as a guiding activity of intellectual virtue is the understanding of human good that one needs in order to deliberate, choose and act will. One cannot fully have the virtues of character without practical wisdom. Aristotle’s ethical thought is realistic and this worldly and normative in character. According to him, man is not an isolated being. He lives in society and in Greek polis. Politics created the law and institution for the civilized, moral and happy life. He says that the good life, then, is the chief end of society, both collectively for all its members and individuality.

According to Mill, Good life is the life of happiness and the life of happiness is the satisfied or contented life. He discusses the concept of good life from the empirical and objective standpoint and purely individualistic manner. He considers that development of individual’s character is not merely useful but an essential part of good life. In estimating good life, he says, emphasis on experiences of people is highly countable than others. He introduces quality of pleasures to avoid the change of vulgar hedonism, of being a theory of value with a base; an ignoble conception of
what human can be and strives for. He gives an importance of virtue which can be
desired for its own sake, though agents concern for virtue must be motivated by
finding virtuous activity pleasing. He also considers justice as one of the qualities of
good life. Mill is influenced by Bentham and James Mill to establish the concept of
good life, though he gives some new interpretation on good life which is normative in
character. According to him, like Bentham, good life is general happiness which
emphasizes rules, judgment and consequences of action. He says that politics make
the way for the good life of its citizen by providing a moral motivation in the form of
connection between happiness and freedom. Mill interprets happiness in terms of
pleasure on the ground that pleasure in what we desire for its own sake and only for
its own sake. Pleasure is a psychological state, a type of experience which is
desirable for its own sake and which is good as so desired. According to Mill,
pleasure is valued as an end and for that reason it is good as an end. However, it’s
being good as an end is dependent upon its being the ultimate object of desire. Since
pleasure and pleasure alone is what has value as an end, according to Mill, so his
concept of good life is just like an example of value monism. Mill says that sympathy
is one of the crucial elements to account of what could be motivated people to act
morally. It is not just essential to understanding values but also to explain the
practical, action motivating character of moral considerations. He argues that fellow
feeling and taking pleasure in the well being of others and being distressed by their
suffering are basic to moral concern. Mill locates moral values in state of affairs the
consequences of action rather than locating it in the agent’s motive or character. As a
consequentialist theory, Mill’s concept of good life is a part of ethical theory and it is
explicated as a habit of desire in accordance with which an agent is disposed to act in
ways that promote utility. Mill’s concept of good life is altruistic in nature. Though Mill says that the moral worth of an act is measured by its usefulness in promoting pleasure or happiness but this happiness is not man’s own alone. His own good is to be realized in conjunction with that of others, because like one individual other individuals also eager for a life of satisfaction and contentment. The welfare of the individual depends upon all people living in societies. Mill gives primacy of individual rights though he admits that the right of the individual to happiness cannot be achieved by an individual independently of regard for others, his happiness must be dependent on the existence of the state. The individual needs the state for the achievement of happiness and public policies are valuable only if they promote social well being. Thus Mill’s concept of good life starts with an individualistic standpoint and ends by prescribing an altruistic goal. Mill makes a qualitative difference among pleasures and on the basis of experience; pleasure can be measured whether pleasure is superior or inferior in kind. Thus, Mill’s concept of good life aims at the realization of a better social life in which each man should count for one and no one for more than one.

Radhakrishnan conceives good life as the spiritual self-realization which is termed as ‘sarvamukti.’ The moral philosophy of Radhakrishnan which is idealistic is rooted in Hindu view of life especially with Vedanta philosophy which is a way of life itself. Though the ethical doctrines and principles of Radhakrishnan an essentially in conformity with the tradition of Hinduism, he recommends several changes of it, because he was not a dogmatic follower of Hindu tradition. He was very strict to follow the principles which are necessary for spiritual development and he propounds noble and ousters ethics of mysticism. He deals with the problem of good life in an
integrated and comprehensive way and he takes full account of man’s spiritual as well as empirical and religious existence. He appreciates the values of life from both Indian and Western standpoint. He interprets the classical Hindu view of life and reveals to us the essential truth in a new form with a new orientation. According to him, man is not only psycho-physical being, but also the spiritual being. So he gives more importance on spiritual values in case of the development of man’s ethical and social nature i.e., in good life. Man has to work not only for his own individual freedom, but also in a greater measure for the upliftment and all sided development of his society, nation and for human race as whole. He says that good life is not possible if the social environment in which he lives, moves and breaths, is not improved. His interpretation of varnasrama dharma signifies the evolution for man’s spiritual personality. As a contemporary Indian philosopher, Radhakrishnan says that liberation i.e. the highest end of life of individual is not only freedom from karma, ignorance, birth and death, but also means the attainment of harmony with society. He emphasizes the fact that the liberated individual must not remain satisfied with the individual liberation alone, but must work ceaselessly for the liberation of the masses as well. Without the liberation and perfection of society, individual liberation and perfection is something abstract and partial and so cannot be said to constitute the highest good of life i.e. good life of man is impossible without the perfection of society. For Radhakrishnan, though dharma in variable and eternal the principles of dharma are absolute and eternal. Dharma is rooted in human nature, but we cannot identify dharma with any specific set of institutions. The basic principle of dharma, according to Radhakrishnan is the realization of the dignity of the human spirit. The goal of dharma is the double object of happiness on earth and salvation. According to
Radhakrishnan, the purpose of ethical life is the discipline of human nature leading to the realization of the spiritual. The practical code of morality lies in non-hatred to all being in thought, word and deed, good will and charity. He contends that the detachment of spirit and not renunciation of the world is what is demanded from us. Throughout the ethics of Radhakrishnan, the supreme virtue consists in truth and life in according with the truth. Truth signifies the supreme virtue in Radhakrishnan’s moral philosophy and non violence in the best ideals of ethic. According to Radhakrishnan, good life must be grounded in a philosophical conception of the relation between conduct and ultimate reality. Man is not satisfied with his empirical surroundings. He is very much conscious of his dependence and finitude. He aspires for something better and this is the mark of spirituality. Man’s spirituality also follows from his moral nature. Man is at liberty to take his moral decisions and it is also an evidence for the spirituality of man. The real good of human life, as Radhakrishnan conceives, it is the attainment of perfection, complete self realization. Radhakrishnan conceives that the real nature of man is spiritual, so self realization is described as the realization of the divinity. According to Radhakrishnan, concept of ‘love’ and ‘freedom’ have very distinctive role in man’s search for good life. Love has to be realized in the actual experience of life. It has different manifestations such as non-violence, sacrifice, tolerance, patience, forgiveness etc. He emphasizes a fuller, nobler, peaceful and dignified life even with man’s material comfort unlike Gandhi’s concept of hard rigoristic life. So his good life is free from compulsion and it has full freedom which means freedom from suffering. As man is potentially divine, a vision of the good life is the conviction of all ethical endeavours. Social reconstruction is essential to lead good life, but he says that more socialist reconstruction with a proper
awakening of moral consciousness will be an obstacle for leading a good life. So he wants to integrate the experiences of spiritualistic approach with the development of science and technology for the progress of mankind so that good life can be achieved.

From the above analysis we are able to indicate the similarity and differences amongst Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan regarding the concept of good life which is given below.

**DIFFERENCE: REGARDING THE VIEW ON THE CONCEPT OF GOOD LIFE:**

**Difference between Aristotle and Mill:**

Aristotle’s ethics can be interpreted as a kind of naturalism because of the significance in it of a proper end, intrinsic to human nature. However, his conception of fully actualized intellectual activity is a conception of activity that transcends our biological human nature. In other words, Aristotle’s ethics can be taken as a kind of naturalism on account of the centrality of his notion of a real intrinsic end proper to human nature and the way in which that end is realized through virtuous activity. His naturalism is quite different from Mill’s naturalism. According to Aristotle, what we find most pleasant is found to be so because it is good- it is naturally pleasing as the proper activity of a being with our nature. But according to Mill, pleasure is a psychological state, a type of experience which is desirable for its own sake and which is good as so desired. Mill says that pleasure is an empirically accessible natural psychological phenomena. We are to promote utility with utility understood in terms of pleasure. His ethical naturalism is mainly based on how much utility and action or a practice has an objective, factual matter. Thus Mill says that moral evaluation refers to a moral fact.
In Mill's utilitarianism, happiness is interpreted in terms of pleasure on the ground that pleasure is what we desire for its own sake and only for its own sake. But in Aristotle's eudaemonism, happiness is interpreted in terms of virtuous activity and there by connected to the excellences proper to a being with a rational nature. He argued that there are excellent activities that are pleasing because they are good rather than the other way round and that a life shaped by these activities is a good life, happiness being the final end at which we aim. A good life, a well led-life, a life of excellent activity is a happy life, though the pleasure is not the main end of life. Even though he argued that happiness and the desire for it could not supply the basis for moral duties. He holds that virtuous activity is pleasing and that its pleasures are integral to happiness.

According to Mill, pleasure is valued as an end only as an end, for that reason it is good as an end. However, it's being good as end is depended upon its being the ultimate object of desire. But, according to Aristotle, pleasure is valued as an end and only as an end and it is desired for its own sake. For Aristotle, the virtuous agent loves what is just and noble, and takes delight in virtuous activity and in the virtue of other excellent agents, in his view the best kind of friendship is a partnership in virtue of which each party seeks the good of the other for the sake of the other.

One of the key parts of Aristotle's moral philosophy is that ethics cannot be codified, nor is there some single fundamental principle or criterion of right action as there is in Mill's utilitarianism. The man of practical wisdom is a living norm and a proper object of emulation. There are certain virtues, the excellent person must have and there are certain excellent rules the agents act on, but ethics over all is a matter of judgment that is carefully calibrated to the feature of particular situation. It is not a
simply or mainly a matter of rules following. But in case of Mill, the action is good if it produces maximum amount of pleasure, so utility is the principle of determining the consequences of action. According to Mill, there is a single, comprehensive criterion of right and wrong, while in Aristotle’s ethical theorizing, the person with practical wisdom is the relevant measure. That person can articulate the reason for his actions. In that sense, there is moral understanding that can be transmitted. But these reasons are not themselves desirable from the application of an overall criterion of rightness.

Aristotle’s concept of good life involves a comprehensive treatment of a question, “How should we live?” Against this Mill’s concept of good life involves the treatment of question “What ought I do?” From this it is clear that Aristotle’s concept of good life emphasizes the primacy of character traits and Mill’s concept of good life emphasizes rule, judgment and consequences though both are normative in character.

Aristotle’s good life is teleological in nature in which teleology concerns the normative dimension of the capacities constitutive of human nature and how their realization is a cause of happy life or flourishing. As a teleological theory, Mill’s concept of good life can be derived from the states of affairs, the consequences of action rather than locating the moral values in the agent’s motive, character or the intrinsic nature of action types. As a consequentialistic theory, Mill’s utilitarianism is teleological though it is often explicitly not teleological in Aristotelian sense. So also Aristotle’s theory is typically not teleological in that of Mill’s sense.

Though Aristotle’s good life and Mills good life both bear a somewhat normative character, there are some basic differences between these two concepts. Unlike Mill, Aristotle conceives pleasure to be distinct from happiness, though pleasure can not be separated from the happiness. Aristotle indicates also the
difference between pleasure and happiness in case of completeness. The completeness of pleasure is only for a moment but completeness of happiness belongs to a whole time because completeness of happiness is the final goal of man’s desires at least in the sense that nothing less would satisfy.

Since there is a relation between happiness and activity, Aristotle conceives happiness as an activity rather than as a state or disposition of Mill. The goal or end of a thing is its functioning well according to its nature and functioning is activity. Moreover, happiness cannot be a disposition as virtue is, for a man can have a virtue without exercising it.

Mill accepts our desiring pleasure or what serves our purpose, as a truism, and his presentation of the fact of every body’s desiring his own pleasure as a ground of validity of the absolute desirability of pleasure can be explained as an attempt to emphasize the point that the moral or evaluative principle is valid by means of the acceptance of the agent, that is to say his subscribing to it. On the other hand, Aristotle’s believing as he does that the common man’s opinion inheres the true wisdom regarding the nature of objects, he only knows it partially or even confusedly, contents that if the common man seeks his own happiness he must be basically right, the philosopher is only to correct his mistakes and limitation and shows him in what his true happiness does consist and only so far performs a prescriptive task.

In determining good life, Mill and Aristotle both take pleasure but Aristotle’s meaning of pleasure and that of Mill is not exactly the same. Mill tries to explain this conception with adequate justification to mean that pleasure enjoys a logical status. He says that the logical end to be sought in all we do is the fulfillment of our desires or the attainment of the object of desire. If the object of desire is what pleasure means,
pleasure is evidently our end, which indeed is a logical truism. We do not find any such logical stand in Aristotle’s concept of pleasure. Because according to Aristotle there is a pleasure in relation to every sense organ and the best, the most complete is the most pleasant. The best activity of an organ is both complete and pleasant. The pleasure completes the activity as a supervening character.

Aristotle’s moral theory is an example of non-consequentialism and on the other hand Mill’s theory is a form of consequentialism. As a form of non-consequentialism Aristotle’s virtue centered ethics says that moral value of action depends upon the dispositions and judgment of the action. Here agent’s character reflected in action is regarded as crucial to moral quality of action. But Mill’s theory locates moral value entirely in the state of affairs that action brings about. From this it can be said that Aristotle considers the good life from the standpoint of agent’s character but Mill emphasizes on utility derived from the action in determining the good life.

In Mill’s moral theory there are objective moral facts of concerning the utility produced by different actions. As a version of perfectionism Aristotle’s approach to ethics says that good life is one in which the end proper to human nature, is realized and enjoyed and it involves quite specific virtues and activities rather than being based on a particular agent’s choice, interest and concern.

In Aristotle’s moral philosophy there is an important connection between virtue and happiness. Happiness is not interpreted simply as pleasure. It is achieved through deliberate actions and seeking of ends guided by a correct understanding of human good. The activity is pleasing because it is caused by proper operation of our rational capacities and since it is good, so it is pleasing. Thus a conception of well
ordered human activity is the basis of living well or good life, both in the sense of an excellent life and in the sense of a life that is enjoyed as worthwhile and freedom regret over how one has exercised self determination. For the virtuous agent moral motivation is of an internal character, so we can say that Aristotle is an internalist. On the other hand, Mill is an example of externalist because he denies that there is an internal connection between moral consideration and moral motivation. In his utilitarianism, he makes a difference between considerations about utility on the one hand and the actual motivating factors that move people to act in accordance with considerations. But in Aristotle's theory, the agent with sound character is moved to do what virtue requires through both seeing that it is right and wanting to act virtuously.

Regarding virtue also, there is a difference between Aristotle and Mill. According to Aristotle, virtues are of primary importance in understanding good activity and well led life i.e. good life. For Mill, virtue in a part of ethical theory, but utility is more fundamental notion than virtue. Mill says virtue is explicated as a habit of desire in accordance with which an agent is disposed to act in ways that promote utility. But for Aristotle, virtue is a central element in moral theory and virtuous agent is the measure of good action. In Mill's concept of good life, we find that there is a criterion of right action specifically independent of the notion of virtue. In Aristotle's concept of good life, the excellence of the virtuous agent rather than a principle specifically independent of an excellent agent's character is the standard of moral soundness. It implies that in order to act well and to live well an agent must have certain states of character. A virtuous agent must have correct understanding, good judgment, and deliberative excellence. So, virtuous activity is the central element of
eudaemonia. An excellent life or good life enjoyed such activities and these are conducive to happiness, but these are not engaged in happiness.

A treatment of vice is appropriate in just about any moral theory. In Aristotle’s theory, vice is a state of character that is both bad and sufficiently fixed in the agent so that the agent habitually acts wrongly. But in Mill’s theory the moral qualities of state of character whether virtuous or vicious, will be explicated in terms of value or principle or criterion that is independent of an agent’s character. In Aristotle’s view virtues or vices have a more basic place in overall views of morality.

Regarding will, there is also a significant distinction between Aristotle and Mill. According to Aristotle an action can be regarded as virtuous action, if the agent acts knowingly or choose the action for its own sake and does so from a firm and unchanging character. It seems that he includes will or volition in his conception of virtuous action. But Mill gives an account of will quite different from it. He interprets will as a disposition or habit of desire. It is not a separate faculty from desire, but in willing to do something we do it from desire having become habitual.

Sympathy is not just essential to understanding values, but also to explain the practical, action motivating character of moral considerations. This is particularly prominent in Mill’s concept of good life. He argues that fellow feeling and taking pleasure in the well being of others and being distressed by their suffering are basic to moral concern. It is not possible to acquire good life without sympathy in case of Mill’s view. But such type of sympathy is not found in Aristotle’s good life.

Both these two thinkers admit that politics and ethics are interrelated. But there is a difference between them regarding the relation between politics and ethics. According to Aristotle, politics makes the way for the good life of its citizens by
providing moral motivation in the form of connection between happiness and virtue. On the other hand according to Mill, politics makes the way for the good life of its citizen by providing a moral motivation in the form of connection between happiness and freedom.

**Difference between Aristotle and Radhakrishnan:**

According to Aristotle, ethics cannot be codified and there is no single fundamental principle of right action. But in Radhakrishnan’s moral philosophy there is a single principle on the basis of which right action is evaluated. According to Radhakrishnan, it is nothing but dharma and on the basis of it moral activity is determined.

Aristotle and Radhakrishnan both these thinkers admit that the ultimate end of human life is self realization. But regarding the nature of self realization there is a difference between these two. Aristotle’s self-realization is intellectual in nature, but Radhakrishnan’s self-realization is spiritual in nature, so we can say that Aristotle’s good life i.e. the ultimate happy life can be achieved through intellect whereas Radhakrishnan’s good life can be drawn from spirituality though he does not deny the role of intellect.

Aristotle’s ethical theory is realistic and this-worldly. But Radhakrishnan’s ethics is idealistic in nature.

Aristotle is an intellectualist and so the best life for him is one of contemplation whereas Radhakrishnan is a spiritual thinker so the best life for him is one of spirituality.
Radhakrishnan emphasizes on spiritual obligation in case of leading a good life, but Aristotle gives emphasis on social obligation. Radhakrishnan lays much stress of inward constraint than the law imposed from outside.

According to Radhakrishnan, religious and moral life cannot be separated from each other but religion has nothing to do with Aristotle’s conception of life of goodness.

Radhakrishnan had labeled the golden mean as a humanistic position which implies a balance between pleasure and virtue. But Aristotle considered ‘golden men’ from the perfectionist standpoint which implies the mean between the two opposite virtues.

Radhakrishnan’s good life is the heart of modernism. But Aristotle opposed the modern liberal humanist, individualist and utilitarian conception of human being and the life of goodness.

**Difference between Mill and Radhakrishnan:**

There is no such difference between Mill and Radhakrishnan regarding the concept of good life. The points in which they differ are very small in number.

Radhakrishnan describes good life from spiritual standpoint. But Mill describes good life from empirical standpoint.

According to Radhakrishnan, religious and moral life cannot be separated from each other. But, according to Mill, religion has nothing to do in moral life. Radhakrishnan’s views regarding the inter dependence of religion and morality springs from the dictates of a transcendent being though he admits Brahman as the ultimate reality.
The best life, for Mill is general happiness, but the best life for Radhakrishnan is spiritual self realization.

According to Radhakrishnan, to lead a good life spiritual obligation is more important than societal organization. But Mill does not give importance on spiritual obligation.

Though, there are some different points between Aristotle and Mill, between Aristotle and Radhakrishnan and between Mill and Radhakrishnan regarding the concept of good life, still they somehow seem to meet on the same ground starting from the opposite perspectives. So, we are going to indicate the similarities amongst these three thinkers consulting their views on good life.

**Similarities between Aristotle and Mill:**

Aristotle and Mill both admit that the only ultimately good thing in the world is the happiness of sentient being and the only ultimate moral rule is one enjoying us to maximize the sum of that happiness.

Aristotle and Mill’s theory of good life may be regarded as form of goal-oriented theories because like goal-oriented theories these theories also do not place such an emphasis on authority or on the source or status of principles. Aristotle’s emphasis was on how people behaved and on their fitting into practices of the community rather than obeying principles for their own sake. In Mill’s theory even though there are principles, they are not taken as absolutes in themselves but rather only as guidelines as instrumental to achieving the ideal society and the best life for everyone. Mill’s theory places all its emphasis on the actual consequences of moral rules and principles and insists that they are justified only be appeal to how happy they make us. So also Aristotle’s theory of good life emphasizes that the rightness and
wrongness of human activity is judged according to their aim i.e. happiness. All activity ultimately aims at happiness, the final end. According to Aristotle, the good life is the life of virtuous action filled with happiness which makes life good. He says that the aim of happiness would be always the well being of entire community. Mill calculated the greatest good for the greatest number of people by adding up the individual advantage and disadvantages of an action or rule. Aristotle simply assumed that the ultimate advantage of the individual would be identical to the well being of the community in which he or she lives. In fact, list of Aristotle’s virtue indicates that every virtue aims at strengthening and protecting the community as well as adding to the status and happiness of the individual. Although Aristotle was quite explicitly a goal oriented moralist he also included within his theory the element that might be considered the part of a morality of principle, another theory of morality. For example, he considers reason and rationality as essential to the good life and rationality for him, included the understanding and contemplation of principles. Moreover these principles have authority both the authority of reason and authority of society as a whole which is their justification. Aristotle defended one further virtue, which he sometimes described as the good life as such, ‘the life of contemplation’. From this view the good life is essentially the life of philosopher and its main ingredients consist in the joy of thinking about as well as acting upon, the general principle of morality.

Both Aristotle and Mill’s conception of good life is altruistic in nature. On the basis of one sided thinking, some thinkers remark that Aristotle’s conception is egoistic while Mill’s conception is altruistic. They argue that the happiness which Aristotle expects the virtuous agent to pursue is not as Mill would have it, the general
happiness of the sentient world but rather individual happiness of the agent himself. By considering the views found in book X of *Nichomachean Ethics*, that happiness is the ultimate good and it is desired for its own sake never for the sake of anything else, they remark that Aristotle’s concept of good life is egoistic. Here Aristotle refers to happiness as consisting of the most perfect activity of the wise man i.e. the contemplation, since reason is man’s distinctive virtue. From this standpoint it is correct to say that his view is egoistic. But in Book I section II of *Nichomachean Ethics* he points out that the good of the community is above the good of the individual. The good of the individual may coincide with that of the community; still the good of the community must be preserved over and above the good of the individual. He says, “though it is worth while to attain the end merely for one man, it is finer and more god like to attain it for a nation or for city states.” According to Aristotle, a man requires and desires social communion with others. He says that final good must be sufficient by itself. He remarks, “Now by self-sufficient we do not mean that which is sufficient for a man by himself, for one who lives a solitary, but also for parents, children, wife and in general for his friends and fellow citizens, since man is born for citizenship.” Aristotle’s individual is a citizenship of the society and is conceived only as such, all his virtues broadly referring only to citizen’s duty. The happiness of the state determines the character of the individual’s virtue and hence of his happiness, so far as his happiness consists of his virtuous activities. From the above discussion it is proved that Aristotle’s conception of good life is altruistic, not egoistic. On the other hand, Mill’s concept of good life is altruistic in nature, though his utilitarianism starts with an individual that desires his own happiness and ends by prescribing an altruistic goal. He says, “the moral worth of an act is to be measured by
its usefulness in promoting pleasure and happiness. But this happiness is not man's own alone. His own good is to be realized in conjunction with that of others for he and they alike are eager for a life of satisfaction and contentment. A satisfied, contended life is in the ultimate analysis a life of happiness. Mill argues that though general happiness constitute the norm of right and wrong of individual action, since the welfare of the individual seems to depend upon that of all people. He gives primacy to individual rights and leaves to individual freedom as large a scope as is consistent with public order. In spite of this Mill says that the right of the individual to happiness cannot be achieved by an individual independently of regard for fellow beings, his happiness must be depended on the existence and organization of the society or state to which he belongs. The individual needs the state for the achievement of happiness and public policies are valuable only if they promote social well being. Thus we find that Mill and Aristotle are altruistic with regard to the views of good life. Though Mill's approach is individualistic in starting point, ultimately he accepts altruistic attitude towards the good life.

Qualitative difference amongst pleasure which is accepted by Mill is also seen in case of Aristotle's concept. The evaluation of pleasure is dependent on the person who is acquainted with both intellectual pleasure and physical pleasure i.e. on the basis of experience pleasure can be measured which is superior or inferior in kind, according to Mill. Aristotle also admits that pleasures intensify their activities and what intensify a thing is proper to it. Thus, corresponding to different kind of activity there are different kind of pleasures and it implies the same manner of Mill's distinction of pleasure not only in quantity, but also in quality or kind. He also admits that there is a close connection of each pleasure with the activity that it perfects. For,
the pleasure proper to an activity intensifies it, for those who work with pleasure show
better judgment and greater precision in dealing with that particular kind of object.
Moreover, things proper to different thing are also different in kind. Aristotle says,
"without activity pleasure does not arise and every activity is completed by the
attended pleasure. For this reason pleasures, seems too, to differ in kind. For, things
different in kind are, we think completed by different things (we see this to be true
both of nature objects and of things produced by art, e.g., animals trees, a painting, a
sculpture, a house, an implement), and similarly we think that activities differing in
kind are completed by things differing in kind. Now the activities of thought differ
from those of the senses and both differ among themselves in kind, so therefore do the
pleasures that complete them."4

Both Aristotle and Mill admit that the distinction between the baser and the
nobler kind of pleasure is known to the wisdom of the learned, the experienced man
and this wisdom is required to follow for the common man. Aristotle says, "that
neither is pleasure the good nor is all pleasure desirable, and that some pleasures are
desirable in themselves, differing in kind or in their sources from the others."5 It
implies that every pleasure is not desirable. The pleasures which are desirable must be
superior either in kind or in respect of the sources from which they come. Mill also
says that, "Of two pleasures, if there be one to which all or almost all who have
experience of both give a decided preference irrespective of any feeling of moral
obligation to prefer it, that is the more desirable pleasure."6 Thus we find that both
these thinkers admit experience as an unavoidable factor in leading a good life i.e.
good life can be cultivated with the help of experience. In other words good life

depends upon the capacity of human being of distinguishing the quality and quantity of pleasures. Human beings must have the experience of both these kind of pleasures.

Aristotle conceives virtue or happiness as an object of knowledge on the ground that happiness means welfare, perfect realization of one's potentialities. But even the distinction between pleasure and happiness, Aristotle conceives that pleasures which accompany happiness are knowable phenomena. For, only the good man's pleasure is real and truly human and the existence of this is known by the wise man. Mill also finds happiness or pleasure to be what the wise man recognizes to be such. The preference of the wise man is to constitute the guideline of our conduct, that is to say our moral duty. Thus both these thinkers admit that to lead a good life one should follow the path of wise man and it is accepted by all. These thinkers admit that if happiness means welfare of human being then there is an objective criterion to verify it and only an expert is capable of knowing what end or act fits in that criterion.

Aristotle and Mill both those thinkers admit that there is a close relation between ethics and politics. They agree that politics makes the way for the good life of its citizen by providing moral motivation. But they differ in one point. Because according to Aristotle, moral motivation exists in the form of connection between happiness and virtue and according to Mill, it is the connection between happiness and freedom.

Both these philosophers admit that we desire pleasure. Instead of it if they would say that we desire the object and pleasure comes up as a result of the fulfillment of desire, both theories would be more intelligible. In this regard Sidgwick remarks, "we could not pursue pleasure at all, unless we had desire for something else than pleasure."7 Though it is one of the drawbacks of Aristotle and Mill's theory, they
are similar in many cases. Seeing the similarity between them, Prof. J. Barnes regards Aristotle as “a precursor of the great English utilitarians Bentham and Mill.”

**Similarity between Aristotle and Radhakrishnan:**

Aristotle and Radhakrishnan both conceive ethics as practical sense. Dharma for Radhakrishnan and practice for Aristotle are the central terms in morality.

Like Radhakrishnan, Aristotle also admits that the good life is self-realization. Though regarding the nature of self-realization there is a difference in between them.

According to Aristotle, virtuous agent performs certain actions for their own sake and not on an account of an independent desire or passion. But this desire is not same as Kant's categorical imperative. Because according to Kant, the possession of practical reason enables any rational agent to grasp what is unconditionally required, what is required independent of desires and sensibilities? But for Aristotle, it is only the agent in whom the desire and cognition is in argument – the agent who has a stable and correct comprehension of what is fine and just. In the same manner Radhakrishnan also says that ethical principles are independent of this or that individual but they are not unconditional command as Kant says.

**Similarity between Mill and Radhakrishnan:**

Mill and Radhakrishnan both consider morality in a practical sense. Dharma for Radhakrishnan and utility for Mill are the central term in morality.

According to Radhakrishnan, ethical principles are objective only in the sense that they are independent of this or that individual but they are not unconditional command. According to Mill, the ethical principle 'utility' depends upon the greatest number of persons concerned and for this reason Mill’s concept of good life can be
said that it has an objective basis. He argues that the ultimate end is pleasure and its being good as an end is dependent upon its ultimate object of desire. We desire pleasure, so pleasure is the ultimate end of human life.

In Radhakrishnan and Mill’s ethics we find that there is a prominent distinction between end and means.

Both Radhakrishnan and Mill’s good life is the heart of modernism.

Radhakrishnan lays much stress on inward constrain than the law imposed from outside. Mill also gives an importance on inner feeling i.e. the feeling of humanity which comes from within and which he describes as internal sanction of morality. Social feeling of mankind, the desire to be in unity with our fellow creatures is the powerful principle of morality according to Mill, but this feelings come from within, not from outside.

Both these thinkers accept that all men are equal because men are the centers of absolute values; they are unequal only in case of instrumental values.

Now we indicate the similarity amongst Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan regarding their views on good life.

Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan – all these three thinkers’ ethics is normative in character. Because all these thinkers admit that morality is based on an ideal. Though they give different names to the ideals, ultimately all are same. According to Aristotle the highest ideal of human life is self realization by means of which one can attain happiness. Mill admits that the highest ideal is general happiness and according to Radhakrishnan it is nothing but spiritual self realization which ultimately gives us to lead a good life. After all Aristotle describes good life in terms of virtuous activity,
Mill in terms of consequence of actions and Radhakrishnan interpret it in terms of spiritual freedom.

The good life of these thinkers is teleological in nature though the dimension in which teleology is concerned is different. Aristotle and Radhakrishnan's teleology is concerned with the normative dimensions of the capacities of human nature such as motive, character or the intrinsic nature of action type. On the other hand, Mill's concept of good life is concerned with the consequence of action.

All these three thinkers describe their concept of good life by following the path of their predecessors' philosophy. In case of Aristotle we find that he describes his concept of good life by criticizing and evaluating the view of Socrates and Plato. But he gives his own view with a refreshingly original attitude without blindly following their views. Mill also influenced by Jeremy Bentham and James Mill, though he is able to give some new interpretations on the concept of good life. In case of Radhakrishnan we observe that his moral philosophy is rooted in Hindu view of life especially with Vedanta views. But his concept of good life is not same as those because he is not a dogmatic follower of Hindu tradition. He described his views in the light of his own lived experience with an integral insight.

These three philosophers admit wealth, money as ingredients to good life. If these are pursued as the means to good life, not for their own sake then these are accepted as means of good life. If man's pursuit of wealth, money, enjoyment, exploits others, these cannot be accepted because human beings have no right to exploit others for their personal benefit. Human beings should not become victims of material interest and vulgar appetites. To lead a good life, a human being must be free
from the sense of mineness. These thinkers agree in this view. They said that ideal conduct is that which is free from anger, covetousness.

These philosophers admit that to lead a good life human being must consider the role of society where the personality of mankind is expressed.

They emphasize that good life is not a subjective feeling, it is objective achievement of excellence i.e. it is independent of individual. But it is not like the categorical imperative of Kant. For Kant the possession of practical reason enables any rational agent to grasp what is unconditionally required, what is required independent of desires and sensibility. But in case of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan the agent who has a stable and correct comprehension of what is fine and just and wants to act on that basis is categorically imperative, not all the agent.

Like Aristotle and Mill, Radhakrishnan also emphasizes the altruistic character of good life i.e. altruistic character is an important feature of good life advocated by these thinkers. According to Aristotle, good of the community is above the good of the individual and Mill says that for the achievement of happiness, an individual needs the state. So also Radhakrishnan says that the highest ideal, liberation is not isolated existence of the soul, but a displacement of false outlook by a true one. It helps the individual to be altruistic. When all men are saved or are able to achieve salvation, then it is regarded as ‘sarvamukti’ which implies the good life. Thus we find that these three thinkers described the concept of good life with an altruistic attitude.

The concept of wise man found in Aristotle and Mill’s theory is same as moral hero of Radhakrishnan’s theory. Aristotle says that the good man’s pleasure is real and truly human and the existence of this is known by the wise man. Mill also finds
happiness or pleasure to be what the wise man recognizes to be such. The preference of the wise man is to constitute the guide line of our conduct. It implies that to lead a happy life we have to follow the path of wise man. In Radhakrishnan’s moral philosophy ‘moral hero’ is the ideal person and to lead a happy life we must follow the way of ‘moral hero’.

From the above discussion it can be concluded that Aristotle’s good life is termed as happy life based on contemplation. Mill’s good life is termed as life of happiness or satisfied life or contented life based on the consequences of good action and Radhakrishnan’s good life is termed as universal salvation or ‘sarvamuktV or the life spiritual self realization based on spiritual freedom. To lead such a good life, according to Radhakrishnan, an inner spiritual obligation, inward truthfulness and utter sincerity are essential. According to Aristotle, to lead a good life virtuous activity is most important and in the words of Mill, experience of human beings to measure the quality of pleasure, virtues which are desired for its own sake and justice are the essential elements for leading a good life. Radhakrishnan’s good life can be regarded as religio-ethical life where as Aristotle and Mill’s good life can be termed as politico-ethical life.

ROLE AND IMPORTANCE OF GOOD LIFE OF ARISTOTLE, MILL AND RADHAKRISHNAN:
Importance of Aristotle’s good life:

Aristotle’s good life is found in his ethical theory or ethics which is known as virtue ethics. Virtue ethics has a prominent place in contemporary world. It implies that Aristotle’s good life plays an important role in present day world. Virtue ethics is a study of the virtuous conduct to live a good human life. This study involves a
comprehensive treatment of the question, 'how should we live'? And in its contemporary shape it has been largely based on Aristotelian framework of virtues. Therefore, it is generally agreed by all that Aristotle's Nicomachean ethics provides the requisite insights for the contemporary virtue ethics. In other words, it can be said that Aristotle's ethics is the pillar stone of modern contemporary virtue ethics. Aristotle's ethics is mainly concerned with the rational account of good human life. It identifies the good human life with the virtuous life and virtue is conceived as human excellence, i.e. good life is virtuous life and therefore the good life is the life of excellence. According to Aristotle, the main purpose of human existence is the attainment of good life. It is actually *eudaemonia* in Aristotle's language which is usually translated as happiness or human flourishing. Happiness is not a subjective feeling or satisfaction; it is an objective achievement of excellence.

Aristotle's thought is primarily functional and biological; it aims above all to understand life. His whole philosophy is built around the categories of life and his thought is teleological. Life is to be understood not in terms of its elements and origin alone, but in terms of its ends. So his treatment of human life is the most illuminating part of his philosophy. Of all the Aristotelian writings, the architectonic science of conduct in man and in societies is the most difficult part of Aristotle's thought to understand, because in his analysis Aristotle, is most limited by the materials he is working with, the materials furnished by Greek culture, Greek customs, and Greek institutions. In this analysis it is most difficult to disentangle the essentials Aristotelian method and concepts from the specific subject matter of Greek culture and values. Like all great knowers, Aristotle is interested, not in the radical remolding of life, in what might be, but in understanding life as it is and will be. He is concerned
to see man's life in the world and to explain it, not to change it into something else. Therefore his concept of good life is very understandable for common man. The Aristotelian attitude towards the problem of human conduct may be stated quite simply. The life of man is the life of an animal both 'political and rational' – an animal who lives in a city, a polis and who is endowed with nous and logos, – in modern terms an animal both 'gregarious' and 'intelligent'. Both politics and ethics aim to discover the end or function of such a social and rational animal and to calculate the means to achieve that end. The best life is the life of the most complete operation of all the powers of such an animal; it is the life of social animal lived on a rational level. He says intelligence is capable of perfecting animal life into the life of reason. From this it can be said that Aristotle's concept of good life is mainly based on rational and social aspect of human being. The man who live in society and operates his rational capacity to lead a happy life in collaboration with the society would be able to lead a happy life. Moreover, Aristotle says that the natural materials of living such as impulses, desires, the accepted customs and ideals as well as the inherited social institutions of living such as the family, the slavery, the city state and its political organization all these can be made excellent by intelligence. So intelligence which is the most important element of human life is very essential to lead a good life. The very core of Aristotle's attitude towards the conduct of man's life is his insistence that he must start with what we find at hand and perfect the tendencies that are actually there, so, one must set out his own particular cultural heritage.

The highest of all goods at which conduct can aim, all man agree, is the good life, or Acting well. It is eudaemonia that is well being or welfare – this is the view of
Aristotle regarding good life. From the present day classification, Aristotle is a complete and thoroughgoing objective relativist in the analysis of good life. His treatment of ethics not like the Platonist's as a science like geometry, but as an art like medicine which is concerned with the health of the soul. He says that good of man—human welfare is the functioning of man's various powers under the guidance of intelligence and in accordance with their own proper and respective excellence or virtue.

Virtue ethics whose root is found in the Aristotle view of morality is also found in Indian philosophy. There are many versions of virtue ethics in Indian philosophy and each version differs from one another in certain respect because of the different intellectual views and interpretations held by Indian thinkers, e.g. the Buddhist version of virtue ethics is embodied in the concept of Tathagata and sila and other Bodhisattva ideas but Jaina version of virtue ethics is embodied in the concept of vratatas (vows) and the Hindu version is embodied in the concept of Dharma. But all are associated with the spiritual and religious idea of liberation called nirvana, kaivalya or moksa respectively. Liberation of the soul constitutes the ultimate goal of a virtuous life in Indian virtue ethics. When there is a conflict between moral virtues, it can be resolved only by following the conduct of virtuous person i.e. the conduct of virtuous people guide us about what ought to be done at the time of internal conflict amongst the moral virtues. But moral conflict cannot be resolved, because moral virtue is interpreted sometimes in deontological sense, sometimes teleological sense and sometimes in spiritual sense. Therefore good life is different to different persons and it is not possible to determine what is truly good in human life. In this respect if we consider Aristotle's good life we find that happiness is the good life according to
him and happiness is that which all man aim, it is not different to different person. So, good life is not an obscure idea from the standpoint of Aristotle’s view.

Aristotle opines that women, children and slaves cannot lead a good life because of certain factors outside their control. This view evolves out of the societal pattern prevalent at the time of Aristotle. Most probably at that time, women were under the control of men and they were deprived of the privileges, rights enjoyed by the men. Under the circumstances, it might be difficult for the women to assert their status and role in the society and this might have restricted their activities in leading a meaningful life. During that period the slave system was prevalent in the Greek society. The slaves were considered as a downtrodden, lowly class whose fate rest on the mercy of their masters. The slaves do not have their own freedom. Though, Aristotle’s good life has a vital role in modern societies, it cannot be taken as a satisfactory theory, because, Aristotle excludes women, slaves and children from leading a good life. Society changes time to time and these changes brought in new views and concepts regarding individual as well as the community life. So in the modern societies the position and role of women and slaves has been defined differently as it was in Aristotle’s time. Now-a-days women have their own empowerment; they have full right in leading their life by themselves. So also there is no slave system in modern times. They become the working class, labourers playing a vital role in the economic growth of the country. From this standpoint Aristotle’s views on women and slaves cannot be accepted as such. Since his views on good life centered on the life of Greek societies prevalent at his time, therefore his theory is a time bound theory. It cannot be true in all time and everywhere.
**Importance of Mill’s good life:**

In estimating the significance of Mill’s position in the development of English utilitarianism it is particularly important that we would keep in mind both the nature of his early environment and training and the various changes that his ethical views underwent even after the important essay on Bentham which makes the beginning of his really independent work in ethics and therefore the beginning of a new phase of utilitarian theory.

Mill’s concept of good life which is nothing but the life of general happiness influences the minds of common people. Generally it is believed that human dimensions such as knowledge, beauty, love and moral characters would count for nothing apart from pleasure. But Mill was not satisfied with this and so he introduced a new criterion for human dimension of relevance, i.e. quality of pleasure. This indicates that Mill gives emphasis on dignity and excellence of human nature in leading a good life. It is the most essential element for the popularity of his concept.

His introduction of quality is an index of pleasure; it is the sole standard of pleasure in pure logical manner. Therefore his concept of good life is the footstep of various ethical thinkers and it is seen in Moorean allegation of naturalistic fallacy. The central proposal of utilitarianism amounts to the contention that the only rational and consistent criterion available for the guidance of an action is the assessment of the pleasurable and painful consequences of any particular action. Therefore Mill’s concept of good life is rational and consistent in nature. ‘Everybody to count for one, nobody for more than one’- is the basic concept of Mill’s good life. It implies that everyone is entitled to equal consideration.
As a social philosophy, Mill’s utilitarianism treats an individual in all of his aspects of existence namely, the physical, the intellectual and the spiritual. It means that man is not only a physical being but also intellectual and spiritual being inspite of their social aspect. Since utilitarianism recognized the impact of neuro-sociological constraints of human living, therefore Mill’s good life which is implicit in utilitarianism, it also included this aspect. Mill also admits that in leading a good life influence of the environment, the genetic factor, the cultural and social factor on a person is very prominent. An individual is essentially a rational being endowed with high sense of intuition – this aspect of Mill’s good life has influenced the non-cognitivist to evolve their system of ethics on higher order principles of valuation. As a social animal, man has to learn everything mostly by his experience and observation. It is another important aspect of Mill’s good life.

Mill’s concept of good life is optimistic in nature and to acquire good life the method which is adopted by Mill is multidimensional because this methodology is built on the safest rocks of things which men love most and these are contentment, equanimity and poise. In Mill’s good life we find that he treats man both as a knower and an actor. No other ethical system has given such a prominent place to this vital aspect of human existence. Simply it can be said that man has the rational, intellectual capacity and he applies this in performing actions which give him greatest happiness in consequences.

After all, Mill’s good life has a wide scope because it combines reason, experience, intuition, pleasure in good life in an inanimate union. We find a reconciliation of these concepts in Mill’s concept of good life. Mill’s utilitarianism can be highly characterized as a methodology for the pursuit of a common end and
such person is able to lead a good life. Without spiritual faith no one is able to lead a
good life though he has sufficient material happiness, therefore Radhakrishnan’s
humanism is mainly based on spiritual values and he describes good life with a strong
religious belief. He says that as a spiritual being man’s complete law is the liberation
of all people rather than the liberation of one’s own individual self. Spirit in man is
the basic truth and goal of human effort.

Radhakrishnan’s concept of good life can be regarded as one the ways for
world peace. World peace cannot be attained only by material gain, it requires
something more and that something is nothing but spiritual development. Material
development is necessary for it but if there is no consistency between material and
spiritual development, no world peace is possible. Radhakrishnan’s concept of good
life bears such an attitude which is based on spiritual and religious freedom of human
community. Modern civilization is self-interest oriented civilization. The impact of
the rapid technological growth in the modern world seems to have some adverse
consequences inspite of its beneficial contribution. Today’s world is ever changing.
These dynamic changes and rate of progress of such changes have caused various
mal-adjustment between old conventions and the new ideas resulting a lot of
complexities which make the modern man confused and unstable. Confronted by
innumerable insecurities ranging from the possibility of the total annihilation of
human race by nuclear weapons, to the mere hatred amongst family members for the
possession of inherited property and wealth, the modern man becomes all the more
puzzled. As a result in the midst of suspicion, hatred and dissatisfaction man finds
himself devoid of mental freedom which is very necessary for the proper nourishment
of good life, according to Radhakrishnan. Nowadays high industrialization with the
motive of maximum production and maximum consumption attempts to relieve the boredom of an alienated individual providing with all kinds of consumption. Radhakrishnan is very much aware of the situation of the modern man aimlessly running after wealth, power and excitement. He observed how materialistic approach of the modern world reduces mankind and the whole of the universe to impersonal machine. On the other hand, he recognized the important role of science to improve the condition of human life by increasing proper awareness, developing means of physical comfort, removing prejudices and superstitions. Above all science fulfills man's eagerness to know the universe of which he is a part and a partner.

According to Radhakrishnan, to lead a good life social reconstruction is necessary. But more socialist reconstruction without a proper awakening of moral consciousness will not improve the lot of people. Radhakrishnan conceives of a new human order where the integrated experience of the spiritualistic approach could be incorporated with the development of science and technology for the progress of mankind. This is the essence of his concept of good life. The global problems of the present century can be solved only by the unity of the whole human race by agreed principle of co-existence, co-operation, compromise and mutual understanding, according to Radhakrishnan. But this must be based on spiritual self realization. It is nothing but the synthesis of ethics, religion and metaphysics of his life which is termed as good life. In the present atomic contexts wars are mankind's greatest scourge, worse than any natural devastation. Wars are man-made. So peace also can be made by man. This is possible only when there is cooperation among the nation of the world. We have hatred in our mind. Hatred is man made why not we make peace
and love among the individual in society. If we exercise the concept of good life of Radhakrishnan, we are sure that it will bring universal brotherhood and world peace.

A close examination of the similarity and difference of the views advocated by Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan on the concept of good life reveals that their views have their own significance in their own field and environment and all views are time bound theories. With the course of history, moral codes of a society get distorted and loose their original significance and our society is no exception to this. This aspect is mainly found in Radhakrishnan's interpretations. Because, he describes the concept of good life from the standpoint of reconciliation both Indian and Western values of life. He emphasizes that man is not only psycho-physical being, man is at the same time both religious and spiritual being. So he analyses his concept of good life by combining morality with religion and says that good life is the attainment of perfection or complete self-realization. For him, real nature of man is spiritual, so self-realization is described as the realization to the divinity. Morality is one of the means to apprehend the reality. Ethics is not merely a science of conduct; rather it is the science of good and the art of realizing it. But this goodness is not to be confused with temporal well-being or physical well-being, it is spiritual well-being. He says, man has to work not only for his own individual liberation, but for the upliftment and all round development of his society and nation and for human race as a whole, i.e., according to him, we must work in detachment which means abandonment of self-centeredness, rejection of selfish interest, detachment not in the sense of renunciation. Radhakrishnan's concept of good life is important not only to understand his life, but also to understand ourselves, our philosophical selves. All round development i.e. good life could be made possible firstly by refining one's own self and desire. In this
respect we can memorize the views of Ranaday, "The reformer has to infuse in himself the light and warmth of nature, and he can only do it by purifying and improving himself and his surroundings. He must have his family, village, tribe and nation recast in other and new moulds and, that is the reason why social reform becomes an obligatory duty." For the present day world Radhakrishnan’s views of good life is more relevant than the others views advocated by Mill and Aristotle. Because human being finds his highest satisfaction when his physical and mental both pleasure find its zenith simultaneously. Only physical pleasure or only spiritual pleasure is unable to give the uttermost satisfaction which is termed as good life. In Radhakrishnan’s analysis we find such a sparkling insight which he expresses through his moral and religious views. Now-a-days, the Global ethics requires such assimilation where east and west, ancient and modern, spiritual and material values go into hand in hand. The life which has the spiritual consciousness of humanity, which is based on love, sacrifice, service, self-control, justice, and above all devotion to truth and righteousness, can be regarded as good life according to the author. Moreover without mental peace, no life is able to lead a good life, although it is physically, economically well equipped.

In conclusion it can be said that moral universe is not a mathematical universe or full of Geometrical axioms and hence extreme logical rigor and objectivity should not be expected in any viable moral system. Since morality is highly personal, one is likely to be sensitive to moral issues. It is not strange to come across dogmatic pronouncements even from authors of refined intellect and ingenuity and Aristotle’s theory, Mill’s theory and Radhakrishnan’s theory has no exception to this inevitable predicament.
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