CHAPTER – 1

INTRODUCTION

Concept of Good life is the fundamental concept of all philosophical as well as moral investigations. The emergence of human being as a self conscious, moral, social and rational agent has reflected strongly on his ultimate end of life which is termed as good life. The literal meaning of good life is a life well lived, the most desirable way to live. One question always comes into the minds of human being, “Why should we be moral?” The answer of the question must be larger than morality itself, for it must supply us with the reasons for accepting moral principles and rules. That answer is called the good life. Good life is a phrase without precise meaning. It signifies the following questions: “How should we live? What do we want? What should we want? What do we most enjoy? What should we most enjoy? What is worth working for? And what is not worth the effort? What should we accept and what should we try to change?” Moral thinkers try to provide the answer of these questions which are the heart of ethics. The goal of ethics is to develop a set of principles and a view of our highest end of life that will allow us to live with clarity and confidence. The general quest includes morality as well as search for good life. Good life provides us the reasons and logical argument for accepting moral principles and rules. It embraces all aspects of human life by which we can make our life meaningful, enjoyable, duty bound, to become industrious and struggle in life amidst odds and to create a new world order by changing the society for betterment. It is an urge of life which satisfies our cravings of being moral.

Good life is a central concept of moral philosophy. It is interwoven with different normative features of morality. For better understanding of the concept of
good life in terms of individual, society and nation, various views of different thinkers of different times need to be counted and critically judged. In the proposed study, the works of three great philosophers representing the different periods of philosophical history have been considered to find out the primary aspects of their ethical views in terms of good life as a whole. The title of the study indicates that the present study is mainly concerned with the analysis of good life in the moral philosophy of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan. The scrutiny of the literature reveals that these thinkers have focused only certain aspects of good life, but not all through their moral philosophy and to find out all and encompassing aspects of good life, it is felt necessary to critically estimate their views regarding the good life. The author tries to redefine their concepts of good life with a synthetic outlook.

In the present time, scientific and technological achievement in different fields influenced our lives immensely and we are confused with the material gains in every walk of life. Some times we are puzzled with the so-called progress, development that is made possible by the technological advancement and whether these rapid social changes ultimately lead to peace and happiness in the world or not. Because such technological advancement and modernization create insecurities in all spheres of life neglecting the spiritual and religious values. In such moment it is very necessary to discuss what actually good life is. Is it material comfort or spiritual development or both? Good life implies all round development of individual living in societies. Real worth of a nation is individual in and through which nation expresses its development. So, universal harmony and peace ultimately depends on the growth and development of individual. Welfare of the individual leads to the welfare of the society and so also
welfare of the society leads to welfare of the state or nation. So welfare of the individual, i.e., good life is the fundamental stone of world peace.

The present day situation creates suspicion, hatred, and dissatisfaction amongst the people and for this they have to spend their life in a position which is devoid of mental peace. Development of mental peace is very much essential for the proper nourishment of leading a good life. Such global problem can be solved only by the unity of whole human race by agreed principle of co-existence, co-operation, compromise and mutual understanding. This unity does not require the same code of ethics, religion and language for all nations, races and regions. It requires only the efforts of development of the creative expression of their own field. Imposition and dominating attitude towards other culture should be discouraged for it. The unity of culture which is the key word for the survival of humanity must be based on harmony and integration rather than imitation and antagonism. Good life is one of the ways of awareness of this present global crises and modification of human activities. To preserve social harmony, morality and moral codes are very necessary within the social set up. Good life which is an organized moral concept is very much essential for this purpose. The aim of life is not merely to create an earthly utopia, but to attain a higher and intense form of consciousness. The picture of Siva, Buddha and hundreds of other saints illustrate this truth that man must have a highest good which is contemplation, freedom and peace of understanding. Morality is a stepping stone, not a stopping place. So the action which is done with no selfish interest but in the dedication to society purifies the mind. Since man’s life is a network of intimate relations of attraction and repulsions from which it is neither possible nor desirable that he should cut himself free. The need for the concept of good life arises due to the
environment where individual lives amongst a host of things which we judge as intrinsically or extrinsically good. On moral priorities we can grade them as higher or lower. Explanation of good life also arises for the sake of moral assertion which includes evaluation, prescriptions, criticism and injunction concerning others and ourselves.

Individual life and social life are inseparable. Good of the individual depends upon the good of the society and vice versa. Regarding the question whether the good of the society is a means for achieving its goal or it is an end itself, many ethical thinkers who mainly believe in the greater good of the society, believe that not only the good of the society is quite often in its end itself, the society itself quest for the good which is not only universally good, the epitome of the goodness, but something that must be the essence of life and the ultimate reality of life too, like Indian thinkers it can be said that ‘Satyam Sivam Sundaram’. That is, Truth is Universal Reality and Reality is Beauty. On the other hand, it suggests that, Reality itself is goodness which is eternally beautiful and true. This is the highest end of individual as well as the society which can be termed as good life. As primary aspect of society, man and ethics are not complementary to each other, but integral to each other’s unity. They create independency as a result of which human reality make progress on earth. Due to the change of time though human ethics has turned into a complex system, its roots are based on natural values only. Development of society depends upon individual and his ethics. So good life is an indispensable stage where development of individual and society occur through ethical development. In Indian literature ethics is mentioned as ‘Naitik Sastra’ and all the major religious books are based on intrinsic values of ethics. The books of Hindu Religion lay emphasis upon ‘duty’ as the iconic
emblem of their rules of life. From this standpoint also good life is a very essential concept.

The title of the study indicates that this study is mainly concerned with the analysis of good life inherent in the moral philosophy of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan. The main aim of this study is to develop and defend good life based on the writings of these three thinkers. Each of them emphasizes only certain aspects of good life, not all. To find out an overall view of good life evolving through different periods of time representing the above thinkers is the main purpose of the work which can be characterized as role model of good life. The present study is also an attempt to analyze the nature, characteristics and conditions of leading a good life in terms of moral interpretation put forward by them and to relate their ideas and views in the present day world and determine its applicability in ethico-social context. This attempt is not to define the problem, but to redefine the already defined problem in the light of changing situation.

The place of good life in the philosophy of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan in the ethico-social and religious perspectives:

Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan were from entirely different family background and atmosphere representing three different societies. They were not only brought up in entirely different atmosphere, but also practiced entirely different life styles. However, the then prevailing socio-ethical situation influenced their thinking, outlook and activities. One of the most common influences amongst themselves was from the richness of the socio-cultural and philosophical heritage of the age - old civilization. Keeping these facts in mind one can formulate similarities and differences in their thoughts. The great philosophers, seers, prophets and religious
thinkers all over the world have from the dawn of history, made serious and sustained efforts to find an answer to the problem of man’s good life. We find the different and interesting answers given in our Vedas, Upanishads and other philosophical schools. This problem has commanded special attention of the great thinker Aristotle from the very beginning. It has also commanded special attention to the philosophy of Mill and Radhakrishnan.

**Place of Aristotle in ethical world (384-322 B.C):**

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 ends. Hence we can expect Aristotle’s treatment of human life to be the most illuminating part of his philosophy. Aristotle is most limited by the materials he is working with, the materials furnished by Greek culture, mores and institutions in his analysis of the architectonic science of conduct in man. So it is most difficult to disentangle the essential Aristotelian methods and concepts from the specific subject matter of Greek culture and values. So it is tempted to judge the moral philosophy in the light of Aristotle’s conclusion. Aristotle exhibits only sober sanity and wisdom and these two see the last things in the world to which Our Age of Anxiety can be drawn.

Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics (N.E.) in which we find the concept of good life as a powerful voice to our own age. It is a challenge to our values, our assumptions and above all else, the complacency with which we approach the task of living life. Moreover, it is an artifact of thought, a key to the historical interpretation of ‘western metaphysics’. According to Aristotle, Ethics is not the same as ‘morality’
or 'right conduct'. It means the cultivation of habit of the soul; it is a disposition
towards the passions that is conducive to virtuous action. One of the strongest notions
of N.E. is pleasure. It is neither a passive sensation nor some sort of activity, but
rather that which brings the activity to perfection, supervening on the activity like 'the
bloom of health' in the young and vigorous. It also means the joyful contemplation of
this life in the blossom of its ephemerality and contingency. N.E. can be regarded as
the work that sums up Aristotle's practical philosophy. It is the synthesis of
Aristotle's practical teachings where he applies his idea of moderation, the Golden
mean, to numerous ethical situations in an attempt to discover what constitutes the
Good life and the Good man.

Aristotle's ethical theory is good-oriented moral theory which says that
happiness is the ultimate good in human life. In the ancient world, Aristotle examined
the different one sided conceptions of good life and rejected them in favor of a single
conception with which most of us are probably in agreement - happiness. Happiness is
the good life, although happiness itself is not a single activity but the result of a great
many activities. In his ethics Aristotle examined two one sided conception of the good
life - pleasure and success and rejected them, yet he also insisted that one cannot
possibly lead the good life without them. But they themselves are not the good life,
only necessary condition for it. The good life is happiness, which he defined as that
which is wanted for its own sake and not for the sake of anything else. As it turns out,
happiness included a large number of advantages and virtues including wealth, power,
community status as well as military courage, the ability to drink wine without getting
too obnoxious, a sense of justice, good friend and a good sense of humor. Happiness
in other words was not just a sense of well being as it is for us. Happiness, for
Aristotle meant the good life as a whole. His ethics is teleological in nature. He is concerned with action as conducive to man's good not as being right in itself irrespective of every other consideration. If Happiness is an activity of man what activity is peculiar to man? It cannot be the activity of growth or reproduction, not yet of sensation, since these are shared by other beings below man; it must be the activity of that which is peculiar to man among natural being namely the activity of reason or activity in accordance with reason. This indeed an actively moral virtues, the intellectual virtues but it is not what people ordinarily mean when they say that happiness consists in being virtuous since they are generally thinking of moral virtues such as justice, temperance. In any case, happiness as the ethical end, could not consists simply in virtue as such, it consists rather in activity according to virtue or in virtuous activity, understanding by virtue both the intellectual and the moral virtues. Moreover Aristotle says, it must, if it really deserves the name of happiness, be manifested over a whole life and not merely for brief period.

But if happiness is essentially activity in accordance with virtue, Aristotle does not mean by this simply to exclude all the common notions about happiness. For example, pleasure which is the natural accompaniment of an unimpeded and free activity, secondly some external good without which a man cannot well exercise that activity. Aristotle remarks that the truly happy man must be sufficiently equipped with external goods. He thus rejects extreme cynicism, but he warns us not to mistake indispensable condition of happiness for essential elements of happiness.

This being established, Aristotle goes on to consider first the general nature of good character and good action, then the leading moral virtues, the virtues of that part of man which can follow the plan lay down by reason, then the virtues of the intellect.
At the end of N.E. he considers the ideal life or the ideal life of activity in accordance with virtue which life will be the truly happy life for man. Good character is developed by doing virtuous act. Aristotle says that we become virtuous by doing virtuous acts, but how can we do virtuous acts unless we are already virtuous? Regarding this Aristotle answered that we begin by doing acts which are objectively virtuous without having a reflex knowledge of the acts and a deliberate choice of the acts as good, a choice resulting from a habitual disposition. For instance, a child may be told by its parents not to lie. Virtue itself is a disposition which has been developed out of a capacity by the proper exercise of that capacity (Aristotle’s philosophy, Fedrick Coplestone p. 335).

In Nicomachean ethics, Aristotle develops a theory of what is the good life for human beings. The good life is, for a human being, to live in the way that is most suitable for a human being that is according to reason. This is what separates man from the animals, as man alone has the capacity to exercise reason and the communicative ability which allows him to form political communities. For Aristotle, the good is not attainable outside of political communities, which are combination of people designed to live self sufficiently in the pursuit of good.

Historically, Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics is the first systematic treatment of ethics in western civilization. It belongs in the tradition began by Socrates and advanced by Plato, a tradition which stresses both supremacy of man’s rational nature and the purposive nature of the universe. He insists that the basic moral principle is immanent in the activities of our daily lives and can be discovered only through a study of them. Aristotle begins his ethical inquiry with an empirical investigation of what it is that men fundamentally desire. In his search, he finds an ultimate end for
man which is firstly self sufficient that which even isolated makes life desirable and lacking in nothing, secondly, 'final' that which is always desirable in itself and never for the sake of something else, thirdly attainable by man. Aristotle maintains that happiness alone is the goal which meets these requirements. However, he recognizes that this is no more than a preliminary agreement about what it is that we should investigate in ethics. More specifically, we should know the nature of happiness and the condition of its attainment. Following Plato, Aristotle tells us that happiness must be explained in terms of reason, man's distinctive function, though it is significantly modified by the doctrine of potentiality and actuality, i.e., man actualizes his distinctive personality by living the life of reason. In others words, happiness depends upon the actualization or the full realization of man's rationality. For the attainment of happiness Aristotle gives a much emphasis on virtue which refers to the excellence of a thing, the disposition to perform effectively its proper function. According to him, a virtuous man lives according to reason, thus realizing his distinctive potentiality. Then he makes a distinction between moral virtue and the intellectual virtue. After all, his ethical view was in harmony with the Greek tradition.

Mill's position in the ethical world (1806-73):

John Stuart Mill, unlike other philosophers, did not attempt to formulate an ethical theory, but rather to defend the ethical theory to which he was born. In his defense, however his intellectual depth and his intense desire to find an ethics which fits the facts of life, led him to modify and go beyond the utilitarian doctrine as it was propounded by his father and Jereme Bentham.

Mill's utilitarianism, though not fully consistent seem to have been more 'locus aggregative' than 'good aggregative' for the formula that he upheld is 'greatest
good of the greatest number'. Mill is concerned with its locus, insisting that the good of every sentient being should be taken into account and maximized so far as possible (locus aggregative) rather than insisting that good ought to be maximized in the universe, regardless of who gets it (good aggregative). So, Mill’s utilitarianism would be concerned mainly with how many persons get good rather than total amount of good. His theory gives emphasis on aggregative not distributive equality.

As an ethical theory, utilitarianism signifies that the ultimate end is and ought to be general happiness and that those actions are right which bring the greatest happiness to the greatest number. The utilitarian standard, according to Mill, is not agent’s own happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether.

Mill separated himself most completely from his predecessors in teaching that pleasure differs not only quantitatively but qualitatively and also in admitting the internal sanction of conscience. But he also held that the core of conscience was the ‘social feeling of mankind’, the desire to be unity with our fellow creature. The social state is at one so natural, so necessary and so habitual to man, that except in some unusual circumstances or by an effort of voluntary abstraction, he never conceives himself otherwise than as a member of a body (Henry Sigdwick, The Methods of Ethics, p. 388). Here he follows Hume and Hartley in attributing to man’s natural altruistic tendencies in creating him with ‘sympathy’ as opposed to Bentham’s theory of self-interest as the motive of action.

Mill’s utilitarianism is known as empirical utilitarianism as against the rational utilitarianism of Herbert Spencer which is usually known as evolutionary utilitarianism. In his utilitarianism a new spirit of understanding and appreciation of the rival school had began to show itself.
Mill's utilitarian ethics is extra ordinarily significant both the matter and the style fascinate, not less than the glow of conviction that permeates the whole.

Mill's nature was in many ways (political thinker, economic leader, philosopher, utilitarian), an attractive one, characterized by high and sterling qualities. He was generous in his outlook and sympathetic with men in their struggles, aspirations and doubts. He was eager to be fair in his estimate of others and of their opinions and always ready to admit that there is likely to be some truth in every doctrine and belief that has been sincerely held, there was nothing of the persecutor in him. His disinterested regard for truth was unbounded and he took little care to cloak or hide unpalatable opinions, but expressed himself freely without regard to personal consequences. He delighted in championing persons and causes that he conceived to be unjustly treated by society or by the law of the land. His public spirit was intense and he never feared to attack legislative or other injustices, and to uphold of unpopular views, in the interest of the working classes or of the down trodden. His life was consistently devoid to one end- furtherance of the good and welfare of his fellow men.

Mill's utilitarianism can be regarded as hedonistic utilitarianism because according to him it is pleasure or happiness present in the consequences which made them good, desirable or worthwhile and therefore an action is right if and only if it produces at least as much happiness as any other available one. It is monistic in nature both in his theory of value by holding that one thing i.e. happiness is intrinsically good and in his theory of obligation by holding that we ought to do only that whose consequences are not less good than those of any other available actions. In Mills utilitarianism, maximization of intrinsic value occupies the most prominent place and
he extends the notion of maximization in the direction of both the experience and experiencer of happiness. So he declares that the highest value which every one ought to aim at is the great possible amount of happiness experienced by the greatest possible number of persons concerned. Like ideal utilitarianism of Moore, Mill's theory also locates intrinsic value in the mental state of consciousness, the experience, of feeling pleased or happy of being enlightened by the acquisition of knowledge or of enjoying beauty, which is intrinsically good.

Utilitarianism is a philosophical mess in which we find a combination of rationalism, intuitionism, empiricism and hedonism. Mill reconciles reason, intuition, experience and pleasure in the same manner. Utilitarianism as an opposition to egoism state, that an action is right if it tends to promote happiness and wrong if it tends to produce the reverse of happiness, not just the happiness of the performer of the action, but also that of everyone affected by it. Utilitarianism is an effort to provide an answer to the practical question 'what ought a man to do' and its answer is that man ought to act so as to produce the best consequences possible. According to Mill, acts should be classified as morally right or wrong only if the consequences are of such significance that a person would wish to see the agent compelled, not merely persuaded and exhorted to act in the preferred manner.

Mill's more important contribution to ethics occurs in utilitarianism. Although he was concerned to reject Intuitionism and although in the Logic he noted some differences between ordinary factual statement and statement concerning obligation. Mill did not develop a meta-ethics, his major concern being, in spite of a brief, qualified anti-Bentham period, to state and defend a utilitarian normative ethics. Estimating Mill's utilitarianism G.E. Moore observes that, "This (Utilitarianism) is a
book which contains an admirably clear and fair discussion of many ethical principles and methods" (Principia Ethica, p.64) . The objectives of Mill’s utilitarianism is to help one understand what constitutes a morally good life and cultivate it as best as one can. It is mainly based on how people behaved and also on their fitting in practices of the community rather than obeying principles for their own sake. Good life is the happiest life, the contented life, general happiness of all people which is universal and which is mainly based on amalgamation between the sensual pleasure and the intellectual pleasures though it requires maximum amount of intellectual pleasures. Social obligation is also necessary to lead a good life, for Mill. The basis of Mill’s good life is feeling of humanity for mankind. So it is humanistic in nature. Sympathy for other human being’s feeling and respect for such feelings as their own is another quality for leading a good life i.e. all man’s feeling are equal in status. Mill’s good life can be regarded as one of the important ways for social integration because its main components are happiness of all people, path of justice, sympathetic to each other, denial of selfish work at the same time respect for all people’s feelings and interest which are very essential to establish an ideal society.

Radhakrishnan’s Position in the ethical world (1888-1975):

Sarvpalli Radhakrishnan, former President of India, is regarded as one of the greatest thinkers of East - the ablest representative of its rich philosophic tradition and its leading spokesman for a reconciliation of Western and Eastern spiritual values. To Radhakrishnan, man’s only hope is a world community, a brotherhood where each human being belongs to the household of God, where truth is the only abiding reality and the only way in which this hope can be fulfilled is by bringing about an inner revolution in the imprisoned mind of man.
Radhakrishnan’s views about ethics are similar to the views of Upanishads. The ideal of ethics is self-realization and Moral conduct is self realized conduct, here self means the deeper nature of man, free from all fetters of selfish individuality. His views on ethics are subsidiary to the ideal of non-dualism. He has written a few articles on morality and a book in Ethics of the Vedanta. He tries to counter the criticism that the Vedanta philosophy has no ethics. Moral action is related to human being. He relates moral agent to the Supreme Reality because man is destined for unity with the Absolute through moral action. Man is born and reborn until he achieves the union with the Divine. Morality is not an end in itself, but is a preparation for union with the supreme. Radhakrishnan in line with Hindu tradition emphasizes the imperative to transcend the ethical in order to attain the eternal. His ideas on morality are scattered over his considerable philosophical writings.

Radhakrishnan is one of the bright jewels in the long tradition of Indian Philosophy. He always admires his predecessors for their valuable contribution to the reservoir of human knowledge. But he was not a blind follower of it. Because he evaluates them, criticizes them in the light of their own experience. Thus, Radhakrishnan established himself as an important figure by his critico-creative style of interpretation. He says, through wisdom redemption of mankind is possible and he uses the word intuition instead of wisdom.

According to him, the purpose of ethical lie is the discipline of human nature leading to the realization of the spiritual. The practical codes of morality, for him are non-hatred to all beings in thought, word and deed, good will and charity. Radhakrishnan contends that supreme virtue consists in truth.
According to Radhakrishnan any ethical theory must be grounded on metaphysics because there is an intimate relation between human conduct and ultimate reality. The ultimate reality can be conceived as the Absolute and the Absolute, for him, is the total spiritual reality and the world is an attempt to realize one of the infinite possibilities contained in the Absolute.

The real goal of human life is the attainment of perfection, complete self realization, since real nature of man is spiritual, self-realization is described as the realization of the divinity. With the course of history, moral codes of a society get distorted and lose their original significance and the Hindu society is no exception to this. Radhakrishnan also draws the attention to those ethical principles which Hindu society should dear and those which should be shunned immediately. ‘Dharma’ is absolute for Radhakrishnan though it has no absolute and timeless content.

Radhkrishnan’s moral philosophy can be regarded as idealistic ethics. Idealism is the ground source from which follows his moral, political, cultural, and social and all other ideas. Idealistic and value oriented approach is applied in Ethics. Morality is a state which is not a matter of doubt, but a factor that uplifts man for the true end of his life. It is one of the means to apprehend the reality. Ethics is rooted in some concept of value and it cannot be alienated itself from the spirit- the ultimate value.

Ethics plays a significant role in the worldly life as a guide. It transforms the chaos and confusion of the obscure and the limited ego into the harmony of the pure and immortal essence. By ‘inward truthfulness’ and ‘utter sincerity’ man can develop a sense for the right and the true which helps man to understand other people’s feelings and problems. As Plato says in his Republic, a man who has seen the real
objects when released from the dark cave is under a moral obligation to return to the
cave and teach the prisoners the truths he has learnt.

According to Radhakrishnan, spiritual life includes the ethical life but not as
moral obligation as it is in Plato, but as a natural outcome of a higher life order.
Radhakrishnan’s view is much closer to Sri Aurobindo, when Aurobindo asserts, the
mental, vital and physical life in their divine change break into possibilities.
According to Radhakrishnan, ethics in not merely a science of conduct. It is rather
science of good and the art of realizing it. But this goodness is not to be confused with
temporal well-being. According to Radhakrishnan, ‘love’ and ‘freedom’ have very
significant role in man’s search for good. “Love is at the very heart of universe”. He
uses the word detachment. By it he means abandonment of self centeredness, rejection
of selfish interest. For, ego orientation is the main hindrance to love. Love has to be
realized in the actual experience of life. He regards non-violence as the most
important moral virtue for a good social life. It is the expression of love. Gandhi
conceives non-violence as a weapon for our entire social and political struggle.
Gandhi is influenced by ancient Indian tradition and the same is applicable to
Radhakrishnan. Because, in our ancient society the idea of non-violence was
prevalent in the form of an ideal of gentleness in feelings and in doings. Sacrifices,
tolerance, patience, forgiveness are the manifestation of love. Unlike Gandhi’s
concept of hard rigoristic life, Radhakrishnan emphasizes a fuller, nobler, peaceful
and dignified life even with man’s material comfort. So, Radhakrishnan’s good life
can be free from compulsion and so it is with full freedom where freedom means
freedom from suffering. He also considers freedom as a postulate of morality,
presupposition of our moral endeavor. So he uses ‘freedom’ in two senses. ‘Freedom
from' is negative freedom, which prepares a man for his positive freedom, i.e. ‘freedom for’ where freedom means the will to be responsible. Every person has the power to will to act according to his choice.

Radhakrishnan describes his idealistic ethics not only from humanistic and spiritualistic standpoint, but also from the religious standpoint with the method of integral experience. Actually he is interested to formulate such an ethics which can be called creative good life rather than reinterpreting a conventional and routine good form already existing in the society. Such an ethics must be based on the act of integral insight controlled by mystical perception, according to Radhakrishnan. For him, the ultimate end is ‘sarva mukti’ or ‘universal salvation’. This is achieved only when the human race as a whole is liberated, only when the redeemed souls become one with the Divine.

METHODOLOGY:

In the present study, a philosophical problem has been observed in a descriptive manner by redefining the original views expressed by the great thinkers - Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan. The existing views on good life have been interpreted and evaluated to derive a synthetic over all view on the main characteristics and its different components. To work out the details, the original books and literature are used as primary source of data and other reliable and suitable information collected from articles, journals, notes are treated as secondary data source. By analyzing the primary and secondary data sources, the author seeks to find answers to questions through existing knowledge on the problem in a causal comparative approach.
This work aims to develop and defend an ethical thesis that emphasizes in the following points:

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Chapter, ‘Concept of Good life- in general’, begins with an attempt to explain different views on good life advocated by different thinkers from different perspectives. Some popular views about Good life are discussed here. These includes both Indian and Western thinker’s views. Moreover, some related concepts of good life such as culture, value, different kinds of goods are also discussed here.

In the 3\textsuperscript{rd} chapter ‘Concept of Good life in the philosophy of Aristotle’, Aristotle’s view is discussed in details as found in his ‘Nicomachean Ethics’ and other sources. Here good life is discussed from the Greek standpoint by indicating the similarities and differences between Plato and Aristotle. According to him, good life is the happy life, the virtuous life, the contemplative life. It is the activity of the soul in accordance with virtue. Morality is meaningless without society- it is also reflected in this chapter. For happiness, other things such as good birth, good health, good luck, and good friends, money are also necessary. So, these are also discussed in Aristotle’s good life.

In the 4\textsuperscript{th} Chapter, “Mill’s concept of good life”, the author presents Mill’s views on good life from utilitarian standpoint. Mill tries to defend Bentham’s utilitarianism. For him, general happiness for all is the ultimate end of human life. Good life, for him is the happiest, the contented life which prefers intellectual pleasure rather than sensual pleasure. He gives emphasis on social obligation to lead a good life and feeling of humanity is another aspect of Mill’s good life.

The 5th chapter, ‘Radhakrishnan’s concept of good life’ contains the views of Radhakrishnan regarding the good life which are implicit in his idealistic ethics. He
explains his views by assimilating the perspectives of the East and West with universal outlook. For him, good life is the spiritual self-realization which can be attained through the spiritual freedom of humanity as a whole and which is based on truth, love and virtue. This chapter also explains Hindus view of life which is the source of Radhakrishnan’s integral ethics.

The last chapter ‘Comparison and conclusion’, contains the similarity and differences regarding the problem in the views of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan. Importance of good life is also presented in this chapter and finally a tentative conclusion is drawn based on the author’s observation.

To evaluate the consistent nature of the good life in the views of Aristotle, Mill and Radhakrishnan and to indicate the commoner elements and differences in their views has been the ultimate end of the present study. With an impartial outlook the author has made an effort to compare and correlate their views on good life in the ethico-social context. The foregoing discussion on the problem reveals that the concept of good life is inherent in the moral philosophy of these thinkers. But the author tries to reconstruct a comprehensive relationship between the various components of good life already existing and to draw a holistic framework of good life. Under the changing conditions in the societies past and present, how good life moulds and these modifications have been absorbed by the societies that query needs to be addressed.

REFERENCES:
