CHAPTER I
THE GOOD IN DIFFERENT TRADITIONS
The Chamber's 20th Century dictionary defines the term 'good man' as the one who has suitable qualities; promoting health, welfare, or happiness, virtuous, kind, benevolent, well behaved, not troublesome, thorough, competent, sufficient, valid, sound, servicable, beneficient, genuine, pleasing, favourable, ample, moderately estimated, considerable, and so on. The Reader Digest's Universal dictionary also defines the term 'good man' as having positive or desirable qualities, not bad or poor, virtuous, morally admirable, upright, benevolent, cheerful, kind, well behaved, obedience, etc.

The above explanation clearly indicates that the term 'good man' refers to the one who strives for general good rather than personal good. A good man is also necessarily a virtuous, righteous and a moral person of the particular society to which he belongs. He must be good not only at heart but also in action. A person cannot be considered as a good man if he is good only in one particular walk of life. For instance, a person may be generous and benevolent but if he is not honest in his earning; his generosity alone cannot qualify him to be a good man. Because a good man must possesses all good virtues and work accordingly.

Turning to the concept of the 'ideal man' we find that the Webster's Ninth New Collegiate dictionary defines the term 'ideal or ideal man' as 1. a standard of perfection, beauty or excellence; 2. one regarded as exemplifying an ideal and often taken as a model for
imitation, 3. an ultimate object or aim of endeavours; goal; etc.
The Reader Digest's Universal dictionary also defines the term, 'ideal or ideal man' as 1. a conception of something in its absolute perfection; 2. one regarded as a standard or model of perfection; 3. an ultimate object of endeavour, a goal; 4. a worthy principle or aim; 5. considered the best of its kind and so on.

The definition of an ideal man given in the dictionary makes it clear that an ideal man is the one who has already achieved the ultimate goal prescribed in a particular society which he belongs to. The ideal man is the exemplified standard of perfection and a model for imitation. The distinction between the concept of good man and the concept of an ideal man is that, the former is in the initial stage or in the process of becoming an ideal man but yet to be fully accomplished. And the latter is the one who has already achieved the feat or the goal of life prescribed by a particular society of which he is a member. Therefore, these two concepts are not interchangeable. However, it may be pointed out here that an ideal man is necessarily a good man but not vice-versa. This shows that there is only one way entailment between the concept of an ideal man and the concept of good man.

In order to understand the concept of good man it is also necessary to explain the concept of an ideal man. Because, as explained, a good man is in the initial stage or is in the process of beco-
ming an ideal man. Therefore, the model or an exemplified standard of perfection achieved by an ideal man is needed for a good man to follow. However, before discussing the concept of an ideal man in different traditions, let us first consider three basic questions about the good man: 1. What is the actual relationship between human existence and the notion of good and evil? 2. Why do we do good? and 3. Why after all we need to be good? We are not however going to define here the concept of good and evil. Our main emphasize would be on the basic nature of man in relation to good and evil. For instance, why do men opt for evil in spite of all restriction given by various religious and moral laws of different societies? Is this something to do with human nature as such? Or because man on his own cannot realize the meaning of life. This is why we need to highlight these basic human problems prior to having any discussion on general conception of the good man and the ideal man.

We hardly raise the question; 'what is the meaning of life' due to our pre-occupation with mundane things. But there come occasions or situations in life when this question comes to the forefront of our consciousness. If we lose a dear one, one's only promising child or one's partner in life, we ask what the meaning of life is? If one faces terrible deprivations and frustration for years together in grinding labour to build up one's business or profession and then when reaching its zenith, one finds to one's dismay that he suffer from cancer, he writhes in agony and asks himself: 'Is life meaning-
less striving? Were my tears and toils to end in smoke? Are life and suffering identical?", and so on and so forth. There are also natural calamities like fire, floods, tempest, volcanoes and earthquakes which destroy lives and properties. Man is thus faced with the challenge of evil within himself and outside of him. To overcome this inside and outside challenge of evil most of us would therefore take shelter in theistic religions and pursue good either for fear of punishment or wanting reward from God (i.e. to liberate his soul). Thus most of us do good to others by expecting something in return if not on earth then in heaven. However, there are also some disinterested persons (e.g. Humanist philanthropists) who work for the good of others just for the sake of good and without expecting anything in return. Again there are some materialists who hold the view that the meaning of life is to eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we may die. These kind of conflicting and complicated human situations lead to different views on human nature vis-a-vis the notion of good and evil.

For instance, the Sophists are of the view that man by nature is rapacious, lustful, domineering and destructive of social life. But he finds that he can have maximum satisfaction of his evil nature by accepting some restrictions on them. Goodness is therefore, a necessary evil for man. However, Socrates exposed the falsity of Sophists' interpretation of human nature. He builds philosophy to show that there is goodness at the heart of man, his society and the universe.
Socrates tells his contemporaries, the Sophists, that they are right in the picture they have drawn of man, that is, man is sensuous, sexual, rapacious and aggressive. But this is not the complete picture of man and hence the conclusion drawn by them are false. Socrates brings out his point by drawing distinction between a craftsman and his tools. A craftsman is user of his tools for his ends. As the name of the user of knife and awl is shoemaker, the name of the user of saw and hammer is a carpenter, so the name of the body is soul. What is primary in my personality is my soul. After establishing that to know ourselves is to know the psyche(soul), and not the body, Socrates goes on to say that if we want to know what the psyche is, we must look particularly at the part of it in which its virtue resides, and adds at once that this virtue is wisdom, i.e. knowledge of good or values and how to practice them. According to him, all goods are definable by reference to the good of the soul. All virtues are virtues when they cater to the good of the soul. All men desire and seek what is of benefit to them. If one has knowledge that virtue benefit one's soul, then he desires virtuous conduct, for he cannot choose what he knows, would harm his soul.

Whereas Socrates traces all evil conduct to our ignorance of nature of virtues and the welfare of the soul, Gautama Buddha traces it to the ignorance of the nature of man's own reality. This
ignorance according to Buddha breeds evil in man. The illusory consciousness of 'I', that is delusion of the ego, is pivotal to our evil life. The real cause of evil in man is ignorant craving (trshna). Our craving arises out of fallacious belief in 'I'. Ignorance is the main cause out of which false desires spring. Ignorance and false desires are the theoretical and practical sides of human existence.

According to Buddha if we are delivered of this mythical consciousness and love of 'I', 'Me' or 'Mine', we will be delivered of craving (trshna), attachment (Moha), error (maya), pride (Ahankara), jealousy (Ersha) and we will be ushered into relationship with the living world with feeling of compassion and love, friendship and joy in the progress and prosperity of all.

Regarding this point Spinoza is of the opinion that the level of knowledge determine the level of perpetual knowledge which is at par with animal consciousness. At this level there is no understanding of interconnection of things. Our ideas are piecemeal, isolated, unconnected and unsystematized. We are affected by environments about and around us. Some of the conditions satisfy our preservative needs. We experience pleasure in them and start loving them. Some of the conditions frustrate our needs of self-preservation and we start to hate them. Our loves and hates are passive emotion because they are caused by external stimuli. We are not active in this respond. We have no knowledge of how we are affected by outer conditions. At
the ordinary level, I say that when we eat sweets I experience a stomach ache. But I don't know how this happens. The two things, sweet and stomach ache are associated for me but not intelligibly connected for me. For a doctor the two things are not just associated. He knows their inter-connectedness. He knows the nature of the chemical relation between the sweet and the stomach ache. The same thing is true about what is good or bad, right or wrong.

Thus, at the rational level, man knows what he is and what is his place in nature. He understands the universe as an inter-related casual system, of which he is a part. He understands what happens to him and therefore, knows how to behave in relation to it. He understands that the things we desire, hate, result of accidental associations and social conditioning. Our running after money, position, power are matters of social conditioning. If we reflect on this truth, we rise above social conditioning, we rise from the unreflective stage to reflective stage. We realise that true life is the life of reason, i.e. of understanding oneself and the universe. When we are enlightened about the inevitability of the laws of things, we do not experience anger or hatred. Thus according to him rational understanding delivers us of irrational fears, envies, hates and loves, on one hand and make us seek adjustment with society and universe on the other hand. This is the life of freedom from evil.
Thus, Socrates, Buddha, and Spinoza hold that ignorance is the cause of evil in us and we can be delivered by knowledge of good, or the true nature of our existence in the context of the totality of the universe. Socrates believes that the pursuit of philosophy or wisdom will deliver us of evil conduct. Buddha holds that deep meditation in which we repeatedly engage ourselves in reflective analysis of our person and law of change, can deliver us of the delusion of the ego and hence of evil tendencies in us. According to Spinoza rational reflection on ourselves in the inter-connected casual system of the infinite universe can free us from our bondage of evil life. However all three believe that ignorance feeds our passions and knowledge can expose and scorch them. Thus, their vision of a good life is to uphold certain virtues. While Socrates regards temperance, courage, justice and wisdom to be the cardinal virtues, Buddha regards compassion (karuna), universal friendliness (Metta), blissfulness (Mudita) and equanimity (Upekha) to be the cardinal virtues. Spinoza gives the highest place to the intellectual virtue of understanding and love of the total universe as a system, a casually connected whole.

It is clear that there are two elements in human nature, namely, the good and the evil. Basically, man is ignorant or unconscious of the truth that soul is the most essential part of the human personality. Because of the lack of realisation in depth of this truth,
man, in action, identifies himself with his body. He in fact knows himself to be the bodily self. No wonder he gives himself to the satisfaction of his bodily appetites and lusts and thus indulges in evil practices is a liability and a loss. But man as an ignorant considers the worldly gains, to be the supreme test for observing the soul values of truth and goodness. Now honesty is a precious value of the soul, but man in his blindness rejects honesty in his conduct if it does not help him in his worldly enterprises and takes to dishonest dealing. If he finds that truth speaking is a hinderance in his worldly ambitions, he gives it up and takes untruthfulness in his conduct. The bodily pleasures and pride together deprive man of his source of salvation from evil in him. Man is too much in love with the pleasures in his biological urges. He is so much occupied in the satisfaction of the bodily needs that he has no time and energy left for getting knowledge of the true nature of his soul and its welfare. These bodily satisfactions not only leave no time for him to pursue the knowledge of the soul but they stand in his way of getting the knowledge of the soul. They pervert his vision. He comes to believe that the knowledge of the external world is of immense value, and the knowledge of his soul is of not much consequence.

Man thus, blinded by false ambition or greed of material gain, status, power and bodily pleasures completely misled opts for evil. Nevertheless, man is not just a beast of prey, rapacious and lust-
ful and aggressive. He has in him some capacity for good life and hence goodness is not foreign to him.

Man has unlimited freedom of choice which enables him to do either good or bad. It is given to man to project ideals of life and strive to fashion his life in the pursuit of them. This has been possible for him because his life has certain characteristics or excellences.

There is no doubt that, man shares with animals in instinct of food, sex and bodily comforts, whereas animal has no say in the determination of its life by these instincts, man evaluates them. Man can choose to change from his past life. This is due to the fact that he can stand outside his life, review it as a film. It means that he is not identical with his life. He is a subject who can review his life as an object, like other objects and choose to stay it in or modify it or cancel it. Man's capacity to learn is also matched by his unlimited freedom to make choice as he always stands at the cross roads of life. Man's freedom of choice is though unlimited, his strength to carry out his choice is limited. His bodily passions, his past life, his social environments, and his biological, mental, moral and spiritual limits are so many obstacles in his way to fulfil his decisions. However, even when weaknesses and limitations defeat his decisions, it does not touch the fact of his unlimited freedom of choice or decision. We, as finite beings fall short of the ideal, the ideal we choose
to realise in life. There are natural, social and individual limitations that obstruct the full realisation of it. Thus only few exceptional individuals could realise their goal of life.

The characteristic of human life is that human consciousness is directed to the future. It transcends the actual and strives for what it lacks. It reaches for what is not. Human consciousness refuses to be frozen into a thing, complete massive and solid. It never feels complete, it is always conscious of what it is to do or be. A man's story is never complete till he is dead. It is ever expanding search for what is not. Man is, therefore, condemned to be unhappy, because the consciousness of what it lacks and has still to attain or obtain, spoils his cup of happiness. He journeys with future possibilities to the end of his life.

Lastly, the excellence of human life is that it can draw distinction between good and bad, right and wrong, means and ends and act at this level of distinction. Animal behaviour is determined by fear and temptation. Fear and temptation are motives in man too, and it is a tragedy that religion has exploited these motives for good conduct. Certain religions would have done credit to itself and man if it has not cultivated infant morality of fear and temptation and taught man to do the right because it is right and avoid the wrong because it is wrong. However, there are men who are honest and do good to others because they consider honesty and doing good to others
to be the right type of relationship between human beings and for no other reason. These men believe in no God, no heaven and hell, no life after death. They are too high-minded to be concerned with public approval or disapproval. Their vision of beauty or honesty and doing good to others is so lovable to them that they live for it. Their exemplary life is not based on either fear of punishment or expecting something good in return.

It is in virtue of these excellences in man that he is able to frame ideals of life and strive to adopt his life to them. Philosophy and religion have both drawn concepts of good man and ideal man. Here I wish to limit myself to the study of the ideal of the good man in four religious traditions, namely, Hinduism (Bhagavad Gita), Buddhism (Mahayana), Confucianism and the Liangmai (Zeliangrong) Naga tradition.

The Bhagavad Gita offers a very satisfactory answer to the problem of evil in human conduct. According to Gita, man comes in contact with things and persons through his senses. In some cases this contact affords pleasure to the individual. He desires them and wants to possess them and develops attachment for these pleasure-affording things and persons. In other cases this contact gives him pain. He feels angry and annoyed and develops aversion for things and persons that cause pain to him. In this way, man develops attachment
for things and persons through his love and aversion for them. We are attached not only to things of pleasure but also to things of pain. The idea of the person whom I hate dominates my consciousness as much as that of the person whom I love. Our loves and hates are born and developed under the principle of pleasure and pain and constitute human bondage. When one is in bondage to love and hate, he loses his reason or sense of right or wrong and with the destruction of reason, he is totally destroyed (Gita: II:62-63).

If man is to rise above his bondage, he must take to niskama karma. To do niskama karma is to act without any desire for gaining worldly rewards, or freedom from birth or even moksa. Niskama karma is action done for the sake of its rightness, without thought of consequences here and hereafter. When a person rises above his desires (vasanas), his reason in him is able to show him duties or dharma in relation to profession (varna) and role (ashrama) and to mankind. If he performs his duties in the three-fold roles, without desire for fruits or any gain in life, here and hereafter he is a good man who is in the process of becoming an ideal man. Gita calls its ideal man 'Sthitaprajna'. Sthita means steady and prajna means reason. Sthitaprajna is steady in his reason and has a clear rational perception that rightness of an action is not determined by its happy or unhappy consequences. For instance, my honesty and truthfulness may cost me my job. But my honesty and truthfulness does not cease to be honesty and truthfulness even when the consequences, by all standards,
are miserable and undesirable. On the other hand, my honesty and truthfulness may help me in promotion in my job. Thus, if the rightness of honesty and truthfulness were to be determined by its consequences, then it is good for one, bad for the other; good in one transaction of life and bad in another transaction of life. It is both good and bad, which is an absurd position.

In ethics, there are two fundamental notions, 'good and right'. Most philosophers regard good as fundamental and regard right as a means to it. They offer ideals of life as happiness, evolution or self-perfection. For them right is what is conducive to the ideal of life. There are other philosophers who hold right to be the fundamental notion and claim that though conducts at times bring about good consequences, yet right has a nature of its own and is not definable in terms of good. These philosophers speak of moral laws and not moral ideals. Gita's Sthitaprajña holds right to be the fundamental notion and aims at rightness and regards fruits of an act as secondary or of small consequence. For it the concept of rightness rises above the distinction of selfish or unselfish considerations. An unselfish action can be wrong or hellish. Since this is the attitude of the Sthitaprajña to consequences, he is neither overjoyed when the right action brings about happy consequences nor depressed with sorrow when calamities follow the discharge of right action. He feels no exaltation or aversion about the agreeable or disagreeable conse-
quences that befall him. He is uninfluenced by praise and blame, because he concentrates on the rightness of the action and the rightness of action is self-satisfying and self-sufficient for him. The agreeable and disagreeable consequences do not disturb the equanimity of his mind.

The Jñānāprajña knows that the longing for asakti, for fruits or consequences deviates the mind into evil actions. When we love to gain things, however unselfish they may be, we are led into wrong actions. So long we have asakti or longing for consequences, the world is divided for us into friends and foes, since some are helpful for us to secure success and some others are hindrances to us. But there is no gain or loss for us if our only interest is righteousness. When one is above attachment or asakti to fruits of action, there is no friend or foe for him. There is no jealousy for he seeks neither possessions nor positions, neither praise nor power. He is all forgiving and merciful. He is a Sthitaprajña. As a Sthitaprajña he is in a state of perfect tranquility for the conditions that distract the tranquility — vasanas; the egoistic loves, asakti for pleasurable consequences are not in him. As Sthitaprajña, he is in a state or attitude of mind to wish and do good to others, for the things that stand in his way of wishing and doing good to others. The Asakti for pleasurable consequences and egoistic loves are absent in him.
Gita's concept of an ideal man is admirable for its insistence on doing the right action, regardless of consequences for self and others, here and hereafter. It holds rightness as primary and it saves one from descending into untruth and evil means in life. It inspires man to accept the most calamitous consequences in an equitable frame of mind, in steadfast dedication to what is right. It calls upon man to rise higher to fear, anger and joy in the discharge of duties. It helps one to remain undisturbed and equitable and steady in his perception of what is right.

In Buddhism we have two concepts of the ideal man. There is the concept of Arhat of Hinayana school of Buddhism. Arhat is like that of Sthitaprajna of Gita, free from all vasanas of body and egoistic loves. He is indifferent to the things of the world. For him a lump of earth and a piece of gold signify the same thing. Either of them has no attraction for him. He is pure in heart. His entire concern is to attain purity and nirvana. He is sinless and spotless in character. He is in a state of nirvana. He stays alone and benefits others indirectly through his example of life.

Mahayana school of Buddhism holds a different concept of the ideal man. According to it, a good person, called the Buddhisattva, is one whose chief aim is to help others to attain nirvana. The word, Buddhisattva, means whose essence is knowledge. In a technical sense it is used for a being who is in the process of obtaining but has not yet obtained Buddhahood or the ideal man. Buddha, before he was
born as Gautama so claims the Mahayana, was Buddhisattva. He attained this position by virtue of a vow he had taken to obtain enlightenment and became Buddha; and from then went on to various rebirths, and in each of which he did his utmost to help the suffering creatures. Thus the ideal of Buddhisattva is not self-centred, but other-centred. A Buddhisattva is entirely a man of compassion. He feels intensely for the sad state of his fellow human beings and is dedicated to deliver them into the state of nirvana. He desires to get nirvana himself in order to help others to get nirvana. He is in love with others and serves them with all his heart. He is not afraid, unlike Arhat, to endanger his nirvana state for the sake of others.

There are three levels distinguished in Buddhism at which we may develop feelings to do good to others. At the first level, a person does good to others to gain for himself some worldly advantages like for example, a rich man who builds charitable hospitals, which are better run than government hospitals. He thinks such charity accrues to his credit and brings a name to his family and gets the blessing of God for happiness, here and hereafter. At the second level, a person serves others, like the orphans, the lepers and the desesed, the lonely and the lost; for such love and service of the helpless earns them spiritual excellence to attain liberation or salvation. It brings peace here and hereafter. At both these levels the
persons seek advantages for themselves. The worldly man seeks worldly good. The religious man seeks spiritual excellence. But both seek some good for themselves. This is central to them. The good they do to others is a means to their own good. Both treat humanity as a means to their own good. There is a third level. A person does serve others out of the love for them. The others are not a means to his good. They are valuable in themselves. They are ends in themselves. They are so valuable in themselves that it is the delight of his soul to serve them to the point of his own extinction. It is love of moth for the light in which it finds it worthwhile to get consumed. It is like the love of the mother for the child. Her child is the centre and focus of her life and it revolves round her child. She wants to love and serve the child even if it means risk to her own life. She is prepared to barter her whole life for the child. It is cynical to think that a mother loves the child for what the child can mean to her when he grows up. If this was mother's love, she would not love and serve a permanently invalid child. Thus, when one makes a real sacrifice and serves for nothing in return he sacrifices even his highest good for others. There is no account of credit and debt. There is no calculation. There is uninhabited flow of love and service of others which bring nothing in return may even result in misery and denial of highest good for oneself. These are the three levels of service which Buddhism distin-
uishes and a **Buddhisattva** is one who lives at the third highest level of conduct open to man. He cultivates all the virtues of **nirvana** for the good of others.

Buddhism holds that one can attain **nirvana** in one's lifetime by getting freedom from **vasanas** and egoistic loves and after death, if he chooses, he can enter the state of complete **nirvana**. The state of complete **nirvana**, is a state of complete illumination and **ananda**. When one enters the state of complete **nirvana**, there is no rebirth. One is delivered for all times from the tragedy of rebirth and suffering. A **Buddhisattva** holds that the highest good is complete **nirvana** and the greatest tragedy is rebirth in the vale of suffering. Yet after he has attained **nirvana**, he refuses to enter the state of highest good, the state of complete **nirvana**. He cannot bear the idea that he should attain to complete **nirvana** while his fellow human beings are in bondage. It is intolerable to him to accept the highest good for himself when other living beings are in pain and suffering. He feels that he should not enter into the state of complete **nirvana**, as he had already vowed to himself to fellowship with the suffering creatures on earth. He therefore accepts with joy the crucifixion of unending rebirths till the humblest living creature is helped by him to attain **nirvana**. He is the last to get into the train of destiny to complete **nirvana**. He knows fully well that he gains nothing for this service, for he is already entitled to complete **nirvana** for asking of it. Here, we have conception of disinte-
rested altruism at its highest peak point. There can be no more dynamic altruism than the altruism of a Buddhisattva.¹

The concept of Buddhisattva is the concept of a martyr in the service of the living creatures. It is a most admirable concept when we realise that the Buddhisattva does not aim to relieve others of their physical suffering only, he perceives that fellow human beings are attached to sense pleasures, enslaved by egoism, pride, false opinion, lust, hate, craving and evil imagination. They do not love virtue and duty, they are ungrateful to their parents and spiritual teachers. They are addicted to violence, strife, falsehood and cunning. This perception of evil in fellow human beings moves the Buddhisattva to discipline himself for nirvana so as to free others of their evil character. His goal of life is therefore, to attain supreme and perfect enlightenment, promote the good of all beings and establish them in the final and complete nirvana and Buddha knowledge. To do this service, the Buddhisattva has to develop in himself virtues of charity, purity from passions, lust and sense desires (ragas); hatred and ill-will (dvesa), forbearance and patience (ksanti), energy, for in the pursuit of good (virya), rapt and musing (dhyana) and knowledge of supreme good or supreme truth (prajna). Thus, the ideal of Buddhisattva is that of the parvasta or turning over of ethical merit to the advantage of others.

¹ The Philosophy of Religion page, 257. by, S.P. Kanal.
The concept of an ideal man is known as Chun-tzu in Confucianism. The Confucian philosophy rests on the obvious truth that man by nature is good and the business of religion and education is to develop or mature man's goodness. Confucius (551-479 B.C.)'s disciple Mencius (372-289 B.C.) offers the following argument in support of the view that man by nature is good. For instance, when a child is seen running towards a cliff and a man rushes to save the child, the man will not save the child because he is his son or grandson. His conduct is above selfishness. He will not save the child to get praise or reward. He will not save the child to escape censor by others. His conduct is above the motivation of reward or punishment, social approval or disapproval. The reason is that he has no time to think of these possibilities. He acts at the spur of the moment in absolute spontaneity with no thought of the here and the here after. The action is too immediate to allow him to think about praise or blame and reveals the feeling of humanity in man. It is the feeling of humanity that is to be matured by religion and education. When this feeling of humanity matures, it becomes love of humanity. Love seeks its object and not anything else. A greedy man seeks money, not praise in life. A lover seeks his beloved and not heaven. When a man comes to humanity, he seeks nothing except opportunities to serve mankind. His love of humanity is the highest thing in him. He, therefore, hates selfishness which he considers injurious to his love of humanity. His love of human-
ity is so overwhelming that he is happy to sacrifice himself for it.

If an ideal man is to make his love for humanity fruitful, he must develop insight into the nature of fellow human beings whom he wishes to serve. He can satisfy his love for them if he understands their nature and not by imposing his nature on them. Human nature is good. It is the good that an ideal man discovers in his people and provides conditions to mature it. There is no chance for an ideal man to develop vanity for as a lover of humanity, he knows humanity to be good like him, only needing some guidance and inspiration from him. He helps fellow human beings to awaken them to their goodness. Love of humanity coupled with insight into human beings to be served, is the first cardinal virtue of an ideal man, called 'Jen' in Chinese language.

There are other inborn good traits in human nature. Man is sincere by nature. Who can be more sincere than a child? He is spontaneous in his expression to the dismay of his elders. Again there is reciprocity in human relations. If someone does me an unexpected favour, I instinctively feel that I should do some good to my benefactor. It is not only the mother who loves the child, the child responds to love by love. There is spontaneous love in a pair when they choose to be husband and wife.

There is mutuality or reciprocity in different relationships. Confucius provides instructions for maturing reciprocity in
relationships, namely, the relation between child and parents; husband and wife; the elder brother and other brothers; the king and the people; and friend and friend. He gives wise counsel as to how to mature these relationships. He puts special emphasis on filial piety so much so that it developed into a national cult. He thought that if a man matures in his reciprocal relationships in these five spheres, that is, he does his duties and obligations in them, he will automatically behave in a correct way in other relationships. This is the second cardinal virtue of an ideal man consisting in sincere righteous reciprocal relationships called 'yi'.

An ideal man who loves humanity and has feelings in reciprocal relationships also cultivates good manners. An ideal man takes, with all seriousness, to the study and training in the etiquette of the people with whom he is in contact, to avoid misunderstandings to crop up between him and others whom he loves to serve. His manners have the grace of royalty and a soul of a humanist. Further, an ideal person is a father or a mother, a husband or a wife, an officer or a subordinate, a ruler or a ruled. Each role or office has certain great responsibilities attached to it. An ideal person tries to be an ideal father or an ideal mother; an ideal husband or an ideal wife; an ideal brother; an ideal officer or an ideal ruler. Every role and office has etiquette and standard of life attached to it. The study and observance of the style of life related
to one's role is a necessary equipment for an ideal man. This is called rectitude of names. One must be true to one's name. If a woman is a wife, she should be true to her role as a wife otherwise she is false to her name or unnatural in her behaviour. This third cardinal virtue of good manners and rectitude of names in an ideal man is called 'Li' in Chinese.

The fourth virtue of an ideal man is wisdom or 'chih'. Wisdom is perception of what is the right and spontaneous expression of it in one's conduct. When one achieves love of humanity (Jen), develops reciprocity in inter-relationship (Yi) and observes etiquette in conduct (Li), in full measures and responds on each occasion, social and private, with perfect spontaneity, he has achieved the virtue of wisdom (chih). The wise man is much concerned with preserving his virtue as an inferior man is concerned to preserve his possession. The wise man is ever anxious to know what is right as the inferior man is ever anxious to know what is profitable for him.

To summarise and supplement Confucian philosophy in the words of his great disciple Mencius, man by nature is good. The virtue of Jen (love for humanity), together with the virtue of Yi (righteousness), Li (decorum), and chih (wisdom) arise from inner seeds of the feelings of compassion, shame, modesty and the intuitive sense of genuineness and artificiality. Such seed feelings are as universal and come as naturally to man as taste of food, hearing of
music or sight of beauty. A human being is good if he is guided by these innate feelings. An important function of education and self-culture is to love one's original child-heart so that the four seeds become four flowering virtues.

The Confucian concept of an ideal man is beautiful. It is free from the speculative metaphysics of God and soul. It is optimistic and uplifting in character. According to critics Confucianism does not satisfactorily account for evil in human conduct. Confucius claims that man does evil because of bad education or bad environment. But bad environments and bad education can deviate us into evil conduct if only if we have potentiality of evil life, so say the critics. Confucius' view that a man becomes evil when he does not know his good nature or he tries to be good beyond his strength or under-cultivates his goodness, or tries to modify his good nature appears not to have satisfied them.

Any account of human well-being must rest on some concept of what is important or of value in human life. A good man must think that his own well-being lies in the attainment of those goals which are important to him. For some, what matters may be material success — wealth, power, the continued ability to enjoy what they bring; but for a good man what matters is that he acts rightly — that he lives his life in the service of the good. His criteria of well-being can be specified only by reference to his moral or religious values. A good man will think he is harmed only when
in so far as he is prevented from pursuing those goals and activities which are fundamental and important to him. Thus the man committed to a moral life will count as harmful anything which does not interfere with that. As long as he 'wills the good' poverty, disease, persecution and even death will not harm him, since they will not touch that which is of significance in his life. His entire life depends on the importance of acting honourable and justly. Nothing else matters. And this is to bear the affliction that life brings patiently, that is, not to desist from acting decently even under pressure or misfortune. A man who has such an attitude to life sees that as long as afflictions do not thus deflect him, they do not harm him — not in relation to what he regards as really important in life. A good man identifies himself with his family, his country, his fellow beings or with any group of which he is a member so that his moral well-being is bound up with theirs. He will not just work for their well-being and care about their successes and failures, but he will regard these successes and failures as his own. The destruction of his family, his country, his fellow beings would be considered as his own destruction, the suffering or disgrace of its members would be his suffering or disgrace.

As I have already pointed out, different philosophers give different views on the notion of good and evil in human nature. For instance, the Sophists are of the view that by nature human beings
are evil but Confucius gives a diametrically opposite view that human beings are good by nature. However, for Socrates, the human nature is a combination of both good and evil. The Liangmai Nagas although rejected Sophists view on human nature they agreed with both Confucius and Socrates view on human nature to certain extent. According to the Liangmai Nagas, though human beings are basically good in nature they pave a way for evil by themselves due to their misuse of their freedom of choice and stray from the path of righteousness. Evil thus creeps in human nature in the disguised form of greed, vanity, selfishness and many other irresponsible actions. Consequently, evil has germinated and firmly rooted in human nature so much so that it has become a part of human nature. The tribe thus believes that the presence of evil in human nature destroy the peace of mind and affects the size, height and even the life span of mankind and reduces it to this present status. The evil presence in human nature could be easily overcome if man is willing to eschew his greed, selfishness, vanity and many other similar vices and start working for the welfare of other fellow beings. The Liangmai Nagas' concept of good man thus revolves round this belief. For them a good man is one who follows all the maxims which in a nutshell consist in working for the general welfare of the whole community. A good man is one who fights against the evil force which are detrimental to the peaceful co-existence of the society.
In the Liangmai Naga tradition, a good man is known as 'mai-wi-mai', and an ideal man is known as 'Liangtuang'. These two concepts are not interchangeable. It may be, however, noted here that a Liangtuang must be necessarily a good man but not vice versa. According to them to be a good man or mai-wi-mai, one must possess all good qualities or virtues like, love for peace (manai agyibo tu masenbo), truthfulness (majiboga chapbo), sincerity (inchangbo), kind-hearted (lungsa sibo), faithfulness (matunbo), generous (inmahbo), benevolence (wa sibo), Trustworthy (malum khai suibo), helpful (inkhasibo), courageous (hubo), and many other similar virtues. In other word, mai-wi-mai or a good man must be pious, righteous and moral person who never hesitate to sacrifice his own happiness for the welfare of others. Basically, the concept of good man or mai-wi-mai also refers to an aspirant for the feat of Liangtuang or an ideal man but in the initial stage. The concept of Liangtuang on the other hand is a model or an exemplified standard of perfection for a good man to imitate or to follow if he so wishes. It may be, however, pointed out here that every good man or mai-wi-mai may not be able to achieve the feat of Liangtuang even if they wish. Because in order to achieve the feat of Liangtuang one must not only possess all the virtues of good man mentioned above but also it is necessary for a person to be physically and mentally fit for the task. He must possess not only strong determination or will power but must be also
an expert on martial arts or a good warrior who is physically and
mentally capable of facing any situations and challenges. Thus on-
ly a few good men or *mai-vi-mai* would be able to achieve the feat
of *Liangtuang* or an ideal man for the above reason.

The concept of *mai-vi-mai* or a good man plays a pivotal ro-
le in the Liangmai Naga society, without it peaceful co-existence
is impossible in the society. The Liangmai Nagas therefore, ask each
and every individual to be righteous and live a good life. The con-
cept of *mai-vi-mai* man does not necessarily strive for the the Li-
angtuang. In other words, it is not necessary for all good men to
achieve the feat of *Liangtuang*. Moreover to achieve the feat of
*Liangtuang* one must possess an extra ordinary quality which many me-
n lack or are devoid of. Thus, it is not necessary for all good men
to become *Liangtuang* but a *Liangtuang* must necessarily be a good
man or *mai-vi-mai*. According to the Liangmai Naga, although it is
not possible for all individuals to become a *Liangtuang* it is pos-
sible for all to be good if they so wish. It is possible, because,
man is good by nature, the notion of goodness in man is inborn
or innate but evil is an external force which enters into human
nature in a disguised form. Therefore, it is not that difficult
for man to retain his good nature or his good old self and discard
evil if one so wishes. Moreover, our purpose of life on earth is

to live a righteous life and maintain peace and harmony among
not only mankind but also with other fellow creatures on earth. However, man loses his paradise on earth because of his foolish and irresponsible actions. He turns his purpose of life upside down and allows evil to control him. If man continues to allow the evil and let it prosper and keep growing it will endanger their very existence on earth. Therefore in order to prevent the menace of evil man must live a righteous life and work for peace and harmony among all living creatures. Thus, if everyone leads a righteous and a good life, there may not be any significance of the concept of Liangtuang or an ideal man. However, unfortunately, because only few could live a righteous and a good life the concept of Liangtuang or an ideal man plays a crucial role in making men aware of their goal of life on earth. Although the concept of mai-wi-mai or good man is fundamental, and without which there cannot be any Liangtuang, the concept of Liangtuang plays the more important role in the society.

The concept of Liangtuang is similar in many ways with that of Sthitaprajna of Gita, the Buddhisattva of Mahayana Buddhism and Chun-tzu of Confucianism. For instance, like Sthitaprajna, Liangtuang also work for what is right without having a thought of consequences here and here after. He holds right to be the fundamental notion and aims at rightness. He is neither overjoyed when the right action brings about happy consequences nor depressed with sorrow.
when calamities follow the discharge of right action. He is not influenced by praise and blame, because he concentrates on the rightness of the action and the right action is self-satisfying and self-sufficient for him. The agreeable and disagreeable consequences do not disturb the equanimity of his mind. Like *Buddhisattva* he is not self-centred, but other-centred. He does not do good to others to gain for himself either some worldly advantages nor to attain liberation or salvation. Like *Chun-tzu*, he also knows humanity to be good like him, only needing some guidance and inspiration from him. He helps fellow human beings to awaken them to their goodness through various means.

To explain the concept of the *Liangtuang* I have discussed the religion of the Liangmai Nagas in the third chapter of my thesis.