CULTURE AND BELIEF

Chapter II

The second chapter elaborates that within a particular culture, the norms and beliefs, said to be commonly shared, are in effect differently perceived and justified. Beliefs do play a role in creating a socio-cultural reality, whether they have any cognitive function is a matter of dispute and it is also argued that beliefs and tradition are justification which are otherwise significant for human life. The content of tradition expressed in the works of literature and art are facts of a given culture which has progressively emerged as something upon which a community is build. Belief is a very common word; everyone is familiar with it and uses it very casually without knowing exactly what it means. Here an attempt is made to understand the term belief specially its cognitive and non cognitive aspects.

Etymology and Historical Development of 'Belief'

The word belief has travelled across time and got adapted accordingly. On line Etymology Dictionary tells that belief C. 1175 replaced O.E geleafa from W.Gmc. galaubon ( cf o.s gilobo, M.Du gelove O.H.G giloubo Ger. glaube) from galaub “dear esteemed “ The prefix was altered on analogy of the verb. The distinction of the final consonant from that of believe developed 15 c. Belief used to mean “ trust in God “, while faith meant “loyalty to a person based on promise or duty”(a sense preserved in keep one’s faith, in good [or bad] faith and in common usage of faithful faithless, which contain no notion of divinity) But faith, as cognate of L. fides, took on the religious sense beginning in 14 c translations, and belief had by 16 c. become limited to “mental acceptance of something as true”, from the religious use in the sense of “things held to be true as a matter of religious doctrines”(C.1225).

Wilfrfed Cantwell Smith explored the relation between ‘belief’ and ‘faith’ historically and across religious traditions. He demonstrates that the Old English words which evolved into the modern ‘believe’ (geleofan, geliefan) meant ‘to belove,’ ‘to hold dear,’ ‘to cherish,’ ‘to regard as life,’ virtually to
love; this is what its German equivalent belieben still means today. Similarly
the adjective lieb is "dear, beloved" (mein lieber freund, "my dear friend"). Die
Liebe is the noun "love", and lieben is the verb to love" (Ich liebe dich, I love
you") Belieben, then, is to treat as lieb, to consider lovely, to like to wish for,
to choose. This root survives in English in the modern-archaic "lief," and
reflect the Latin root libet; 'it pleases,' or libido, 'pleasure' (Smith WC: Belief
and History, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, VA, 1977 pp. 41-6
and Smith 1979, pp.105-27) In Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales, the words
‘accepted by believe’ mean simply accept my loyalty; ‘receive me as one who
 submits himself to you.’ Thus Smith argues that ‘belief in God’ originally
meant ‘a loyal pledging of oneself to God, a decision and commitment to live
one’s life in His service.

Modern English "lief" (dear, beloved) goes back to old English ("Anglo-
Saxon") leof, lieof, of the same meaning, with which there was a cognate and
more or less parallel form lufu, "affection, love". In old English, from leof,
"dear, beloved," was formed the verb geleofan, geelofan, geiiefan,
"to hold
dear, to love, to consider valuable or lovely", this later reduced phonetically to
iiefen, lieven,
with the same meaning. From the other grade came Old High
German giiluben, again with the same meaning. This last has developed into
Modern German giauben, first "to hold dear, to regard as lovely, to attach
oneself to," and now "to have faith in."Along with this is the noun der Glaube :
the act or condition of, if you will endearing; now "faith". In middle English
it was the lighter of the two grades that prevailed with the meaning "to hold
dear, to consider lovely, to value, to love": namely be-leve (n). This gave the
early Modern English "believe" (to cherish”; latter, "to have faith")

Thus the world "belief" does not mean today what it once meant;
a ctually its meaning has acquired altogether different sense. We still regard it
as inter changeable with the word faith and equate it with religious conviction
which, in its turn, relates to certainty. In modern usage however, it implies
uncertainty e.g. suppose that someone asks you ‘does this bus goes to Delhi?'
If you know it does then you will say, “yes” but if you do not know so you’ll
reply, "I believe so” meaning thereby that he should check it from someone
else. So believing is not committing and belief in the sense of faith means conviction. In origin the world belief was related to love and commitment, to the beloved rather than to the notion of holding certain particular opinions. The word “belief” has come to mean “the holding of certain ideas”, and one might interpret it as the intellect’s translation might we not say “reduction” of transcendence into “ostensible terms”, the conceptualization in a particular way of the vision that metaphorically, one has “seen”. Through historical and linguistic analysis, Smith came to the startling conclusion that ‘the idea that believing is religiously important turns out to be a modern idea’, and that the meaning of the English words ‘to believe’ and ‘belief’ have changed dramatically since around 1700 A.D.; leading to misunderstanding of religious traditions, both Christian and others.

**Definition and Nature:**

The Oxford English Dictionary (1989) defines ‘belief’ as:

a) The mental action, condition or habit, of trusting to or confiding in a person or thing: trust, dependence, reliance, confidence, faith.

b) Mental acceptance of a proposition, statement, or fact, as true, on the ground of authority or evidence............

c) The thing believed: the proposition or set of propositions held true..........

This definition indicates that the definition of belief as a proposition held to be true, a definition apparently taken by anthropologists, rests on an older definition of belief as condition of trusting in a person or thing, as ‘faith’. At the same time, while a ‘belief’ is defined as a ‘mental acceptance of a proposition ............ as true.’

MARRIUM WEBSTER’S DICTIONARY & THESAURUS defines belief as

A state or habit of mind in which trust or confidence is placed in some person or thing or conviction of the truth of some statement or mean assent to the truth of something offered for acceptance. BELIEF may or may not imply certitude in the believer.

Belief is the mental state of conviction or assurance towards a proposition without the full intellectual knowledge required to guarantee its
certitude. We say 'I believe this though it may not be true'; we never say 'I know this but it may not be true'. It is the conviction of the truth of a statement. It is the subjective side of judgment. Also it is a state of mind in which confidence is placed in some person or thing. Faith is formed, nourished, sustained and patterned by the tradition and faith also sustains the tradition. Mostly belief formation is involuntary and spontaneous activity, as religious and social belief system develops because of family. One cannot choose to believe. In some cases people do not stop believing things because they do not want to face the reality, particularly about those with which they are emotionally attached. Sartre would call it 'bad faith'. Belief is contrasted with knowledge. It is not knowledge nor related bilaterally with knowledge. We say 'I know therefore I believe' but never 'I believe therefore I know'. Beliefs are not permanent, they are shed as experience advances; actually they are replaced by deeper and more comprehensive beliefs. Nobody is free from beliefs.

Belief is holding of certain ideas and its doctrines; it is equally a deeper and very personal feeling which is sustained by a religious tradition. It is reflected in the life style of a person; the way he is orientated. His way of tackling things, how he looks at things i.e., his whole culture is reflected in his belief system. In that sense it is a subjective quality of the person. Of these two the first version of belief is epistemological and the second is religious, usually named as faith; the first is known as cognitive aspect of belief and the latter is called as non-cognitive aspect of belief.

**Belief: Cognitive Aspect**

In the history of western philosophy Plato is the first person to formulate the criterion of knowledge. According to him, knowledge is justified true belief. Before Plato, no distinction was made between belief and knowledge. Knowledge was considered to be synonymous with belief. But, according to Plato, there is an important distinction between knowledge and belief. From Plato onward this distinction is being upheld. Belief and knowledge, both
these words come to us from Greek or Hellenic tradition. A belief may be justified or unjustified. Whenever a belief becomes justified, it becomes a part of our knowledge. Plato made a distinction between epistemia and doxa. There is a slight difference between opinion and doxa. The term, doxa, actually implies something to which we give our assent. Why someone does gives his assent to some opinion! There may be several reasons for it. As far as culture is concerned, we have considered belief here from two different perspectives. The first one deals with the cognitive aspect. When something becomes a part of our knowledge then how does it help fostering up our culture? The second aspect is non-cognitive. This aspect is either beyond intellect or different from intellect. As far as justification or support for a belief is concerned, it may be either a religious backing or a rational support. The former deals with the evaluative aspect of our life.

Our cognitive beliefs are based on the laws of nature. We acquire knowledge out of nature. We develop science and then technology which helps us to make our life more comfortable, and beautiful. But it only adds to the external form of our culture. The external form of our culture is civilization. Therefore, the set of our cognitive beliefs only add to the external form of our culture, i.e., civilization. But the knowledge which is pure forms the core of our culture. This pure knowledge affects our pattern of thinking, thought-process and attitude.

As a person it is our enrichment and development. What is use of reading mathematics as such! If we read simply mathematics then we can not develop technology and it would appear that is useless to study mathematics. Without mathematics engineering is not possible; hence there is department of mathematics. The number of students is far greater in engineering than mathematics because it is technology which brings about the facilities of life; whereas Mathematics is pure knowledge. Similar is the case with Science. All the departments of Science are theoretical even if they conduct practical. If one does research or becomes scientist then it is different otherwise it is similar to mathematics, i.e., it is pure knowledge. Even then it develops our personality, the person inside us. Since one element of person is intellect;
hence whatever development of intellect is there in multy dimensions, it is the
development of person. Hence the knowledge which is justified true belief is
helpful in developing the culture. E.g. the rationale (mental level) which
human had 10,000 years back is not the same today. What we used to think
about nature has changed a lot. How much troubles may the humans be
facing the human culture can not go 5,000 years back. We can not return
back to nature i.e. can not become creature living in forest, due to our
knowledge. So there is a substantial change in culture which is brought about
by knowledge. That element in culture which brings change is the aspect of
belief which is supported, justified, and true; it is knowledge. This is the

cognitive aspect of culture.

**Hume’s Analysis of Belief**

The relation between Belief and Knowledge has fascinated
philosophers since Plato. The chief concern was the fact that belief is a
weaker version of knowledge, inferior to knowledge. Some refer knowledge
as a species of the genus belief. It was Hume who shifted the attention to the
"nature of belief" itself from the relation between belief and knowledge.
Hume finds the problem of causal inference or necessary connection very
tough. So he began by ‘beating about all the neighbouring fields in the hope
of something useful turning up’.\(^3\) It was here that he introduces the
conceptual analysis of belief. Hume finds that it is the principle of ‘Custom or
Habit’ which makes the relation between cause and effect as necessary.
Custom is the great guide of human life. It makes us expect a repetition of
train of events which have appeared in the past to appear in the future also.

All belief originate from two facts (i) some object present to the
memory or senses, and (ii) a customary conjunction between that and some
other object. “Having found, in many instances that any two kind of objects –
flame and heat, snow and cold have always been conjoined together; if flame
or snow be presented a new to the senses, the mind is carried by custom to
expect heat or cold, and to believe that such a quality does exist, and will
discover itself upon a nearer approach. This belief is the necessary result of placing the mind in such circumstance.  

Hume then sheds views on the abilities of mind. Mind can work only on the stock of ideas present to it through the senses. Yet it has unlimited power of mixing, separating, uniting and dividing these ideas. There may be three attitudes towards an idea. One may believe or disbelieve it or may entertain it without believing or disbelieving it. He puts the three under two categories belief and fiction (incredulity). He gives the reason to distinction as emotional factor. He writes "the difference between fiction and belief lies in some sentiment or feeling, which is annexed to the latter not to the former and which depends not on the will, nor can be commanded at pleasure. It must be excited by nature like all other sentiments; and must arise from the particular situation in which the mind is placed at any particular juncture. Whenever any object is presented to the memory or sense it immediately, by the force of custom, carries the imagination to conceive that object which is usually conjoined to it and this conception is attended with a feeling or sentiment different from the loose reveries of the fancy. In this consist the whole nature of belief."  

He then gives a name to this sentiment – Belief. "Belief is the true and proper name of this feeling." He says that it is next to impossible to find a definition of this sentiment. Yet he defines it as: "Belief is nothing but a more vivid, lively, forcible, firm, steady conception of an object, than what the imagination alone is ever able to attain," Then he further differentiates belief from fiction. The factor of difference rests, not in the peculiar nature or order of ideas but in the manner of their conception, and in their feeling to the mind. Since what is conceived in both cases is the same. Thus the difference between belief and fiction is a difference of mental attitude and not of the object.  

This force, 'liveliness', 'firmness', comes into existence from being related to or association with a present impress through customary conjunction, i.e.  

*Hume calls entertaining as conceiving the ideas according to the proposition.
past experience of constant conjunction. This belief arises in us independently of our choice, it is involuntary act; one can not help believing. He further explains that belief is “that act of mind which renders realities more present to us than fictions, causes them to weigh more in the thought and gives them a superior influence on the passions and imagination.” Belief is something felt by the mind, which distinguishes the ideas of the judgment from the fictions of the imagination. It gives them more weight and influence, makes them appear of greater importance, enforces them in the Mind, and renders them as the governing principle of our actions. He concludes that the sentiment of belief is nothing but a conception more intense and steady than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination, and that this manner of conception arises from a customary conjunction of the object with something present to the memory or senses.

Price summarizes Hume's theory of belief as follows:-

1. The differences between believing and not believing is a differences in the manner of conceiving an ideas, and not in the content of the idea conceived.
2. We can roughly indicate what this manner of conceiving is, by saying that a believed idea is one which feels strong or forceful or lively or solid.
3. Except in the Special case of madness, the forcefulness or liveliness of the idea arises from its relation to (its associative linkage with) a present impression; the idea gets its liveliness from its relation to something actually perceived (or introspected) at the moment.
4. In sensible or sober or some belief, this associative link between idea and impression arises from past experiences of constant conjunction. The impression A enlivens or strengthens the idea B, because A-like impression and B –like impressions have been constantly conjoined in the past experience of the believer.
5. If or to the extent that, the associative link between idea and impression is of another sort (if it is just association by resemblance or by contiguity), then or to that extent the belief is subnormal or silly or unjustifiable. And a fortiori the belief is subnormal or silly or unjustifiable if the liveliness or
forcefulness of the idea does not arise from its relation to a present impression at all, but merely from purely physiological causes (or as Hume might have added from the effects of hypnotic suggestion).

John Locke’s Analysis of Belief

Although David Hume acknowledges himself to be the pioneer researcher of belief, the seeds of this problem may be traced back to John Locke, who uses belief, assent, opinion and faith interchangeably in his “The Essay Concerning Human Understanding.” He defines belief as the “being which makes us presume things to be true, before we know them to be so.”

Belief is not necessarily true but there is likeliness to be true. Locke writes, "The very notation of the word signifying such a proposition, for which there be arguments or proofs to make it pass, or be received for true." He further defines belief as "the admitting or receiving any proposition for true, upon arguments or proofs that are found to persuade us to receive it as true, without certain knowledge that it is so". It is a probability and not knowledge. So belief is uncertain knowledge, which lacks intuition present in all the parts of knowledge. In knowledge each immediate idea, each step has its visible and certain connection which is absent in belief.

The origin of religious or moral beliefs lies in the superstition of a nurse and/or the authority of an old woman (grandmother) which by length of time and consent of neighbours, grow up to the dignity of principles. Children are like white papers who receive any characters or doctrines to retain and profess. Beliefs are catered to "them as soon as they have any apprehension; and still as they grow up confirmed to them, either by the open profession or tacit consent of all they have to do with; or at least by those of whose wisdom, knowledge, and piety they have an opinion, who never suffer those propositions to be otherwise mentioned but as the basis and foundation on which they build their religion and manners, come, by these means, to have the reputation of unquestionable, self-evident, and innate truths".

We call some principles as innate because we do not remember when we began to hold them. When we reflect on our own minds we cannot find
anything more ancient than these opinions; reason being that they were taught before the memory began to keep a record of their actions, or date the time when any new thing appeared to it. So we conclude that the propositions we find in ourselves are certainly innate, i.e., the impress of God; present with the birth and not taught by anyone else. We believe in such principles and follow them because we are trained so and we have no recollection about the origin of these ideas. Hence we take them to be natural. There is hardly anyone who do not posses some admired propositions which are believed by him as these principles on which his reasoning are based and by which he judges the truth and falsehood, right and wrong. It is difficult to break free from or to challenge the "received opinions of their country or party".13

The belief of divine is inured in all children and young folk by custom which is a greater power than nature. Custom seldom fails in accomplishing its task. Kids bow their minds and submit their understandings to the teachings of custom. In grownup men belief is developed due to "either perplexed in the necessary affairs of life, or hot in the pursuit of pleasures, should not seriously sit down to examine their own tenets; especially when one of their principles is, that principles ought not to be questioned."14 He also cites reasons like "some, wanting skill and leisure, and others the inclination, and some being taught that they ought not to examine, there are few to be found who are not exposed by their ignorance, laziness, education, or precipitancy, to take them upon trust."15 Locke notes that none dares to shake the foundations of all his past thoughts and actions, and bears the shame of having been a long time wholly in mistake and error. Anyone who dares to resist custom is called by the name of whimsical, skeptical, or atheist. So he will be much more afraid to question those beliefs than anyone else.

Locke notes that the "wrong connexion of ideas a great cause of errors. This wrong connexion in our minds of ideas in themselves loose and independent of one another, has such an influence, and is of so great force to set us awry in our actions, as well moral as natural, passions, reasonings, and
notions themselves, that perhaps there is not any one thing that deserves more to be looked after. He groups the connection between ideas into two sets. "Some of our ideas have a natural correspondence and connection one with another: it is the office and excellency of our reason to trace these, and hold them together in that union and correspondence which is founded in their peculiar beings. Another connection of ideas is wholly based on chance or custom. Wholly non-related ideas appear to the mind in such a manner that it is very hard to separate them. They are found segregated such that appearance of one idea in the mind is followed by the appearance of the other. And if they are more than two then the whole gang shows together, as inseparable. This strong combination of ideas is associated by custom and not by nature. The mind makes this connection either voluntarily or by chance; and "hence it comes in different men to be very different, according to their different inclinations, education, interests, &c." 

Reasons for error lie in 'believing without knowledge, nay often upon very slight grounds'. People often stick to their past judgment, and adhere firmly to conclusions formerly made, such stubborn behavior is often the cause of great obstinacy in error and mistake. The fault lies in the fact that people judge their memories and propositions before examining. They never question or examine their own opinions even then everyone holds his opinions with the most firmness. The sorriest part of it is the fact that people who are completely certain and generally the most fierce and firm in their tenets are those who have least examined them. Locke calls this as. Locke concludes that "which thus captivates their reasons, and leads men of sincerity blindfold from common sense, will, when examined, be found to be what we are speaking of: some independent ideas, of no alliance to one another, are, by education, custom, and the constant din of their party, so coupled in their minds, that they always appear there together; and they can no more separate them in their thoughts than if they were but one idea, and they operate as if they were so. This gives sense to jargon, demonstration to absurdities, and consistency to nonsense, and is the foundation of the greatest, I had almost said of all the errors in the world."
Lock names three grounds for belief viz., evidence and reason; revelation; and enthusiasm. Only the first is the proper normative base for justified belief:

(i) Evidence and reason

Evidence covers broadly two types of experiences. First is the conformity of anything with our own knowledge, observation, and experience. Second is the testimony of others, their observation and experience. The testimony of others is to be assured through the following considerations: the number; the integrity; the skill of the witnesses; the design of the author, where it is a testimony out of a book cited; the consistency of the parts, and circumstances of the relation; and the contrary testimonies.

Reason: all the arguments’ pro and con ought to be examined, before we come to a judgment. Probability wanting that intuitive evidence which infallibly determines the understanding and produces certain knowledge, the mind, if it will proceed rationally, ought to examine all the grounds of probability, and see how they make more or less for or against any proposition, before it assents to or dissents from it; and, upon a due balancing the whole, reject or receive it, with a more or less firm assent, proportionally to the preponderancy of the greater grounds of probability on one side or the other. 21

Unquestionable testimony, and our own experience that a thing is for the most part so, produce confidence. For example when our own experience is in agreement with all others who mention it; so the particular instance is attested by many but undoubted witnesses providing our assent a sufficient foundation to raise itself to assurance. Fair testimony, and the nature of the thing indifferent, produce unavoidable assent.

When testimonies contradict common experience, and the reports of history and witnesses clash with the ordinary course of nature, or with one another; there it is, where diligence, attention, and exactness are required, to form a right judgment, and to proportion the assent to the
different evidence and probability of the thing: which rises and falls, according as those two foundations of credibility, viz. common observation in like cases, and particular testimonies in that particular instance, favour or contradict it.

(ii) Revelation:-

'Revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately; which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God.' The bare testimony of divine revelation is the highest certainty. The only kind of propositions that defy the certainty of bare testimony is that which is contrary to common experience and the ordinary course of things. The reason of certainty in bare testimony is that it is the testimony of God himself who never deceives nor is deceived. Hence in it lays an assurance beyond doubt, evidence beyond exception, Locke calls it revelation and our assent to it as faith. Faith determines our minds absolutely and perfectly excludes all wavering, hence leaves no manner of room for doubt or hesitation.

But Locke tells that revelation is not necessarily true, the problem is not on the part of the divine but on the human part. “The proposition taken for a revelation is not such as they know to be true, but taken to be true. For where a proposition is known to be true, revelation is needless: and it is hard to conceive how there can be a revelation to any one of what he knows already. If therefore it be a proposition which they are persuaded, but do not know, to be true, whatever they may call it, it is not seeing, but believing.” Locke further acknowledges that “all their confidence is mere presumption: and this light they are so dazzled with is nothing but an ignis fatuus, that leads them constantly round in this circle; It is a revelation, because they firmly believe it, because it is a revelation.”

(iii) Enthusiasm:-

Enthusiasm is the third ground of assent. Enthusiasm accepts its supposed illumination without search and proof resulting into odd
opinions and extravagant actions. But the love of something extraordinary; the name and fame one gets from being inspired; and becoming above the common and natural ways of knowledge, tempt many men, particularly who are lazy, ignorant, and vanity. It is not easy to give up these easy ways. Enthusiasm ignores reason completely and the persons "see the light infused into their understandings, and cannot be mistaken; it is clear and visible there, like the light of bright sunshine; shows itself, and needs no other proof but its own evidence: they feel the hand of God moving them within, and the impulses of the Spirit, and cannot be mistaken in what they feel. Thus they support themselves, and are sure reasoning hath nothing to do with what they see and feel in themselves: what they have a sensible experience of admits no doubt, needs no probation." Locke comments "This is the way of talking of these men: they are sure, because they are sure: and their persuasions are right, because they are strong in them." 25

John W. Yalton notes that only the first of these three grounds for belief is a proper normative base for justified belief. The second, revelation, is accepted with some qualifications and only for specific types of claims. The third ground for belief is rejected. 26

James Mill’s Analysis of the Phenomena of Belief

In his book "Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind: Chapter XI BELIEF" James Mill considers the several cases of belief under three heads:

1) Belief in events, real existences:
   a) Belief in present events
      (i) Belief in immediate existence present to my senses &
      (ii) Belief in immediate existence not present to my senses or belief in external objects.
   b) Belief in past events and
c   c) Belief in future events.
2) Belief in testimony, and
3) Belief in the truth of propositions.
Analyzing the Belief in external objects, he finds that ‘one of the most remarkable of all cases of belief is wholly resolvable into association’. The idea of sensations inseparably united one with the other, and inseparably united with the idea of our selves as having them alone constitutes belief. In the remarkable case of the association of extension and figure with the sensations of sight, this alone constitutes belief; and in no case can it be shown that anything more is included in it. Whenever the association between the sign and the thing signified is sufficiently strong to become inseparable it results in belief. Memory is in fact a case of belief. Belief is a general word. Memory is one of the species included under it. Memory is the belief of a past existence.

The idea which forms the fundamental part of belief is produced by associations. Ideas and association are necessary parts of belief. The association is so strong that the combination appears necessary and irresistible. Whenever the name belief is applied, there is a case of the indissoluble association of ideas. In very instance of belief, there is indissoluble association of the ideas.

While examining belief in present existence, belief in past existence, and belief in future existences James Mill finds that “in the most simple cases belief consists in sensation alone or ideas alone, in the more complicated cases, in sensation, alone and association, combined, and in no case of belief has any other ingredient been found.”

Belief in events or real existences has two foundations, our own experience and the testimony of others. Belief in past events based upon our own experience is memory and that based upon other men’s experience is belief in testimony; both of them resolved into association. Belief in future events is the inseparable association of like consequents with like antecedents.

In the note xiii he mentions that, “the state of belief is identical with the activity or active disposition of the system, with reference to the thing believed. Now as there are various sources of activity so there are various sources of belief. These are:

- Spontaneous activity or the mere overflow of energy growing out of the nourishment of the system.
• Voluntary action, in the strictest signification, or the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain, under the stimulus of one or other of those states.
• The tendency of an idea to become an Actuality, the degree of which tendency accords with the mental excitement attending the idea.
• The addition of Habit to all the others.

Under every one of these four influences, we are prompted to act, and in the same degree disposed to believe. Not one of the tendencies is any guarantee for the truth of the thing believed; which is a somewhat grave consequence of the theory contended for.”

In note xiv, he concludes “that all cases of belief are simply cases of indissoluble association: that there is no generic distinction, but only a difference in the strength of the association, between a case of belief and a case of mere imagination: that to believe a succession or coexistence between two facts is only to have the ideas of the two facts so strongly and closely associated, that we cannot help having the one idea when we have the other”.

J. Mill shows that the example of belief, when we see extension and figure as well as colour, is referred to the almost invariable and constant conjunction of our visual, tactile and muscular sensations. So that, when we have the sensation of colour, we cannot avoid having the ideas of extension and figure along with it. A.Mair notes that, “there is a certain inner incoherence in this doctrine, as has, indeed, been pointed out by J.S.Mill. The elder Mill in introduction the illustrations here quoted, states that in these cases it is generally admitted that we receive no sensation but that of modification of light. This at once brings the doctrine of indissoluble association into question, because we have here a case (one of many) in which such an association does not lead to belief. For, those who are interested in these matters, and who follow in Mill’s track, do not believe that they see extension and figure, or they declare that they entertain this belief only at times when they are off their guard. There are thus two conflicting attitudes possible with regard to the same fact, and there clearly must be in
at least one of the two cases a determining factor other than association. Association cannot be made the key-word with regard to belief any more than it can with regard to knowledge. It should nevertheless be recognized here that the operation of association has undoubtedly an influence on many beliefs. It appears, however, that association is effective not so much as a factor in setting up the belief as in conserving and supporting it once it is set up.”

**James Stuart Mill’s Analysis of Belief**

As the editor of the book “Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind” J.S. Mill writes that if belief consisted in an indissoluble association, belief itself would be indissoluble. Belief is only an inseparable association it is a matter of habit and accident and not of reason. Assuredly an association, however close, between two ideas, is not a sufficient ground of belief; is not evidence that the corresponding facts are united in external nature.

There are instances in the history of science, even down to the present day, in which something which was once believed to be impossible, and its opposite to be necessary was first seen to be possible next to be true and finally came to be considered as necessarily true, and its opposite (once deemed necessary) as impossible, and even inconceivable; in so much that it is thought by some that what was reputed an impossibility, might have been known to be a necessity.

All belief is either memory or Expectation. Belief is always a case either of memory or of expectation. Under the later are included conditional as well as positive expectation, and the state of mind similar to expectation which affects us in regard to what would have been a subject of expectation, if the conditions of its realization had still been possible.

J.S. Mill concludes that “Belief, as I conceive, is more than an inseparable association, for inseparable association do not always generate belief, nor does belief always require, as one of its conditions, an inseparable association: we can believe that to be true which we are capable of conceiving or representing to ourselves as false, and false that we are capable of representing to ourselves as true. The difference between belief and mere
imagination, is the recognizing something as a reality in nature, and regarding it as a mere thought of our own. This is the difference which presents itself when Memory has to be distinguished from Imagination; and again when Expectation, whether positive or contingent (i.e. whether it be expectation that we shall, or only persuasion that in certain definable circumstances we should, have a certain experience) has to be distinguished from the mere mental conception of that experience.\textsuperscript{29}

**Belief: Non Cognitive Aspect**

Whatever values, higher standards are there like love, respect for life, truth compassion etc.; whatever good is there we believe in them. There is no answer to why people believe in them. Reason being that if one will try to answer it with the help of something else, then he will do a mistake of giving importance to something which is not a value in itself. But moral values are the highest, they have intrinsic value. So there can be no answer. Hence the evaluative reference we have, knowledge of values, search of values, recognition of values, bringing of value in life, all these are directed by intellect; but not in this matter. Because the intellect does not tell what will be the benefit of doing that. What is called as value is a belief, belief in certain values. This belief in certain values is not based on intellect. It is not gained by intellect; it does not direct us to believe in some values which will result in so and so gains. Neither its cause lies in the fact that the nature has told us so i.e. there is some causal relation of nature with it. So values cannot be explained as law of nature either. Hence we cannot claim that the cause of belief is expectance of some gain through it. Actually the belief in value is a basic element of culture. Such belief is not supported by intellect i.e. it is non-rational, it is beyond intellect or it is prior to the intellect. So all the decisions taken by intellect are dependent on it. We can call it absurd or non-intelligent but not incoherent in any situation because it is on its basis that all the intellectual decisions are taken. Our intellectual life runs on its basis. We can compare it with logistic system, axiomatic system. The axioms in an axiomatic system cannot be proved. They are not self-proved. Today it is believed that
they are conventional and we have accepted that they are so. After accepting them we prove other things. Self-proved is old idea. Today it is believed that as such nothing is self-proved; only if it is to be proven then one have to prove it in a system. Today we accept axioms because without these we cannot proceed further.

The same is true about ethical values also. It is after we accept these values that our ethical behaviour begins. It is not in accordance with intellect. Actually moral values mean our belief in certain moral values. Such belief in ethical values is prior to intellect, intellect follows it; this is non-cognitive aspect of belief. Another non-cognitive aspect of belief is that of religion. The non-cognitive aspect of belief becomes the basis of culture. There can be no culture without values. One will never find law of nature as normative. This does not mean that law of nature cannot become basis of law of culture. When one is distanced from nature then he gets either distorted or refined. Opposite of natural is non-natural i.e. either abnormal or cultured. When one goes beyond the nature then only it is to make cultured i.e. to recreate beautifully. So nature is that which created everything; and natural means crude, which is not well organized. Cultured means beautified and well organized; and that which is uncultured is deformed. Going away from nature means either deformed or cultured. But in any circumstances when one becomes cultured then it is not in accordance to the nature. It is different from nature. To not to be in accordance with nature does not mean opposing nature but different from nature. Hence to be normative is not to be natural, not to work under law of nature. Law of nature is e.g. if one is hungry then eating without caring to whom it belongs; this is natural. See animals they doesn't think that it is his home; they enter anywhere, eat anything even if they get beating for it. We human beings do not do so, because we do not behave according to law of nature. E.g. even if we are hungry we will either eat our own food that which we get from somewhere or be hungry; but won't be ready for punishment. It is not due to fear but because of dignity, due to our morals. Hence owing to be human beings our faith in moral values takes us away from law of nature. It establishes us in culture.
Therefore, as a human being we have deep faith in certain ethical values. It takes us away from the laws of nature and helps us establishing ourselves in the culture. Therefore, we evolve as a cultural being. What actually these laws are? Are these natural laws? From where did these laws emerge? Are there laws which are not natural laws? Kant gave a thorough reflection on this problem. According to him there are such moral laws which are parallel to the natural laws. He put forth three dictums and asserted that if you move according to these three dictums then you move according to moral laws otherwise not. In very simple terminology, it can be fairly said that what your wisdom suggests you to be right is actually right and one should do that only. As far as the criterion of universality is concerned, we can formulate thousands of such foolish laws. It can also be shown that in such laws we are not using anyone as a means. Therefore, it is possible to demonstrate that there can be thousands of foolish laws that fulfil the demands of Kant’s criterion of morality. The only thing that will remain out of the purview for such laws is the concept of goodwill envisaged by Kant. Therefore, we have to rethink on what is the basis of our moral laws? Therefore, Kant said that there are two postulates of morality. First, the belief in God who is witness to all our actions; secondly, there is another life after this present earthly life, a life beyond this Nature.

The non-cognitive aspect supports that which generates faith, that belief is an internal journey, conscious investigation of faith. It becomes religious investigation, investigation of faith. Let’s investigate the concept faith; ‘from where does this faith comes’ is a matter of appraisal. It is not achieved by natural cause-effect, etc. rules. If one have faith in any Being, any transcendental Being or any of such stage of one’s own consciousness which is not the functional consciousness but transcendental to it; say Nirvāṇa, Kaivalya, Mokṣa etc. it is not our functional consciousness. In Jainism, Buddhism also where there is no God all this is there. The state of consciousness in nirvana is not functional consciousness; it is that state of consciousness which is transcendental. From where does this faith in one’s own consciousness or transcendental form of ones' own being, came from!
This question subsists in the faith itself and with it begins the journey of religion. It brings forth the internal journey culminating into belief, religious inspiration of faith, religious life. It is not that it is developed religion, developed religions have made from it. We are talking of culture of that age when man became civilized from non-civilized. To become cultured he came one step out from nature towards culture. We are talking about primitive religion. Facticism, Manaism, totemism, how it shapes the life-from within! how it refines the person from within! The faith at that stage is totem; from point of view of Durkheim totem is some plant or forest object or living object, and that became a symbol, a kind of object of worship. How it became object of worship or faith! This was possible only if meaning of faith or worship was known previously. Without the idea of Divine or divinity it was not possible. Hence the primitive man had some understanding of faith; otherwise it would have remained simple like other plants or animals. Today we perform worship very nicely and sophisticatedly. In that era man knew little, had no eating sense; but had a clear understanding that this is clearly a matter of faith. Faith is produced neither by Science, nor by knowledge nor by nature. Faith may be in anything in any form. Followers of one religion do not accept all things of other religions. Reason being that their way of faith is different from others and there is conflict. Hence it appears that other religions do not keep neat and clean; they believe in strange things. This is natural with followers of all religions. It is only an appearance; reality is that it is faith which matters.

Therefore the feeling that it is holy, secret, or divine is the culmination of faith. Faith makes divine, hence the inquiry about origin of faith leads to the journey of religion. The sentiment of faith is not new; it is very old, from the day of Adam. Belief in totem is irrespective of our knowledge that it is a plant. For one tribe a totem is god but it is a plant for other tribes. Similarly other tribes have some other totem which is god for them but plant for others. Tribals living in forest are well aware that it is a plant. What differentiates it from other plants is the sentiment of faith. It appears different because one perceives it differently. One’s sentiments get attached with it so
one does not take it as ordinary. The reason for the connection may be what so ever; but other plants are not that special. Thus the totem may be a plant yet the tribal people worship it. Even if it is not creative God, almighty God, and omniscient God, as we believe. But they believe it to be special, not ordinary. It is extraordinary in which there are strange powers which seem to be happening in life. In magic, in power, physical power, muscle power, in uniting social power; by what so ever way it is seen, this sentiment of faith from which religion begins is found from beginning. It leads to journey of religion. Investigation of faith is through the way of faith and not through way of science otherwise it becomes superstitious. It makes faith. As an animal man has many instincts, drives; but as human being he bears an ability of self-conscious being. With this ability has come an unnecessary question about our origin. We have nothing to do with it nor will we get out of it. It will not help in hunting or uniting or else. None of the animals is troubled with it but man is facing it from very first day. From where have we come, what was before us and what is after us! There is no answer and whatever is told is skeptical, but there is no way out from this question. From beginning of the life of man, faith is present as the potential answer to this question that I have come from somewhere and will go somewhere. With today’s knowledge man has become sophisticated but when he was living in forest, uncivilized he found totem to be very special; it has given him life. Something is special about it; from the first day when man was uncivilized, lived in forest. With knowledge many things have became sophisticated, in the forest days totem gave him life.

Thousand years back science was not developed and man was living a tribal life. But on the strength of faith only he continuously improved and managed to become a modern man. In the absence of faith man would have remained animal or at the best tribal man only; and could not have become modern man. Hence the craving, which itself is the manifestation of faith, "where is our origin and what is our future!" The query about origin and future is meaningless in the scope of nature; but this meaningless question is haunting man since time immemorial. Mankind has found answer to it from
time to time but doubt also rose over the answers again and again, and so the question still keeps on haunting. An interesting question can be raised regarding the origination of this question. From where does this question emerge? There is no natural basis of this question and intellectually this question seems to be useless. This question is solved when it is established on belief; since it is here where its own discovery is seen. Here one concludes that it is not he who initiated this question. This question basically emerged from the deep within; I am only a sparkle of it; I have not created it. This question haunts us till it remains an intellectual pursuit. But when this question emerges as subject-matter of faith or as an object of faith, then it become an object of religion; and this is the beginning of religion.

Religion played an important role in formulation of primitive cultures. It is the strength of a culture. All the natural laws are evolutes of faith. This element of faith is self-originating by nature. It is not a product of our efforts and all natural laws are manifestation of this element of faith in man. What is morality? Moral thoughts developed along with religion and faith became law. Primitive man did not speculated about morality as we do now. His speculation was related with the faith which originated itself and developed into moral laws. Hence moral laws have contributed a lot in a culture. Science and knowledge has also contributed in culture and civilization; and even in the development of man as a person. Yet the self conscious faith is the most important factor in the development of culture. There has been not a single primitive society which was devoid of religion. Religion was present in all the primitive cultures in one form or the other. Primitive religions, totemism, manavism, faticism, etc. which are described by Durkheim in detail in his works, can still be found in Andaman Nicobar Islands where science has not yet penetrated. It is the religion on the basis of which they survive as a group against all odd forces like death, natural calamities etc.; though there is no science to rescue them against all these problems. Therefore the contribution of religion to any culture is undeniably supreme. Hence the journey of religion in the form of belief is very important to understand the development of culture.
Some thinkers say that culture is a substitute of religion. There are some modern thinkers like Taylor who says that with the passage of time culture will acquire the position of religion. The main point here is that those questions which earlier were raised in context of religion will now be raised in context of culture. Culture will solve the problems which were tackled by religion. Culture will provide the humanity with all the benefits which were earlier provided by religion. Hence it will replace the religion. But an important point that can be raised here in this context that how far it is justified to claim that culture can be a substitute of religion because if all elements of religion are incorporated in the category of culture then it won't be anything different from religion. Religion is a non-rational existence of human existence which has got the capacity to absorb human sufferings, tensions, defeats, dissatisfactions, etc. This aspect of religion is needed to be understood in the right perspective as these are the effects of religion and not its purpose. Religion does not aim at these; actually these are a sort of bonus with religion. Aim of religion is not to provide life free from disturbances. It is not a technique of stress management. It is also true that a religious person is free from distress. Therefore, in this sense too, religion is not a substitute of culture and if it become a substitute then culture would remain nothing else than religion.

In nineteenth century when science was on its peak people thought that to be cultured is something very good and to have faith in religion is to be dogmatic. This modern thought was shattered by post modern thought. Philosophically speaking this thought was absurd, meaningless. Actually culture is much related with religion. This contribution of religion can hardly be denied and culture is always found associated with religion. People like Vinobha Bhave and Mahatma Gandhi believed that there can be no morality without religion. Here they don't wish to stress upon the gross aspect of religion rather they have religiosity in their mind. For instance, if you are a Buddhist then you have to become religious from within otherwise you cannot be a truly moral person, in the real sense of the term. Your conduct will be alright but you will not a truly moral person. Kant too believed in this. There
arises a question: is it possible to have culture without religion? This question should be framed in the backdrop of our ancient development and not in that of our modern time. But this question should be framed in the backdrop of our ancient development instead of our modern time. In modern days, we form groups or clubs based on various interests and call it culture. This is very narrow sense of culture. The straight question that should be raised here is that 'had there been an evolution of a culture during ancient times without any religion?' The answer is no. There is a logical reason behind it. The reason is that the rational aspect of man is capable of knowing natural laws, but culture is not in the domain of nature. Culture is different from nature. Therefore, culture cannot be a by-product of nature. Hence culture does not develop from nature. Then what is the source of our culture! The clear-cut answer to this question is religion.

In religion there are so many things like superstition, necromancy, evil souls, black magic, etc. but along with it there is the inspirational force the query 'from where is our origin? From where have we come?' There can be no religion without it, and there can be no culture either. There are some aspects which are common in all cultures of this world whether they are ancient cultures or modern. For instance there is no culture on earth which upholds incest. The crime of incest consists of sexual between near relatives. Most systems prohibit intercourse between immediate relatives- father and daughter, brother and sister, mother and son. Incest is never accepted in any culture; howsoever old it may be. Even when concept of marriage had not developed, it was forbidden. This became the very basis of family system. There are families even in animals but there we don't find concept of regard about incest. Marriage is an institution which emerged later in the history of mankind. This is an institution basically related to economy and property. Marriage was necessary to family. There was a time when children were considered as property. A person with more progeny was considered more powerful. In Vedic culture there is a taboo about marrying to a girl of same gotra, though she may not even be distant relative. It is there because it is believed that they are offspring of the same ancestor, i.e., brother-sister.
Hence marriages cannot be solemnized between persons with common *gotra* (surname.) How it came into existence is not sure but today science has proved that breeding in a very small gene pool only is very harmful. The progeny will be less intelligent and their fertility is also affected. In contrast the hybrids are superior to their ancestry. But human being could envisage in advance that it is not proper that one should marry in the same *gotra*. In Islam also the marriage between the children of same parent is not allowed though the marriage between children of same father but different mothers is allowed, though it is not considered to be a respectable thing. What is the ground behind such sanctity? There is no ground behind it except that it looks awkward. It is not a good relation. Freud too stressed this point. Freud did psychoanalysis of totemic religion. He called it obsession or neurosis of religion. In his analysis the son killed his father and established physical relation with the sexual partner of his father; and took her as his wife. It is not considered to be acceptable either in Islam or in Judaism or any other religion on earth. Oedipus did exactly the same. There is a Greek legend about Theban hero Oedipus who mistakenly killed his father and unknowingly married his own mother. Hence it is called Oedipus Complex. It denotes a desire for sexual involvement with the parent of opposite sex. The Greek legend tells that result of such marriage was heavenly curse which resulted in drought and famine. Thus this relationship is not acceptable; it is an unworthy act which should be punished. If such an act happens then it is abnormality. That is why it is said to be a complex and not a normal phenomenon of life. But such a thing can said to be a normal phenomenon in animal world. Why is then incest prohibited in human cultures? Such questions are related with the beginning of self-consciousness in man. The light of self-consciousness takes him on this road of life. All these values enter into man's life at the very moment when man turned self-consciousness and interestingly, they enter through the medium of religion. We know very well that these values form the core of our culture. Without any base of these values, no culture can exist. Without this value culture will become ugly. How much the technology may develop, it will remain dirty, hideous; and human beings cannot accept
it. Such a concept came to humans from religion. It is not that the day religion came to exist it also appeared. The day religion enter in to human world such values also entered. It is one of Ten Commandments; anyone who will violate it will be burnt in the fire of hell. Hence it is not permissible. We see that there is no intellectual support behind such conjunctions. Neither they are necessary for a moral life or a social life. Whales and honey bees also live social life but still they cannot be equated with the social life of human being. It is because values, culture, and religion are part of human life only. Therefore, the role of non-rational aspect of our life which manifests itself in the form of belief, religion, faith, etc. in the constitution of any culture is unparallel. The contribution of this aspect is great whether judged historically, or conceptually.
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