

INDIVIDUATION ELUDES MECHANISM AND TELEOLOGY

Dr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwari

(Mahatma Gandhi Antarrashtirya Hindi Vishwavidyalaya, Wardha)

Dr. G. N. MISHRA

(Retired Principal, Goa)

Explanations are offered as to facts, events, occurrence, entities, existents or realities so as to make intelligible. Explanation is the central and perennial theme of philosophical thinking. Having ontological beginning with the curiosity to know the origin of the world, its nature and its relation with its source, philosophy entered into language, experience, nature, man, self, conduct, morality, religion, beauty, environment, society, family, state and all that. There are five kinds of fundamental facts and phenomena, namely matter, life, mind consciousness and values, which perennially demand explanation and which philosophers and others have been trying to understand in their own ways.

The two most common explanations of different phenomena are mechanical and teleological. The former tries to find explanation of a phenomenon in its antecedents, while the latter in what lies ahead of its in the expected future occurrence. In order words, in mechanical explanation the cause of a phenomenon precedes it, while in teleological one, the cause succeeds it. Both explanations are deterministic. In both there is a cause determining an occurrence. In one antecedent factors are the cause in the other the so-called 'goal' 'purpose' 'aim' 'end' or 'teleos' is the cause. In both the cause and the effect are conceived to be two spate and distinct phenomena bound by some causal relation such that the former produces or leads to the latter. In the former there is push, in the latter there is pull. In the former the past shapes the present and in the latter the future determines the present.

Matter in mechanism

In the first conception of physics. Propounded by the Greek Atomists Leucippus and Democritus, the world was conceived to be made of matter and matter was conceived to be composed of small, inert lifeless, atoms, which were explained to be homogeneous, indivisible, impenetrable and imperishable. This conception could not explain the fact of motion. Hence, the Newtonian classical Physics proposed second conception of matter in which kinetic and casual relation was brought in the totality of the physical world. Newton propounded three Laws of Motion to explain the fact of motion. In his Kinetic-corpuseular explanation of matter atoms are conceived to be compact, rigid, inert, indivisible (a=not+tom=cut) and every piece of matter is determined by the forces of the other material bodies which act upon it. This version of

mechanistic explanation also leaves the source of motion unexplained. Suppose an atom A is set in motion by the impact of another atom B and B in turn by C and so on ad infinite. This explanation commits the fallacy of infinite regress. It has to stop somewhere and assume the existence of First Cause-the Unmoved Mover. Additionally, this mechanic view of matter does not give any insight into the inner frame of the basic atoms themselves.

Hence, mechanism had to shift its position to the third conception of matter which rejects the earlier view that atoms are rigid, indivisible or static. Now it is held that the atoms have a sub-atomic structure, wherein elements are arranged in a manner like solar system and that electrons in an atom. Niels Bohr has shown that Protons have positive charge to electricity while electrons are charged negatively. This explanation begs the question as to why some elements are positively while others negatively charged. Now, Einstein's theory of Relativity and Max Planck's Quantum Theory, Heisenberg's Principle of uncertainty dismiss the deterministic explanation of the physical world. The elements of probability and uncertainty go country to the deterministic picture of the physical world.

This means that atom is an organization of elements and not an indivisible unit. Every atom in matter is an organism trying to maintain its integrity as far as possible. There is not rigidity in the atoms. They exhibit, on the contrary, a wide range of adaptability to the forces that impinge upon them. From this we draw the conclusion that an atom is not material in the sense of being rigid, inert, indivisible and passive but an active agent, displaying a tendency to readjust its elements so as to counteract such forces which tend to disrupt its unity and integrity. This further implies that atoms, instead of being determined from outside, possess in themselves some degree of self-determinism. This means that an atom has some power of self-initiated action and that of resistance, which fact mechanistic explanation fails to fathom.

Mechanistic explanation of Living Organism

Life has a physical basis as every living matter is made up of cells and every cell contains protoplasm which is a jelly like substance. Unicellular organisms, like amoeba are nothing but protoplasm. Protoplasm contains in itself two kinds of constituents, namely, inorganic, like water and salt, and organic, destruction, called metabolism goes on constantly in every body. The basic elements in matter and living organism including psychological, ethical, aesthetic and spiritual phenomena in accordance with this physical basis, which explanation is obviously wrong. What the mechanistic view omits to note is the difference of organization of elements in inert matter and living organism. The living matter is a more complex and highly organized form of the same elements which make the physical world. But although the components of the protoplasm are derived from the physical world, their chemical synthesis exhibits the unique quality of sentience which is not observable in the matter. It is present in matter for, otherwise

it would not emerge in their collocation. This feeling or sentience must be potentially present in each material element and the same becomes dominant in their complex form which we call living organism.

This sentience which is dormant in matter and dominant in living organism is more conspicuously felt in the phenomenon of reproduction. Reproduction is the process of individuation that is forming new individual. It has two forms, namely, sexual and a-sexual. The latter is a simple process in which new individuation occurs from a part of the old one. A cell produces another cell by a process of cell division. In the former, which is called fertilization, two cells called gametes unite to form a single cell called zygote and this zygote develops into an individual. Gametes are either male or female, called sperm and egg respectively. The whole process of individuation is based on sentience or feeling. Adaptability is a special feature of a living organism as opposed to a non-living one. Living organisms are found to expand when they have rapport with the environment. This is because of the presence of sentience in them and this is what mechanistic perspective fails to explain.

The whole process of individuation from non-living to living individual is an enfoldment for something ever present. This something cannot be passively inert but dynamically active and creative and no mechanistic approach can fathom it. This process of non-living becoming living is the process from the potential to the actual, as Aristotle would say. He rightly conceived of matter, life, mind, society, state as the hierarchical individuation of the same inherent creative force. Modern science has shown that matter and life do not differ so much in kind as in degree of organization. We are told in chemistry that hydrogen atom is the simplest atom having an atomic weight 1.0080 while the atomic weight of mendelevium is 256. It means that the atoms have an organization and their complexity increases as we pass the living organism also the degree of organization determines the lower and higher forms of life. Rational animals do not differ from other animals in the stuff but only in the organization of elements. The mechanistic explanation is inadequate to picture the force that is at the base of this organization.

The mechanical theory of evolution adopts deterministic explanation of life and its basic concepts like heredity, struggle for existence, mutation, survival of the fittest, natural selection remain unexplained. August Weismann found continuity and immortality of germ-plasma in evolution. According to him "heredity depends solely upon the transmission of the germ-cells, which are not affected by changes in the body cells and which are transmitted from generation. Heredity, therefore works in such a way that every individual springs not really from the parent but from the 'immortal' germ-cells safely stored and preserved by the parent'.¹ Neo-Darwinians emphasized natural selection in evolution but they failed to prove that it is the cause of evolution. L. L. Kellogg admitted that the causes of evolution remain unknown.²

Similarly the concept of struggle for existence demands explanation. Why should there be such a struggle? In fact it implies and inherent activity in the living organism, which mechanical explanation does not comprehend. We can say that the explanation of evolution lies 'in the will to live, in the primordial impulse, push, appetency, desire, aspiration, or whatever it is, which is life itself.' Another concept, namely, variations in individuation cannot be explained by heredity and therefore, De Vries proposed Mutation theory which holds that sometimes something wholly different is produced. But this poses the question as to why should mutation occur. The cause of mutation remains unknown. T. H. Morgan and Mendel et al try to explain ultimate units of life and the base of inheritance. What in themselves they are not known. The mechanic concepts of 'mitosis' and 'meiosis' explain neither heredity nor variation respectively. Germ-cells have some mechanism to carry on heredity in living organism. But machines does some agent to gain some end. 'It all seems as if some inherent intelligence, or some impulse or push, were striving toward some goal, the goal being both the continuation and the diversification of the species. We might introduce some 'entelechy' or an élan vital; or finally we might just introduce the things.'³ The fact is that neither anthropomorphic nor mechanical explanation of heredity is adequate to give a correct picture of individuation involving continuity and diversification. We have to admit that genes are tiny bits of chemicals containing the potency of full growth of individual. Genes contain the Force or source of individuation and mechanism fails to explain their operation.

Natural Selection is a dominant concept in the mechanistic explanation of living organism. It is said that evolution occurs through heritable variations or mutations in the germ-plasma. When these variations help organism to adapt, Nature selects them. Such a concept leads to supposition that there is some agency or force in Nature that does the selection work. Criticizing this view of natural selection John Burrough says "What is called Darwinism in entirely an anthropomorphic view of Nature-the Nature humanized and doing as man does. What is called Natural Selection is man's selection read into animate nature"⁴ But Natural Selection means neither mechanical nor teleological, anthropomorphic or divine process but only the process of individuating one of the several potentialities inherent in the genes in accordance with the favorable conditions of Nature. The mechanistic theory of evolution fails to explain newness in the process and it fails to determine the cause of the evolution. Now it is realized that mechanical theory is inadequate to explain even the evolution of matter into life. Evolution indicates a process in which the implicit becomes explicit, the potential, actual. The elements of newness in the process of individuation are also potentially present in the earlier stage as *ex nihilo nihil fit*. Since life emerges from matter we can infer that matter contains the potency of life. The newness in the result of organization of material elements. The organization

of Hydrogen and Oxygen leads to water which must be potentially present in them. The newness in a molecule of water is the result of organization of the two elements. This newness is not capable of being explained mechanically. Every new form is new unfoldment, a new beginning for further undolment. Mechanism is unable to throw light on the origin or the nature of mind and life. Individuation is integrative, expansive, constructive, creative and formative. It appears as if it is planned and purposive but the plan, purpose and planner are not outside what is planned and evolved.

C. Lloyd Morgan in his Emergent Theory of said that at every stage of evolution a new structure or organization emerges and the process goes on from matter to life and mind etc. To explain what caused the emergent to emerge, he proposed the concepts like activity, mind, God. This theological stand, instead of explaining the fact from within, drags in external agency to overcome the shortfalls of mechanistic Darwinianism. Thus the mechanistic theories merely state the facts of individuation but do not explain why an individual was created, why it survives or what makes it fit and adjust to nature. William Patton introduces the concept of cooperation or mutual service to explain the creative process. "An atom, an organic body, an animal, or a state, is essentially a cooperative system, which endures only so long as inner cooperation endures and so long as cooperation with the environment endures." He rightly says that interpretations of heredity, variations, struggle for existence in terms of physics and chemistry have filed.⁵

Thus we see that evolution is a gradual process from simpler to a more complex form, indefinite to definite, incoherent to coherent, potential to actual form. It is an orderly change from lower to higher stage. The scattered elements get integrated and then the integrated system begins differentiation. For example the primitive germ cell is evolved by the concentration of the previously diffused atoms of Carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen and oxygen CHNO. Then it starts dividing and subdividing into many cells. Each cell has the tendency of self-division and self multiplication. Matter, motion and force are the factors involved in evolution. We do not know what they are per se. in biological evolution also first there is homogeneous mass of protoplasm and then through differentiation different organs emerge for different functions. The process of integration and differentiation takes place at every stage of evolution including material, organic, psychological and social and the force of this process is within the elements themselves. Even Darwin does not admit that the environment produces changes in organism. They are within the organism itself. These spontaneous variations in the body cell are transmitted to posterity by heredity. Natural selection does not mean that Nature is the agent. It means that organism selects its variation which it finds favorable to help it in survival. Those variations which help the organism to adjust to nature survive and are passed on the offspring.

But in fact the strength to be fittest and survive lies within the organism itself. Every organism has within itself the capacity to multiply. Organism develops and uses its organs to satisfy its needs. The organ which is used gets strengthened and survives and is passed on to new generation. When modification continue from generation to generations a totally new species emerges. From this we infer the inner life-power of an organism moulds itself in response to nature. Nature cannot mould it, nor has it power to select. The organic needs evolve and develop the organs. The effort produces and organ and the internal structure of an organism is self-caused.

This is what the propounders of vitalistic theory, Lamarck and Bergson also confirm when they say that evolution involves internal vital function which preserves the past in the present and gnaws in the future. The living organism does not respond to external stimuli mechanically but organically. It selects its stimuli. As Angell and Car⁹ have pointed out feeling or sentience intervenes between organism and environment. This sentience, the central organizing principle, ontological impulsion in organism which binds the parts and makes the whole is what evades mechanic and teleological explanations. Similar view is held by Wisemann who holds that only spontaneous variations inherent in gram cell itself are passed on to new generations. He further holds that germ cells are immortal and they pass on from one generation to the next. The line of descent is from germ cell to germ cell, so that there is germinal continuity on which the heredity depends.

Thus we find that the mechanistic theory fails to explain why random forces come together to produce what we have. To say that per chance they come together is unscientific. Secondly, it fails to explain how life and mind emanate from their opposite life-less matter. Matter has a katabolic tendency to dissipate and stagnate. But organic forces are anabolic which means tending to activity. Just coming together of inert atoms cannot produce life, mind consciousness, intelligence, emotions and art. Also, evolution exhibits development which needs a directive principle serving some purpose, Mechanical theory reduces everything to matter. It ignores the basic force, the evolutionary urge, which impels the evolution of and in the cosmos. Bergson has rightly visualized the *élan vital*, the vital impetus as the evolutionary urge or source. That urge or force creates new entities out of itself without being determined either by present, past or future. His creative evolution is neither mechanical nor teleological but beyond them. The in-dwelling force or urge does not need an external agency like external intelligence, God or purpose to unfold what it potentially contains.

Teleological explanation

The failure of mechanical understanding of natural, individual or social phenomena does not mean validity or teleological interpretation of the same. Traditional concepts of purpose,

end, design, aim or goal have been used to explain occurrences or phenomena. Herein the cause of a phenomenon does not precede but succeeds it. Purpose determines the phenomenon or causes it to occur. Purpose rules both the macrocosm and microcosm. Hormic psychological McDougall said that man is a bundle of fourteen instincts all of which, even reflexes, are fitted with purpose. "No realm of being is devoid of purpose. All that is moved must have a goal towards which it is moved." In vegetative world and in humans, like any machine or human product, each part or organ, like roots leaves, branches, lever, kidneys, heart, lungs, has a purpose. Since they are not made by plants, trees or humans, there must be a cosmic intelligence, agency or God who designed all that exists. The argument is based on analogy or machine. But unlike in machines, plants and human body has additional quality of adaptation. It can be assumed that there is a purpose in the adaptive behavior of vegetative and human organism, as we notice a system and order in them. But we also see similar orderly pattern in Nature. So nature or world cannot be said to be a matter of chance. There must be a design, a purpose in the cosmos. Anaxagoras had said that mind was the initial cause of motion in atoms. But he did not mean that mind was a designer of atoms. Plato claimed that the world is a 'cosmos' and not 'chaos' and that it is a movement towards the realization of Ideas or values. The purpose of the world is to approximate cosmic Ides which everything is conceived to have a final cause or purpose. What Aristotle is advocating is not external but internal or immanent teleology. The world is not created. It is an eternal process or development in which what is potential is becoming actual and every actual is ideal to be realized. The final ideal being is Good or God, the Prime Mover which is within the process itself.

Teleologists argue that plants and humans are organic wholes in which parts serve the purpose of whole and of other parts. There is adaptation, organization, structural harmony in organism showing teleological causality. Mechanism cannot explain the complex phenomenon of organic life. We admit that even in plant life there is purposiveness. Even the tree roots and leaves go in the direction where they get their food and water. Mango tree spreads its roots beneath the earth to search for those elements which will be conducive in producing mango taste and not those which will produce pumpkin. In living organism the small organs select certain things for food and reject others. If we do not eat the food that fulfills the need of an organ like liver or kidney it will die. But this, in no way, shows that the propose lies outside the plant or any living organism. There is no external teleology but only internal or immanent purposiveness. The purpose is an integral essence of plants or living organism.

Explaining life

The simplest living organism apart from being material has the element of life and this cannot be explained mechanically. They additional element, that is, life, is not captured by causal

relation. In our view, matter and life are not bound by causal relation but by the relation of potency. We deny causal relation between organs of body or between prenatal and post natal stages of life and we also deny the teleological view that the former aims at the latter or that the former is means of the latter. We hold that the former has the potency of getting transformed into the latter. To say that B is higher form of A means to say that A has the potency of being B or that B is the actualization of its potency present in A. There is neither mechanical necessity nor purposiveness between A and B. The so-called effects is only an organization of the elements. Each cell, as an individual, organizes itself and coordinates with other organs and with nature to appear in the whole. The living thing is an autonomous unit in which every part is functionally related to every other and exists as an aid to the whole.

The parts in organism have a purpose but this purpose lies within the organ itself. Even the simplest organism selective process, by which, when chromosomes divide, a selection is made from the material in the cytoplasm suitable to its use. The rootlets of a tree select from the soil those elements which serve its purpose. There is purpose of the nest the bird builds, namely hatching and rearing the egg. When birds migrate from Siberia to Bharatpur there is a purpose. Human Associations, institutions, in fact all activities are done with a purpose. In organism there is a development from birth to death and it is never without a purpose and this purpose is not outside but ingrained in the organism itself. The individual contains within itself 'an inner directing principle, an evolutionary urge, a primordial direction and coordination of energies' or an ontological impulsion to push itself forward towards full realization of its potentiality. Every organ, individual or element is 'windowless monad' of Leibnitz which needs no external pull or push to perform its function or realize its purpose.

From the observation of order, structure, organization, harmony in the material nature and the same plus values, ends, and purposes in the animate world, it is natural to think of a cosmic mind as the cause of everything. "We should think of the world as the expression or manifestation of an infinite or absolute mind or self; or we should think of mind as immanent in the world, an indwelling spirit or intelligence working through evolution and the laws of nature in a spiritually ordered world."⁶ From this, the theologians infer cosmic mind, divine mind or God, who, living outside plans the world with a purpose. Our stand is that such a mind is not outside the world but immanent in every piece of creation, in every individual. L T Hobbes also says that something of the nature of mind is to be carried further down in the organic world, and that mind may be the essential driving force in all evolutionary change.⁷ This mind cannot be a thing or organ but a force or *elan vital* or potency of the thing or organ to organize and unfold itself into may.

An understanding of a material object does not help in understanding a living organism. The former is governed by external relation in which, we say that A is the cause of B, both to which stand apart. But in a living organism, parts inter se and with the whole are bound by internal or organic relation in such a way that A and B are both cause and effect of each other and cannot stand apart. In an organism the whole and its parts are mutually dependent in such a way that both are the cause and effect of each other. There is reciprocal relationship between them. Nature is evolving into goals like life, mind consciousness, individuality, society, state and so on. But the purpose does not lie outside Nature or what evolves. It lies within it. There is neither a push nor a pull, neither mechanism nor teleology but only self impulsion or inherent propelling process of individuation which goes beyond both.

Supporting this Henry Bergson rightly rejects both mechanism and teleology and holds that the evolutionary process is neither mechanical nor teleological but creative. Being deterministic, both mechanism and teleology cannot explain the creative element present in what evolves. According to the former past determines the present while according to the latter future determines the present. In both there is nothing new in the effect. "Teleology is inverted mechanism." Elan vital, the vital urge, freely evolves new entities out of the past. One original elan vital which is undifferentiated differentiates itself into new forms of existence. Matter is potential life. Life inherent in matter bursts forth and evolves into plant, animals, man, mind and consciousness. The force that individuates may be called God but this God is not the God of theology. This God is the creative force itself striving to be complete. The elan vital, the ontological impulsion, is the being which passes through apparent becoming. In the process of becoming each higher emergent is new and controls the entity from which it emerged. Life controls matter, mind controls life and matter and so on. The lower forms are not extirpated but only tamed and appropriated by the higher forms which have higher power of organization and higher qualities.

Thus, while Bergson puts elan vital as the source or nius of individuation, Lloyd Morgan drags in God as the original force and Alexander brings in Space and time as the matrix and puts Deity at the top of the process. Their explanations are unsatisfactory in the sense that they only state the facts without explaining them. To say that life emerges from matter, mind emerges from life etc. will not suffice. A philosopher has to explain why the higher form emerges from the lower one. A satisfactory explanation would be to accept that higher is latent in the lower. Life is latent in matter and mind is latent in life and so on. The fact of the matter is that the elements at the lower level. When combined in a manner, give rise to an organization which develops new qualities which were latent in the elements. Protons and electrons, when organized, give rise to atoms into molecules which get organized into compounds. Organization

of protoplasmic matter begets cells and cells contain the potency of life, which produces mind and so on.

The subjective element in evolution which enables individual to be self-adaptive, self-maintaining, self-preserving and self-perpetuating was recognized by J. A. Thompson who said that the laws of physics and chemistry are inadequate to explain evolution of species, says Goudge, is wholly destructive, or eliminative, not creative.¹¹ How new species come out from old ones cannot be explained by mechanistic theory. Mechanistic theory excludes the concept of organizing or directive agency. In extreme form it explains all forms of life as a chance assemblage of mass particles in space.¹⁶ This view has been condemned by biologists like B. Moore who says that "...it was not fortuitous combination of chances and no cosmic dust which brought life to the womb of mother earth...but a well regulated, orderly development..¹⁷ As Henry Bergson has affirmed the evolution of new species necessarily involves internal vital process which conserves the past in the present and goes on gnawing into the future. 'In order words, there is something else that is real besides the material elements and the physical and chemical processes, namely the organism itself, involving structure and organization and intergration.'¹⁸

The experts in genetics say that a living organism does not respond to stimuli mechanically but organically and as Whitehead says it maintains a 'nexus'. Prof. Agar and Hans Driesch proposed vitalistic theory in which the life is said to contain within itself an organizing principle, an inward agent, a central force or a subject.¹⁹ '...there is some agent at work in morphogenesis which is not of the type of physic-chemical agents/'²⁰ He says that life is the result of a non-material force, which he calls entelechy or psychoid. This only means that life is an individuation of sentience or ontos from matter in which it is potentially present which organizes parts in unison to grow, to adjust and to meet any emergency. 'No external power comes into play here. What happens is wholly immanent to the complex situation in which a population interacts with its environment'¹⁴ As Angell and Cart⁹ have said the sentience or the central force is the organizing force which is dormant in matter and more active in higher individuation of living organism. John Burroughs says that it is because of this force that organized matter develops into new forms. 'An acorn develops but a quartz pebble only changes'.²¹

Matter and purpose do not depict the entire course of reality/ '...in other words, there is something else that is real besides the material elements and the physical and the chemical processes, namely, the organization itself, involving structure and organization and integration'¹² B Moore and J. M. Macfarlane call that central force 'biotic energy' which Goethe called 'inherent growth-principle' and the same is variously called self, Atman or ontos. Hume

tried to catch it but could not, William James called it 'stream of consciousness' to McDougall it is just a bundle of propensities or instincts, Freud considered it libido, a store-room of energy. Epiphenomenalism viewed it as a by-product of body. Kant declared it to be Transcendental Unity of Apperception. Now it is realized that the ontological force or self is the centre of personal identity which goes in the past, remains in the present and projects in the future. And as Rollo May says 'the self is the organizing function within individual. It is prior to, not the object of, our senses; it is presupposed in the fact that one can be a scientist.²² The denial of self, says Pratt, is 'suicide of thought'.¹³ it cannot be known as object but it is always available to us as identity within us graspable only by introspection.

The organizing force, the ontological impulsion, which is potentially present in apparently lifeless matter and asserts itself the organic life ascending higher in man and mind goes on to form family, society and state. This ontological force eludes both mechanism and teleology and demands recognition and cogent explanation. Social contract theory of the advocates for mechanism which considers individuals in family, society or state bound by external relations is found to be unsatisfactory. Man, like animals, is gregarious by nature and that is because of immanent force of ontological feeling in each organism. William Morton Wheeler goes so far as to assign social impulse even to material electrons and protons. They have, he says, "an irresistible tendency to cohere and organize themselves into more complex emergent wholes."²³ Society is not mere mechanical aggregation of individuals but an organic whole. Anthropologists and sociologists have found ample evidence to prove that man has a natural, an inborn propensity to enter into voluntary cooperation with fellow beings which becomes conducive to common good and individual eudemonia. Society is an organic or spiritual unity of in-built or inherent conscious forces, which we call ontological impulsion.

Our view is that both mechanism and teleology are partial explanations and both have their drawbacks. Mechanism rules more in material world and teleology more in the realm of organism. But the concept of individuation, involving the relation of potency, rules in both the realms and goes beyond them. Matter has the potency of life and life has the base of matter. The former is the actualization of the latter. The entire material world exhibits harmony and order. It proceeds to get life out of itself through its own inner mechanism of potency without requiring push from behind or pull from outside. There is no external Intelligent principle to work out individuation. There is only self-mechanism and self-purposiveness operating in the process of individuation. To drag the concept of God in the process of individuation is not only unscientific and illogical but also self-contradictory amenable to damaging questions like the cause and purpose of God. To characterize God as *causa sui* is the fancy of human imagination, which

defies logic and to hold him having purpose in creating the world is not only to limit the unlimited but also to clothe him in human garb.

The philosophy of individuation holds the most cogent view that both the cause and the purpose are present in each individual, animate and inanimate, in actual or potential form. Matter evolves into life as vital breath, and life-force into mind, mind into consciousness and lastly into the highest harmony and order involving Anand. This is what our scriptures, like Tattiriya¹⁶, point out this is what synchronizes both mechanism and teleology, either of which is inadequate to explain the world we live in. the ontological impulsion, the indwelling force, the entelechy, the tendency to evolve, manifest or individuated lies in the entity itself whether it is living or non-living. One may call it God and if it is God, He also must reside in every entity, in every particle or dust. He is not ex machine, an external architect but the very indwelling force, initial as well as continuing and perennial eksfga esa rksfga esa [kMx [kEHk esa ?kV ?kV O;kih jke and this is what scriptures indicate when they declare loZa [kyq bne czã. The monadic force in every entity pushes forth to realize its higher structure, organization, harmony and inbuilt entelechy. It does not need an external agency or broker. What is true to each individual entity is also true in case of the whole cosmos. ;r fiaMs rr czãkaMs John Caird confirms this by saying that "One organic whole, one self-evolving, self-realizing idea infusing the lucidity of reason into all things potentially present in the lower order or existence, slowly advancing itself, without arbitrary leap, form lower to higher, so that the lower, though not the cause, will be the presupposition and prophecy of the higher, the higher, the explanation of the lower, and the highest of all that in which the meaning, end, or aim of the whole will be clearly seen.¹³ The essence of individual, call it God, if you so desire, lies in the individual itself. Essence and existence are one and the same. One cannot conceive of the World without its immanent force or Force without the world. This process of individuation, the process of the potential becoming actual, evades mechanical and teleological explanations because both fail to capture the ontological impulsion, the central Force, the Ontos as the elan vial of individuation.

References

1. George Thomas White Patrick, Introduction to Philosophy, Surjeet pub. Delhi, 1978, P. 134
2. Ibid p. 135

3. Ibid p. 140
4. Ibid p. 142
5. Ibid p. 153
6. Ibid p. 172
7. Hobbhous L. T. Mind in Evolution, p.173
8. Ibid p. 175
9. Neel Ann F Theories of Psychology, Uni. Of London, Press 1969
10. GTW Patrick, op cit 133
11. Goudge, T. A. The Ascent of Man p. 21
12. Ritter, W. E. The Unity of Organism ch xxi
13. J. B. Pratt, Personal Realism, Machmillan, N. Y. 1937
14. Goudge op.cit 118
15. J. A. Thompson, The System of Animate Nature, 143-60
16. Tattiriya Upanishad VI-1
17. B. Moore, The Origin and Nature of Life, H. Holt, p. 190
18. Bergson H, Creative Evolution, Introduction to Metaphysics Tr. Arthur Mitchell, The Modern Lib. N. Y. ch. Xxi
19. Agar, The Theory of Living Organism, p. 32
20. Ibid p. 19
21. John Burroghs, Accepting the Universe, Houghton Mifflin, p. 209
22. Rollo May, Man's search for Himself, Norton, N. Y.
23. Titus H. H. Living Issues in Philosophy, Eurasia pub. House, New Delhi, 1968 p. 39