

Chapter IV

The Concept of Metaphysically Grounded Human Nature

- 4.1. Introduction
- 4.2. Metaphysics: An Overview
- 4.3. Metaphysics: Grand Designs
 - 4.3.1 Pre-Socratic Concept of Metaphysics
 - 4.3.2 Socrates and Plato's Concept of Metaphysics
 - 4.3.3 Aristotle's Concept of Metaphysics
 - 4.3.4 Rationalism and Metaphysics
 - 4.3.5 Empiricism and Metaphysics
 - 4.3.6 Kant's View of Metaphysics
 - 4.3.7 Positivists View of Metaphysics
 - 4.3.8 Logical Positivism and Metaphysics
 - 4.3.9 Phenomenologist and Existentialists View of Metaphysics
 - 4.3.10. Modern Science and Metaphysics
- 4.4. Metaphysically Grounded Human Nature
 - 4.4.1. Greek Metaphysics of Human Nature
 - 4.4.2. Rationalist Metaphysics of Human Nature
 - 4.4.3. Empiricist Metaphysics of Human Nature
 - 4.4.4. Enlightenment View of Metaphysics of Human Nature
 - 4.4.5. Kantian Thought on Human Nature
 - 4.4.6. Modern Empirical Science on Human Nature
- 4.5. Concluding Observation

Chapter IV

The Concept of Metaphysically Grounded Human Nature

1.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter it is found that the questions surrounding human nature remain unresolved even today. It is also found that the complicated nature of the human experience lends us neither to a clear and convincing theory of human nature, nor to a satisfactory moral philosophy, which according to most thinkers rests on corresponding metaphysical principles.

In the present chapter, an attempt has been made to provide a brief introduction to the concept of metaphysics and its historical development. It also studies some of the important metaphysical theories which influenced the concept of human nature, which more or less includes a brief study of Greek metaphysics of human nature, Rationalist metaphysics of human nature, Empiricist metaphysics of human nature, Scientific realist and Naive Realist Metaphysics of human nature, Kant's view of metaphysics of human nature, Modern empirical science metaphysics of human nature, Enlightenment view of metaphysics of human nature etc. The chapter also tries to study scientific understanding of metaphysics and their interpretation of human nature.

4.2. Metaphysics: An Overview

Metaphysics is a discipline with a long history. Yet over the course of a long history, the discipline has been conceived in different ways. Since the ancient period, philosophers have disagreed about the nature of metaphysics. Therefore, it is not easy to say what metaphysics is. The word 'metaphysics' derives from the Greek *Meta ta Physika* (literally, "after the things of nature"), an expression used by Hellenistic and

later commentators to refer to Aristotle's untitled group of text that we still call the *Metaphysics*.¹ It is the probable meaning of the word '*Metaphysics*' that is about things which do not change.

Metaphysics is that kind of 'science' which studies "being as such" or "the first causes of things" or "things that do not change". Of course, it is not possible to define metaphysics for two reasons. First of all, a philosopher who denied the existence of those things that had once been seen as constituting the subject matter of metaphysics first causes or unchanging things would now be considered to be making thereby a metaphysical assertion. Again, secondly, there are many other philosophical problems which are now considered to be metaphysical problems which are not related to first causes or unchanging things, for example, the problem of free will or the problem of the mental and the physical.² *Metaphysics* is a broad area of philosophy marked out by two types of inquiry. The first aims to be the most general investigation possible into the nature of reality: are there principles applying to everything that is real, to all that is? If we abstract from the particular nature of existing things that which distinguishes them from each other, what can we know about them merely in virtue of the fact that they exist? The second type of inquiry seeks to uncover what is ultimately real, frequently offering answers in sharp contrast to our everyday experience of the world.³

Again, in the medieval and modern period of philosophy, the word '*Metaphysics*' has also been taken to mean the study of things transcending nature. It is existing separately from nature and having more intrinsic reality and value than the things of nature. The empiricists and Kant were critical of both Aristotelian and rationalist conceptions of metaphysics, arguing that they seek to transcend the limits of human knowledge. By the word '*Metaphysics*,' Kant has often meant a priori

speculation on questions which cannot be answered by scientific observation and experiment. Hume also use of the term 'metaphysical' to mean 'excessively stable.' In modern philosophical usage of 'metaphysics' refers generally to the field of philosophy dealing with questions about the kinds of things there are and their modes of being. Its subject matter includes the concept of existence, thing, property, event, the distinctions between particulars and universals, individuals and classes, the nature of relations, changes, causation and the nature of mind, matter, space and time.⁴

In the period of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the term Metaphysics was used mostly to include questions about the reality of the external world, the possibility of a priori knowledge, the existence of other minds and the nature of sensation, memory abstraction etc. Of course, in present time these types of questions are included in the study of epistemology. The history of metaphysics in Western philosophy (taking metaphysics in the contemporary sense) began with speculations of the Ionian cosmologists in the sixth century B.C. about the origin of the physical universe, the matter of stuff from which it is made, and the laws of uniformities everywhere present in nature.⁵

The beginning of the concept of metaphysics is most ancient. Its beginning is counted dates back from Parmenides (515-450). Of course, some of the typical characteristics of metaphysics as a distinct philosophical enquiry are present in or at least suggested by surviving writings. The main source of the term 'metaphysics' indirectly is Aristotle (384-322). He is also known as the source of a systematic list of metaphysical issues. He, for the first time introduced a technical language in which these metaphysical issues are stated. However, the primary use of the word metaphysics occurred one hundred years after the death of Aristotle. The fourteen books presently called Aristotle's *Metaphysics* was originally named by the ancient

philosopher: 'first philosophy,' 'first science,' 'wisdom,' and 'theology.' Editors then entitled Aristotle's fourteen books *Metaphysics* to warn students that these advanced topics should not be read until after reading and understanding *Physics*, his books concerning the natural world.⁶ Aristotle has also developed a metaphysical system and proved it fruitful to a huge extent. Metaphysics is a traditional branch of philosophy concerned with explaining the fundamental nature of being and the world that encompasses it, although the term is not easily defined.⁷

The concept of metaphysics also attempts to clarify the fundamental notions through which people understand the world, e.g., existence, objects and their properties, space and time, cause and effect, and possibility. One important branch of metaphysics is ontology, which investigates the basic category of being and their relation to each other. Cosmology is another important branch of metaphysics, which deals with the study of the origin, fundamental structure, nature, and dynamics of the universe. Of course, some thinkers also include epistemology as another important concern of metaphysics.

Another, two major historical developments in metaphysics was idealism and materialism. Among these two, former is presenting reality as the ultimately mental or spiritual and the latter is regarding it as wholly material. Both these theories are monistic in proposing a single ultimate principle. But, it is more important to notice that many metaphysical systems have been dualist, taking both to be fundamental, and neither to be a form of the other. In this sense, both the traditions are ancient. Again, in modern times, idealism received its most intensive treatment in the nineteenth century. But, materialism has been in the ascendant in the second half of the twentieth century.

Prior to the modern history of science, scientific questions were addressed as a part of metaphysics known as Natural philosophy. Originally, the term 'science' (Latin *scientia*) simply meant 'knowledge'. By the end of the 18th century, it had begun to be called 'science' to distinguish it from philosophy. Thereafter, metaphysics denoted philosophical enquiry of a non-empirical character into the nature of existence.⁸ Of course, there are some philosophers of science, e.g., the neo-positivists, say that natural science always rejects the study of metaphysics. While a group of philosophers of science had shown their strong disagreement in this context.

4.3. Metaphysics: Grand Designs

In the history of western philosophy, different philosophers dominated at different times. But most of the philosophers accept the importance of metaphysics. The metaphysics has been commonly presented as the most fundamental and also the most comprehensive of enquiries. It claims to be fundamental because questions about what there is or about the ultimate nature of things underlie all particular enquiries.⁹ It is primarily concerned with the investigation of the ultimate nature of reality. This investigation tries to attempt two problems. Firstly, metaphysics tries to arrive at the most fundamental truths about what exist, and secondly, it tries to provide an account of the concepts that are involved certain fundamental truths. This important feature immediately gives rise to another question of the relation between metaphysics and science. Philosophers have disagreement about the nature of metaphysics. So, the claim of metaphysics to be comprehensive is more difficult to justify. Here, just because of its extreme generality, metaphysics becomes comprehensive. Some philosophers, such as Amie Thomason, have argued that many metaphysical questions can be dissolved just by looking at the way we use words; others, such as Ted Sider, have argued that metaphysical questions are substantive, and that we can make

progress toward answering them by comparing theories according to a range of theoretical virtues inspired by the sciences, such as simplicity and explanatory power.¹⁰

4.3.1. Pre-Socratic Concept of Metaphysics

According to Aristotle, the first known philosopher of Pre-Socratic period is Thales of Miletus. Thales sought a single first cause under which all phenomena could be explained and rejected mythological and divine explanations. He mentioned that this first cause was in fact moisture or water. In his philosophical development, Thales also taught that the world is harmonious. It has a harmonious structure, and thus it is intelligible to rational understanding. Anaximander and Anaximenes, another two great Miletus also developed a monistic conception of the first cause.

Another important Pre-Socratic school was the Eleatics. Methodologically, the Eleatics were mostly rationalist, and they took logical standards of clarity and necessity as the criteria of truth. This group was developed by Parmenides, and included Zeno of Elea and Melissus of Somas in the early fifth century B.C. According to Parmenides the reality is a single unchanging and universal Being. Another great thinker of the school was Zeno. Zeno in his paradoxes used “*reduction ad absurdum*” to demonstrate the illusory nature of change and time. Again, Heraclitus of Ephesus, made change as his central teaching and pointed out that “all things flow”. He also taught the unity of opposites. Democritus and his teacher Leucippus are known for formulating an atomic theory for the cosmos.¹¹ All these were reflected as the forerunners of the scientific method.

4.3.2. Socrates and Plato's Concept of Metaphysics

Socrates (469-399) is known for his dialectic or questioning approach to philosophy rather than a positive metaphysical doctrine. He articulated condescension for metaphysics, natural science, which according to him, culminates in atheism and mathematics, which to his mind, consists of nothing but barren speculations. Whereas Plato, whose philosophical horizon is broader than that of Socrates, exaggerates the metaphysical significance of his doctrine and uses Socrates as a mark for his own ideas. Metaphysics, according to Plato means the theory of ideas. In this way, the theory of ideas had a great influence in the history of thought. Plato, the great student of Socrates, is famous for his theory of forms or ideas (which he places in the mouth of Socrates in the dialogues he wrote to expound it). Platonic realism (also considered a form of idealism) is considered to be a solution to the problem of universals.¹² Plato's technical contributions to metaphysics were contained in his later dialogues, especially the Parmenides and Sophist.

4.3.3. Aristotle's Concept of Metaphysics

Greek Philosopher, Aristotle (384-322) is indirectly the originator of the term metaphysics. He is also known as the pioneer of the fundamental metaphysical issues. He used a technical language through which the issues of metaphysics are stated and also adopted an excellently beneficial system to develop it. The most important part of his philosophical doctrine is called by Aristotle the "First Philosophy". Aristotle's problem of "first philosophy" or metaphysics, as listed by him in his books Beta and Kappa of the metaphysics are partly about the metaphysics itself. The subject matter of this first philosophy, according to him, is the highest principles amongst all existent things that cannot be known through sense organs but can be comprehended through reason alone and which is essential for all sciences. According to him, metaphysics is

the highest achievement of a hierarchy of sciences than a discussion of problems left over by the special sciences. Some of the major problems of metaphysics as listed by Aristotle are the questions about the kinds of things. The most fundamental questions of metaphysics according to Aristotle are concerned with the concepts of being and unity. Are being and unity properties of things, or are they entities or substances of some kind? Again, if being unity are things in their own right, what kind of things are they? His answers to these questions are the most important contribution to the field of metaphysics. In the subsequent philosophy the term 'metaphysics' was used in this sense.

The heart of Aristotle's metaphysics is his analysis of being. His account of metaphysics is not itself an empirical study of being. He also never thought metaphysics as a science of high level generality describing the properties that all beings have. Therefore, it is found that Aristotle's metaphysics is his account of the universe. Aristotle wrote thoroughly on almost every subjects of philosophy including metaphysics. His explanation to the problem of universals contrasts with Platonic idea of universal. Of course, Platonic concept of form exists in a separate realm and it may not exist among any visible things. On the other hand, Aristotelian essences 'indwell' in particulars. The Aristotelian theory of change and causality stretches to four kinds of causes. These four are namely, the material, formal, efficient and final cause.

The opening arguments in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, Book I, revolve around the senses, knowledge, experience, theory, and wisdom. The first main focus in the *Metaphysics* is attempting to determine how intellect "advances from sensation through memory, experience, and art, to theoretical knowledge".¹³ According to Aristotle metaphysics is less important point of a hierarchy of sciences than the discussion of problems left over by the special sciences.

4.3.4. Rationalism and Metaphysics

Rene Descartes (1596-1650) had been traditionally considered as the father of modern western philosophy. He is also widely accepted as one of the central figures in the history of modern Western philosophy. The revival of metaphysics in the seventeenth century begins with Descartes. Descartes used a good deal of material from old ruins in his work of “building from the foundation” in metaphysics in order to set up a firm and abiding superstructure in the sciences. No metaphysical assertion is to be understood unless (1) it is understood with the kind of clarity and distinctness that mathematical propositions have and (2) its truth is either so primarily obvious that, like the postulates of geometry, it cannot be doubted or it is proved with the same rigor with which theorems are proved in geometry.

Descartes is also prominent for his dualism of material and mental substances. The continuation of metaphysics in the seventeenth century begins with Descartes. He posited a metaphysical dualism, distinguishing between the substances of the human body and the mind or soul. This fundamental distinction would be left unsolved and guide to what is known as the mind body problem, since the two substances in the Cartesian system are self-sufficient of each other and irreducible. These claims made for his or any other metaphysical statement were revolutionary and most significant. As Descartes and his supporters understood them, they amounted to a claim that metaphysics be scientific, understanding by the word ‘scientific’ being subject to a kind of thorough intellectual discipline best illustrated in mathematics and the accurate physical sciences.

Again, another great philosopher of that period was Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677). The metaphysics of Spinoza consists of one thing, substance, and modifications of it. In his early part of *The Ethics*, Spinoza points out that there is

only one substance, which is absolutely self-caused and eternal. Spinoza believed that reality was a single substance. He believed this substance as 'God', or 'Nature'. Of course, Spinoza takes these two terms to be synonymous. For him, the whole of the natural universe is made of one substance, God or that is the same, as the Nature, and its modifications.

According to Spinoza, substance is essentially just whatever can be thought of without relating it to any other idea or thing. A substance is to be conceived of by itself, without understanding it as a particular kind of thing. It is also seen that all the attributes are related to substance in some way. However, it is not clear from Spinoza's direct definition of attribute, whether, the attributes are really the way substance is, or the attributes are simply ways to understand substance. But it is not necessarily the ways it really is. In this way, Spinoza argues that there is an infinite number of attributes. Again, there are only two attributes for which he thinks that we can have knowledge. These two attributes are namely, thought and extension. The issue of causality and modality in Spinoza's philosophy is argumentative. Therefore, in one sense, metaphysical philosophy of Spinoza is thoroughly deterministic.

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) was also a follower of Descartes. Leibniz also agreed with Descartes and advocated the demand for a rigorously scientific metaphysics. Leibniz proposed a plurality of non-interacting substances in his concept of Monadology. According to Leibniz, metaphysical system is an effort to get a clear and distinct idea of the universe in his own. Leibniz has dealt with the idea of possible worlds as well. According to him, the idea of necessity is that any necessary fact is true across all possible worlds. Leibniz rejected Cartesian dualism and denied the existence of a material world. In His view, there are infinitely many

simple substances, which he called 'monads'. Leibnitz developed this theory of monads in response to both Descartes and Spinoza. In rejecting this response he was forced to arrive at his own solution. In this way, Leibnitz introduced his principle of pre-established harmony to account for apparent causality in the world. For him, a possible fact is true in some possible world, even if not in the actual world. On the other hand, the academic rationalists of the post-Leibnizian school were also realized that the word 'metaphysics' was used in a more inclusive sense.

It is observed that in the Middle age philosophy, we find that metaphysics was used to conform the truthfulness of theology philosophically. Since the period of sixteenth century both metaphysics and ontology were used in the same sense. Again, the seventeenth century philosophers like Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz and others thought that there is a close connection between metaphysics and natural and humanitarian sciences. But, in the eighteenth century this connection was no longer exist and this idea is particularly found in the ontology of Wolff.

4.3.5. Empiricism and Metaphysics

John Locke (1632-1704) is one of the most significant European philosophers of the early modern period. His concept of metaphysics is generally determined by his theory of knowledge. Locke's main contribution to metaphysics lies in his critical discussion of substance and essence. Advocating the traditional view he argued that a genuine science must be based on knowledge of essences. For him we cannot know the real essences in the natural domain. His more important and original criticism concerns the notion of essence-the notion of what a thing is in contrast to what it is made of, how big it is, its location, its age, and the like.¹⁴

The wide mechanist thesis that what happens in the corporeal realm is reducible to insensible particles in motion is one of the fundamental beliefs of Locke's metaphysics. Another equally important truth of Locke's metaphysics is that with respect to the fundamental constitution of nature, one cannot expect to have even a probable hypothesis. He supposed corpuscular theory as the best hypothesis about the material world, which we likely to have ever. Locke also pointed out that everything exists is entirely particular and we make general ideas (universals) that is abstracted from the experience of particulars. His classification of general ideas is a detail least of sorts of beings. According to Locke, there are simple ideas and complex ones. Simple ideas include not just sensations, but also ideas of sensible qualities.

David Hume (1711-1776), in the eighteenth century, took an extreme position against metaphysics. According to him, all genuine knowledge involves either mathematics or matters of fact. The metaphysics is always goes beyond these, hence it is worthless. Hume was contrary to metaphysical issues even though he bequeathed to his followers the paradigm metaphysical problems of modern philosophy. Again, Hume criticized the notion of a mind as distinguished from the ideas said to be in the mind for the same reasons that Berkeley criticized the notion of matter. According to Hume, the notion of existence itself signifies nothing beyond a greater or less degree of force and vivacity attaching to sense impressions and mental images.¹⁵ In this way, he assumed that the final subject of thought and discourse must be something we are directly conscious only of individual sensations, and whenever we can discriminate only sensation or feeling from another, these exist independently and thus count as different things.

Another great empiricist, George Berkeley, also known as Bishop Berkeley (1685-1753) was one of the great philosophers of the early modern period. He was

going ahead from empiricism to an idealistic metaphysics. As an important metaphysician Berkeley was famous for defending idealism, mainly the view that reality consists exclusively of minds and their ideas. His metaphysical theory denies the existence of material substance and instead contends that familiar objects like tables and chairs are only ideas in the minds of perceivers. The only knowledge we have is of our ideas about objects, such as the sensations we perceive. Our perception of a material object is the entirety of our knowledge about it, whether or not our perception is truly representative of any real material thing. As a result things cannot exist without being perceived. According to Berkeley, the idea or thought about an object is our complete knowledge about it. We have no valid reason for assuming that our idea corresponds to any actual object, or that a world external to our mind exists at all.

4.3.6. Kant's View of Metaphysics

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was a dominating western philosopher throughout the nineteenth century. The metaphysical position of Immanuel Kant was idealistic. Kant himself still wants to assign a substantial meaning directly to the expression "As per as the name metaphysics is concerned, it is not to be believed that it arose by chance because it fits so exactly with the science now is called Nature, but we can arrive at the concept of nature in no other way than through experience, so that the science which follows from it is called metaphysics."¹⁶

Kant was trying to synthesis some of the important trends of that time and advocated its possible revisions. These popular trends were namely, scholastic philosophy, systematic metaphysics, and skeptical empiricism and the burgeoning science of that time. While making this synthesis, Kant tried to build a new framework and addressed all questions including everything. Kant mentioned that

Hume awakened him from his ‘dogmatic slumbers’ and became more suspicious about metaphysical speculation. After thirty three years of Hume’s *Enquiry*; Kant published his *Critique of Pure Reason*. Following Hume, Kant was in rejecting much of previous metaphysics and argued that there was still room for some synthetic a priori knowledge. In this context, Kant also argued for the freedom of the will and the existence of things in themselves, which is the ultimate objects of experience. In this sense, the empiricists and Kant were critical of both Aristotelian and rationalist conceptions of metaphysics, arguing that they seek to transcend the limits of human knowledge.

‘Metaphysics’, as Kant understands it, consists of synthetic a priori cognition from concepts. As ‘cognition’, it consists of conscious representations brought under concepts and referred to objects.¹⁷ According to Kant, all the rationalist philosophers are aiming for a kind of metaphysical knowledge. He defined it as the synthetic a priori knowledge. One of the major dissatisfactions of Kant is that metaphysicians seek to deduce a priori synthetic knowledge absolutely from the unsystematic concepts of the understanding. This synthetic a priori knowledge does not come from the senses and being a priori it is distinct from empirical, scientific knowledge. Kant coined this as synthetic a posteriori. The only synthetic a priori knowledge we can have is the data of the senses which organized in our mind. According to Kant, this organizing framework is space and time, which do not have any mind-independent existence. A priori knowledge of space and time is all that remains of metaphysics as traditionally conceived. Kant points out that there is a reality beyond our sensory data or phenomena. This is called the realm of noumena. However, we cannot know the noumenal realm as it is in itself, but we know only the phenomena as it appears to us.

According to Kant, the origins of God, morality, and free will might exist in the noumenal realm.

Laying the ground for metaphysics as a whole means unveiling the inner possibility of ontology. This is the true sense, because is the metaphysical sense (referring to metaphysics as the only theme) of what has been misinterpreted constantly under the heading of Kant's "Copernican Revolution."¹⁸ Here, Kant follows the problem of the possibility of ontology from an important question. The question is, "How is a priori synthetic judgment possible?" The interpretation of this formulation of the question makes it clear that the laying of the ground for metaphysics is carried out as a critique of pure reason. However, the question concerning the possibility of ontological knowledge requires its preliminary characterization. The *Critique of Pure Reason* does not give any system of transcendental philosophy. Rather it is a treatise on the method itself.

It is true that entire nineteenth century philosophy was excessively influenced by the philosophy of Kant and his successors namely, Schopenhauer, Schelling, Fichte and Hegel. All of them have circulated their own panoramic visions of German Idealism. However, this idealistic instinct is continued up to the early twentieth century. From many Kantian theorists, the point of departure from Kant is Kant's metaphysics and the role his metaphysics commitments play in his ethical theory. Kant struggled for a solution to the problem of how moral agents could be held responsible for their actions in a world governed by natural laws of cause and effect.¹⁹

Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* is the most decisive work of his career as well as the milestone of the history of modern western philosophy. His intension was not only to undermine the arguments of traditional metaphysics, but also to establish a scientific metaphysics of his own. Kant also put a limit to metaphysics that can be

known a priori, which is required for natural science. He must have tried to find a way of limiting the pretensions of the dogmatist's metaphysics and also defended systematic metaphysics as a science which is both possible and necessary. Kant thought that there can be a legitimate kind of metaphysical knowledge. Its aim is to draw the most general structures at work in our thought about the world.

According to Kant, metaphysics must follow the directions of its scientific predecessors to achieve a similar status. In this connection he points out that like logic, metaphysics must succeed scientific status by limiting itself. Like mathematics, metaphysics must consider its objects solely in terms of what is represented in them precisely as objects of our cognitive faculties. According to Kant, the effort to acquire metaphysical knowledge through concepts alone, is condemned to fail, for him, because concepts without intuitions are empty. Kant identifies metaphysics with an effort to develop knowledge of 'objects' conceived, but in no way it is given to us in experience. Finally, metaphysics must be closely connected with both the doctrines and the methods of modern physics. Metaphysics of Kant, like modern science must conceive of nature determined by a theoretical plan projected a priori through understanding and reason. Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* argues that metaphysics can be a science, if and only if its foundations are laid properly. It becomes possible only if it accepts certain limitations on our rational powers which are reasonably troublesome for human beings to believe.

According to Kant, the history of metaphysics had been a story of dogmatism versus skepticism. Dogmatists hold that metaphysics can answer certain questions about the origin of the universe, the existence of god, and the immortality of soul, on the basis of purely logical or conceptual considerations. Kant points out that metaphysics of the soul is generated by the demand for the absolute unity of the

thinking subject itself. On the other hand, skeptics are empiricists. For the skeptics there are no universal and necessary truths of fact. Here, reasoning alone is of no use in terms of answering questions about the existence or natures of things, in contrast to overcoming and experimenting. According to Kant, this fluctuating of dogmatism and skepticism was the effect of alternating over confidence and lack of confidence in the abilities of the human mind. Kant's critical philosophy is an effort to reveal what human knowledge should be like, and its inevitable limits.

Kant along with the empiricists philosopher were critical of both Aristotelian as well as rationalist conceptions of metaphysics, and argued that they tries to transcend the limits of human knowledge. Kant also advocated that there can be a legitimate kind of metaphysical knowledge. The aim of metaphysics is to describe the most general structures at work in our thought about the world. However, Kant's conception of metaphysics continues to enjoy popularity among contemporary philosophers, who insist that metaphysics has as its aim the characterization of our conceptual scheme or conceptual framework. The contemporary philosophers typically agreed with Kant and shared their view that the structure of the world as it is in itself is very difficult for us and the metaphysicians must be content to describe the structure of our thinking about that world.

There are two significant themes present in Kant's criticism of metaphysics. First, Kant seems to offer an explanation and review of the ideas of reason which is specific to each system. The theory of reason plays an important role in Kant's efforts to argue against the "hypostatization" of each of the ideas. Particularly, his criticism of the metaphysical disciplines focuses on his efforts to show that the ideas of reason, that is thought in accordance with the demand for the unconditioned and it has got incorrectly "hypostatized" by reason. For Kant, the prescription to strive for without

condition appears to reason as an objective principle. Therefore, the subjective idea appears to reason as objects existing in a way which is mind-independent.

Finally, Kant also seeks to expose the very specific formal fallacies which make ineffective the metaphysical arguments. It explains the positions in deferent case which are implicitly grounded in dialectical uses of terms and concepts, misapplications of principles, and conflation of appearances with things in themselves. Of course, this variety of aims and complaints certainly made Kant's discussions in the Dialectic more complicated. It also makes a productive and more perceptive criticism of metaphysics. The branch of metaphysics which is dedicated to this topic is known as Rational Psychology. Again, Rational Theology is the last part of metaphysics which was under attack. Kant's criticism of rational theology is difficult for his desire to explain the sources of the dialectical errors, which he will expose in relation to the specific arguments for the existence of God.

Form the above discussion; it becomes clear that Kant's criticism of metaphysics does not end with any simple rejection of the ideas and principles of reason. He thought that there can be a legitimate kind of metaphysical knowledge, which aim is to describe the most general structures at work in our intention in connection with the world. In this way, Kant's idea of metaphysics continues to experience popularity among the contemporary philosophers. According to them, metaphysics has its aim regarding the characterization of our conceptual framework. The contemporary philosophers characteristically admitted Kant that the structure of the world as it is in itself. Of course, it is very difficult to achieve for us and metaphysicians must be the subject matter to explain the structure of our thoughts about the universe.

Of course, the Kantian conception of metaphysics continues to enjoy popularity among the contemporary philosophers. In other words, his criticism of metaphysics is a complex issue, which is grounded in a considerably strong theory of human reason. Accordingly, he identifies reason as the place of certain principles and propensities, and certain 'illusions,' which cooperate with misuses of concepts and principles to create the mistakes that already exposed in the *Transcendental Analytic*. Here, Kant's target is to fix the subjective status of the ideas while spreading throughout the metaphysics that attends to them. Kant's criticism regarding his metaphysics at the same time, involves refusing the pure use of theoretical reason as an instrument for knowledge of transcendent objects, and he also defending reasons ideas as projections or goals which have some significant role to play in the overall project of knowledge of new development. In this sense, it can be pointed out that Kantian conception of metaphysics is not very much impressive; because in his concept of metaphysics there are problems with characterizing the world as it is, and there ought to be similar problems with describing our thought about the world as a whole.

4.3.7. Positivists View of Metaphysics

Positivism is a philosophical theory which maintains that positive knowledge is based on natural phenomena and their properties and relations. The term positivism was used first by Henri, Comte de Saint-Simon to designate scientific method and its extension to philosophy.²⁰ Positivism is a great philosophical movement which is prominent in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century. The important theses of positivism states that the science is the only valid knowledge and facts are the only possible objects of knowledge. According to the positivists, the philosophy does not possess a method different from science.

The Positivism is a philosophical theory which points that positive knowledge that is grounded on natural phenomena and their properties and relations. According to this theory, Positivism holds that valid knowledge (certitude or truth) is found only in this derived knowledge.²¹ Positivists also point out that the task of philosophy is to find the general ideology that is common to all the sciences. According to them, these ideologies are used as guides to human behavior and as the basis of social institute. Hence, information resulting from sensory experience, interpreted through reason and logic, forms the special source of all reliable knowledge. In this sense, the Positivists deny the existence or intelligibility of forces or substances that go beyond facts and the law ascertained by science. Positivists also oppose any kind of metaphysics. Positivism is a way of understanding which is based on science. For them any procedure of investigation that is not correct if it is not reducible to scientific method. People should not rely on the faith of god instead of believing the science behind humanity.

The positivists were influenced by the empiricism of Hume, also by the *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* of Wittgenstein (1889-1951), a work which purports to set bounds to the limits of meaningful language.²² It is also stated that metaphysics lies outside the restrictions and representing language that it has gone on holiday. While, denying the possibility of metaphysics, the positivists held that all of our true thought was empirical. According to them, anything straying beyond the use of scientific method also strayed beyond the boundaries of meaning. The metaphysical theses are not properly empirical. They seemed typically to be argued about from the armchair and to bear no visible relationship to scientific thought and experiment. Therefore, metaphysics theses are not only unscientific but also strictly meaningless, as because, they do not admit verification and falsification. Positivists argue that

instead of metaphysics, all that was left to philosophy was describing the correct methods and structures of empirical science.

There are two fundamental kinds of positivism, namely, social positivism and evolutionary positivism. Both the theories share the general idea of progress, but where as social positivism deduces progress from a consideration of society and history. Comte and J. S. Mill is the principal representative of social positivism. On the other hand, Evolutionary positivism deduces it from the field of physics and biology. Herbert Spencer was the principal representative of evolutionary positivism. *Mill's System of Logic* 1843, which is perhaps the most important work of nineteenth century positivism, contains a fundamental correction of Comte's view of science.²³ Again, evolutionary positivism shared the faith in progress of social positivism. But they have justified it in a different direction. Hence, evolutionary positivism is in its more religious form, as far from materialism as it is from spiritualism.

4.3.8. Logical Positivism and Metaphysics

In the first half of twentieth century, a new trend of philosophy came into existence popularly known as logical positivism. Logical Positivism was a new philosophical movement developed in Austria and Germany in 1920s. This movement was developed from the discussions of a group called the "Vienna Circle". With the establishment of the group Vienna Circle in 1928, this new trend of philosophy came into existence under the chairmanship of Moritz Schlick. It was a group of philosophers and scientists with a little philosophical knowledge combined in Vienna Circle and started to express their dissatisfaction with the philosophy which were mostly prevalent at that time. They were also known as logical empiricism or logical neo positivism. It is a movement of philosophy that combines empiricism, the idea that observational evidence is indispensable for knowledge of the world, with a

version of rationalism, the idea that our knowledge includes a component that is not derived from observation. The primary concern of this particular movement was the logical analysis of scientific knowledge, and also affirmed that statements about metaphysics, religion, and ethics are void of cognitive meaning. The Vienna Circle was very active in advertising the new philosophical ideas of logical positivism.

According to Logical Positivists, a statement is meaningful if and only if it can be proved true or false, at least in principle, by means of the experience or in virtue of its meaning. Moreover, they argued that the meaning of a statement is its method of its verification. This assertion of Logical Positivists is called the verifiability principle. In twentieth century it is generally believed that metaphysics deals with the problems that are beyond this physical world. Thus statements about metaphysics, religion and ethics are meaningless and must be rejected as nonsensical. They have rejected metaphysical speculations and attempted to reduce statements and propositions to pure logic. According to them, based on the verification principle, only the statements about mathematics, logic and natural sciences have a definite meaning. J. Weinberg in his book "*An Examination of logical Positivism*" has mentioned two principal aims of Logical Positivism. He said, "The official programme on which the Vienna Circle was first organized had two principal aims: to provide secure foundation for sciences and to demonstrate the meaninglessness of metaphysics."²⁴

There was a trend developed to reject metaphysical questions as meaningless in the early to mid twentieth century philosophy. The driving force behind this development was the philosophy of logical positivism as started by the Vienna Circle. At that time, a middle course between materialism and idealism was influenced by the American pragmatists. Another system-building metaphysics was introduced by A. N.

Whitehead and Charles Hartshorne, with a fresh inspiration from science. The mainstream of metaphysics in the nineteenth and early twentieth century was idealistic; metaphysicians responded to Kant by constructing systems meant to extend or deepen Kant's critical idealism.²⁵ The science had been making great advance during the period of idealism. At that period idealism was dominant in philosophy. During the 1920s, the arrival of a new generation scientific minded philosophers' led to a sharp decrease in the popularity of idealism. At that time, Bertrand Russell and G. E. Moore was the driving force of the analytical philosophy. Again, the theory of neutral monism was that theory with which Russell and William James tried to compromise between idealism and materialism. Of course, Logical Positivists idea of rejection of metaphysics can be attacked from different angles. One of them is the criteria by which metaphysics is rejected. The method by which positivists reject metaphysics is the theory of meaning. This theory is again based on the Principle of Verifiability. According to this principle of verification, a statement is said to be literally meaningful if and only if it is either analytic or empirically verifiable. The metaphysical statements are neither analytic nor empirically verifiable, so these statements are meaningless and thereby nonsense. In this sense, the positivist rejects metaphysics.

There were two main aspects of Logical Positivism. Of these two, one is positive and another is negative. In its positive aspect, Logical Positivism tried to make strengthen the foundation of sciences, just to make science free from metaphysical concept. According to them, foundation of science is to be prepared, purely on empirical principle. In its negative aspect Logical positivists tried to refute metaphysics. According to them, the traditional philosophy is futile as it has no meaning at all. Metaphysics is nonsense and it misleads people and therefore they

condemned it. According to Logical positivist, whatever is beyond our empirical proof has no meaning and no sense at all.

According to the logical positivists metaphysics has a special meaning. An assertion is metaphysical if it intends to make a statement of fact but fails to do so. In this sense, fails to have a meaning subsequently no observations count as evidence for or against it. This kind of special use of metaphysics is to be understood in the context of the belief of logical positivists. The logical positivists believed that traditional questions of metaphysics do have a point but a point that traditional formulation of the questions indistinct. Logical positivists likely to accept metaphysics in its conventional sense. They accept metaphysics as the name of a legitimate part of philosophy. The special use of metaphysics is to refer some pseudo informative assertions which are meaningless in reality.

There were a number of individuals as well as organizations who have advocated that most of metaphysics should be rejected. While, under the influence of logical positivism, the early analytic philosophers inclined to reject metaphysical theorizing. It was strengthened in the second half of the twentieth century. Again, A. J. Ayer and Rudolf Carnap, in the 1930s also argued that metaphysical statements are neither true nor false but meaningless. According to them, a statement is meaningful only if there can be empirical evidence for or against it. It is depends according to their verification theory of meaning. Another development that led to the revival of metaphysical theorizing were Quine's attack on the analytic-synthetic distinction, which was generally taken to undermine Carnap's distinction between existence questions internal to a framework and those external to it.²⁶

Again, the metaphysical issues are also introduced in the philosophy of language and logic. It occurs when it is suggested that a satisfactory theory of

meaning will have to put forward the existence of deliberate objects. In this way, any meaningful language will have to represent the structure of the world. Ludwig Wittgenstein, the prominent logical atomist introduced the idea that metaphysics could be inclined by theories of Aesthetics via Logic, via the world that is composed of “atomic facts”. He was having a metaphysical character of his own, inspired the strenuously anti-metaphysical attitude of the Vienna Circle. In other words, the works of P. F. Strawson and Quine guided a revival concept of traditional metaphysics. According to Strawson, metaphysics is an inquiry into the most general features of our thought about the world. Strawson calls it as our conceptual framework. He denies that descriptive metaphysics is simply a form of conceptual analysis.

Of course, there are so many objections against the theory of meaning and the principle of verifiability advocated by Logical Positivists. These objections are purely based on the analytic and synthetic classification of proposition. The critique points out that the theory of meaning is undoubtedly arbitrary and narrow in its nature. The metaphysical statements or propositions are very much different from our ordinary empirical statements. Hence, the principle of verification cannot be applied to these statements. This point is advocated by Ayer and points out that metaphysical statements are non sense. Here the term “non sense” is taken to mean that which is not sensory.

The ancient and medieval Philosophers thought that metaphysics has to be defined by its subject matter, as it is found in other disciplines of science. According to them, metaphysics is a science which studies “being as such” or “the first principle of the universe” or “things which are unchangeable.” But this definition of metaphysics is no longer acceptable because there are many philosophical problems such as, the problem of free will or the problem of mental and physical. These kind of

philosophical problems are not related to the first principle or unchanging things. However, these problems are considered as the problems of metaphysics.

According to Logical Positivists there is no reality beyond our sense perception. The metaphysical entities cannot be perceived through sense perception. But, the metaphysicians also believe that metaphysical entities are beyond our sense perception. Metaphysical entities cannot be acquired by reasoning and as such these are beyond our thought. The metaphysicians will also believe that metaphysics is a genuine study. Mere thought or reasoning alone cannot explain it because thought is discursive and it can comprehend its own concept only. They hold the view that the knowledge of metaphysical entities is derived through intuitive experience. They believe that apart from sense experience and reasoning, intuition is an independent source of knowledge.²⁷

4.3.9. Phenomenologist and Existentialists View of Metaphysics

Another major development in nineteenth century and twentieth century metaphysics, represented by phenomenologist and existentialists, agrees with Hegelians that metaphysics is not an observational science in any common sense and also agrees with systematically minded philosophers that a priori reasoning cannot establish anything about the nature of reality. Husserl and other phenomenologist's were intended a collaborative project for the investigation of the features and structure of consciousness which is common to all humans have developed it in connection with Kant's basis of his synthetic a priori on the uniform operation of consciousness. In this sense, both Phenomenology and Existentialism have been combined by a group of systematic philosophers of that time namely, Martin Heidegger and Jean Paul Sartre etc. These philosophers systematically attempted to express an intuitive

understanding of time, contingency, particularity, which are already experienced in human life.

On the other hand, Existentialists advocates that the subject of metaphysics is a reality. It cannot be described in an emotionally natural way. It is in some sense possessed or encountered in personal responsibility to a cause or in facing the certainty of one's own death. From the above analysis it becomes clear that the concept of Metaphysics should be concerned with the nature of reality. It should operate at a higher level of generality. The method of enquiry of metaphysic should be a priori and its means of expression is transparent. It should be capable of providing a foundation for all other enquiry into the nature of reality. But the very important question to deal with is that whether all of these which are desired to be captured within a single field of enquiry or not.

4.3.10. Modern Science and Metaphysics

There is a conflict between science and metaphysics which may best be expressed by the twentieth century philosophy. They are also known as positivism. They have believed in an empirical reality which can be discovered scientifically, in which the observer can be completely objective. Here, the life histories of the observer, his experiences, viewpoints, and interpretations do not influence the choice of methodology, data analysis, and strategy of theoretical development. According to them, truths can be discovered in the laboratory which are timeless and eternal and are valid no matter what happen in a particular situation. In this context, more important is the Positivist rejection of a transcendental reality. The positivists also played the role of debunker of pseudo-science and spiritual myths.

The positivists suggested the verifiability as a standard for justification of meaning. According to them, a statement is meaningful if and only if there is the possibility that it can be verified through empirical evidence which is derived exclusively from the senses. They also advocates that all valid statements are expressed with the rules of formal logic. To reduce logical statements to symbols the logical positivists used Symbolic logic, in which the propositions are absolutely either true or false. According to the logical positivists all of reality could be expressed in the form of logical statements. Positivism, and in particular logical positivism, is basically dependent on thoroughly abstract structures of the mind.

On the other hand, positivist psychologists also include the behaviorists and structuralists. The most prominent positivist philosophers of Vienna Circle were namely, Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Rudolf Carnap and G. E. Moore. These positivists took an atomistic and historical approach to science which preferred an anti-metaphysical persuasive speech and writings. Such persuasive speech and writings maintained that reality was composed of some completely separate units, where the parts were more real than the whole. The bridge between such disparate views of science may be found in Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn. “Our belief in any particular (scientific) law cannot have a safer basis than our unsuccessful critical attempts to refute it.”²⁸

Sir Karl R. Popper (1902-1994) was an Austria-born British philosopher of science. Popper is popularly known for his theory of scientific method and his criticism of historical determinism. Popper was not a member of the so-called “Vienna circle”. However, he was sympathetic towards the scientific attitude of Vienna circle. He was also critical of certain of their beliefs. Popper critiqued the positivists’ anti-metaphysical beliefs in particular.

Again, Karl Popper's metaphysical critique of positivism began with the critique of inductivism. Familiar with John Stuart Mill, whose principle of uniformity of nature was another possibility to David Hume's claim mainly, the contiguity leads to habitual views of cause and effect; and the resulting claim that the future may not resemble with the past. In this connection, Popper also criticized the positivist thinkers for an "uniformitarian's" use of induction, in which particulars were mistaken for universals and conversely. According to Popper, Positivist pseudo-universals are in fact multi-particulars. In this sense, Popper's views are ultimately more excellent and more metaphysical than the positivists. Again, Imre Lakatos maintained that all scientific theories have a metaphysical "hard core" essential for the generation of hypotheses and theoretical assumptions.²⁹ Accordingly, he also points out that scientific changes are associated with vast cataclysmic metaphysical revolutions.

Again, Thomas Kuhn was also another influential philosopher of science who was critical of the anti-metaphysical trends of positivism. According to Kuhn, science could be understood with the notion of the Paradigm. He points out that a Paradigm shift is a crisis between paradigms that occurs when previous theoretical constructs are no longer able to resist the competition of newer and some more practicable theories. In this way, an evolutionary model of science is maintained, where the "fittest" paradigm survives. Kuhn mentioned that, science is an important instrument for solving problems, but not for discovering truth. Thomas Kuhn's Paradigm theory of science is definitively stated in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962)*.³⁰

Again, probable prediction of Kuhn also appears closer to the metaphysical web revolving of the German idealists than any post-positivist idea of science. However, more than Popper and Kuhn, Heisenberg's principle which is most

damaged the absolutist anti-metaphysics of positivism. According to him, the exact position and exact velocity of a particle cannot be determined at the same time. Darwin's unawareness of metaphysics made it more complicated for him to respond to the critics because he could not readily grasp the ways in which their fundamental metaphysical views differed from his own.³¹

On the other hand, Whitehead advocates a smaller version of paradigm shift which leads us away from Cartesian duality toward a Platonic metaphysics. He introduces a novel idea of perception which offers a way out of Cartesian subjectivity. Whitehead newly described this as Process philosophy, whose historical roots were moved towards back to Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, and also merged with the prominent German Idealists, Goethe, Schilling, Emerson, and John Dewey. The first statement of Whitehead's metaphysics was *Science and Modern World* (1925). Again, another famous work, *Process and Reality* (1928) is considered as the 'Whiteheadian Bible'. It includes Whitehead's most mature and technical writings on his scientifically based metaphysical ideas. Whitehead also considered reality as to be God, or eternal objects in a perpetual state of becoming or transformation. Apart from this, Whitehead also claims that atoms are organisms. For him, nothing is inorganic, everything is alive. In this sense, Whitehead understood relativity physics as inter-relational. He contrasted this with Newton's concept of universe, which was made up of external relationships. Here, the relations do not affect the character of the terms. In chemistry, Gilbert Newton Lewis addressed the nature of motion, arguing that an electron should not be said to move when it has none of the properties of motion.³² Again, in contrast to this, relativity physics is made up of internal relationships, and the relations which affect the character of the terms changed by relations. Also, adherence to a deterministic metaphysics in the face of the challenge posed by the quantum-mechanical

uncertainty principle led physicists such as Albert Einstein to propose alternative theories that retained determinism.³³

A. N. Whitehead is famous for creating a metaphysics inspired by electromagnetism and special relativity.³⁴ Whitehead also described the space-time continuum and entities given by quantum physics in which each entity views the universe from its own perspective. Whitehead as like Plato also assumes a world which is understandable and valuable from bottom to top. But, the metaphysics of Whitehead inverts Platonism, which implies that the eternal forms are a potential, a possibility for Whitehead. He also points out that eternal objects are potentialities that participate in the world. Whitehead is prominent for creating a metaphysics motivated by electromagnetism and special relativity. His metaphysics is rather pantheistic, in which the God or nature struggles toward the best for the best, but always remains imperfect. According to Whitehead, God is in process which affirms a scale of values that include reflectivity, creativity, intelligence, and sensitivity. His idea of God is also similar to the quantum, that means a qualitative pulsation progressing toward greater temporal span and awareness.

The metaphysical understanding of Whitehead integrates a clear-cut structure which brings to stand quantum and relativity physics, ensuing in a purpose filled universe vectored towards the future. In the domain of physics, new metaphysical thoughts have arisen in association with quantum mechanics, where subatomic particles perhaps do not have the same sort of individuality as the particulars with which philosophy has usually been concerned. According to Whitehead, the metaphysics is happened to be nothing more or less than nature. He points out that nature is understood mainly by two principles. Firstly, everything in nature has some degrees of value, and secondly, everything in nature is influenced by its environment.

4.4. Metaphysically Grounded Human Nature

From the above discussion, we have found that the concept of metaphysics attempts to clarify the fundamental notions through which people understand the world. It primarily deals with the existence, objects and their properties, space and time, cause and effect, and possibility. Therefore, metaphysics has been commonly accessible as the most fundamental and also the most comprehensive kind of enquiries. It claims to be fundamental because a question about what there is or about the ultimate nature of things underlie all particular enquiries.³⁵ In this sense, the claim of metaphysics to be all-inclusive is more complex to justify. Here, just because of its extreme generality, metaphysics becomes comprehensive. Some philosophers, such as Amie Thomason, have argued that many metaphysical questions can be dissolved just by looking at the way we use words; others, such as Ted Sider, have argued that metaphysical questions are substantive, and that we can make progress toward answering them by comparing theories according to a range of theoretical virtues inspired by the sciences, such as simplicity and explanatory power.³⁶

The debates about human nature have resolved around the most basic questions of philosophy, since prehistoric times. The human nature can be regarded as both a foundation of norms of conduct or ways of life, as well as presenting obstacles or constraints on living a good life. It also causes humans to become what they become, and so it exists somehow independently of individual humans. There are so various contradictory views about human nature. There are multiple branches of humanities together form a significant domain of inquiry into human nature, and the question of what it is to be human.

There are deferent philosophers and scholars of deferent period generally who are inclined to discuss about human nature based on the main schools of thought from

the human history. In this connection, a study of some of the important metaphysical theories which influenced the concept of human nature has a vital role to play. For example, the ancient and medieval thinkers aspired for the metaphysics of human nature, Modern Philosophy as rationalist and empiricist metaphysics of human nature, Kant association of human nature and metaphysics, the metaphysical commitment of scientific realism. On the other hand, the sciences concerned with humanity split up into more particular branches, many of the key figures of this evolution expressed influential understandings about human nature. Amongst them Charles Darwin gave a widely accepted scientific argument, Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, famously referred to the hidden pathological character of typical human behavior and E. O. Wilson's sociobiology defined human nature as a collection of epigenetic rules, the genetic patterns of mental development. In the present study, an effort has been made to discuss some of the important theories of human nature which are also grounded metaphysically, which also reflects the indication of invariable abidingness of human nature in the respective metaphysical principles.

4.4.1. Greek Metaphysics of Human Nature

Socrates (469-399) was a great Athenian figure. Being a rationalist philosopher he believed that the best life and the life most associated to human nature involved reasoning. Socrates emphasized the relevance of living honorably or justly to the idea of living well.³⁷ Socrates turned his philosophy from the study of the heavens to study of the human things. He has studied the question how a person should live best live. Socratic approach on the subject of human nature generally considered to be a teleological approach which came to be dominant by late classical and medieval periods. This approach understands human nature in terms of final and formal causes. Such understandings of human nature perceive this nature as an 'idea', or 'form' of a

human. In this sense, human nature really causes humans to become what they become. So, human nature exists somehow independently of individual humans. It has sometimes understood as a special connection between human nature and the divinity. The most influential version of the traditional theory of human nature views the primarily as a thinker capable of reasoning. This view is illustrated in the thought and writing of the great philosopher Plato.

Greek philosopher, Plato (427-347) occupies an important place among the non-religious theories of human nature. In the different field of philosophy, the theories of the ancient Greeks, especially of their great philosophers namely Plato and Aristotle still influence us today. Plato being one of the pioneers to argue that the open minded but systematic use of our reason can show human beings the best way to live. According to him, the only answer to individual and social problems is a clear conception of human virtue and happiness, which is based on a true understanding of human nature. Plato also emphasized the social aspect of human nature. We are not self-sufficient, we need others, and we benefit from our social interactions, from other persons talents, aptitudes, and their friendship. Plato retained Socratic faith in rational inquiry; he was convinced that it was possible to attain knowledge of deep lying truths about the world and about human nature and to apply this knowledge for the benefit of human life.³⁸

The *Republic* of Plato is the most famous dialogue. It develops many of the great philosophical issues including what the best form of government. It also develops what is the best life to live, the nature of knowledge, as well as family, education, psychology and many more. It also expounds Plato's theory of human nature. Plato held that the truth about human nature involved knowledge of another world of reality. In his *Republic*, Plato gives an outline of an ideal human society.³⁹

But the central argument of *Republic* is at least as much about individual human nature and virtue. The most important role in Plato's theory of human nature and society is played by the moral application of the theory of Forms. In fact, the theory of Form is one of the first and greatest expressions of the hope through we can attain reliable knowledge about the world as a whole. It also provides us reliable knowledge about the goals and proper conduct of human life and society. According to Plato, man is a rational as well as social animal. He liked to identify our nature with reason, and our souls, as opposed to our bodies. For Plato, we have a philosopher soul, a guardian or warrior soul, or an artisan soul. Who am I is depends upon what kind of a soul I have. In this way we should play a general role in the society. Our success or failure in life solely depends upon in what sort of society we live. For Plato, human life needs to be political. It should be spent in the discovery of the proper manner in which sociality ought to be organized, and also in the practical implementation of that ideal in our own societies. Plato points out that we are rational and social creatures in the society. We must live in the real or ideal society in order to become what we really are. Essence is grasped by rational analysis, as it is separate from change.

Plato is a dualist. For him, there is both immaterial mind and material body. It is the soul that knows the forms. The soul exists before birth and after death. He believed that the soul or mind attains knowledge of the forms, as opposed to the senses. According to Plato, there are thus three different aspects to our mental nature. When these three aspects are not in harmony we experience mental conflict. Emotion or passion can be on the side of either reason or the appetites. We might be pulled by passionate love, lustful appetite, or the reasoned desire to find the best partner. We should care more about our soul rather than our body. He believed that we are essentially immaterial souls and our distinctively rational nature lies beyond scientific

investigation. According to Plato, the human soul exists before our birth. The soul is indestructible and will exist internally after death. Again, in the *Phaedo*, Plato presents a number of other arguments that the human soul must persist after the death of the body. In his *Philebus* and the *Laws*, Plato also advocates human nature as divided into two ways between reason and pleasure. Of course in the *Gorgias* and *Protagoras* he says more about pleasure. The remaining feature of his theory of human nature is that we are ineradicably casual to live in a society. It is a nature of human beings. For Plato, human individuals are not self-sufficient. Each of us has many different needs which we cannot meet by ourselves. What is good or bad for us depends on our human nature, the complex factors in our psychological makeup.

Although Plato did not think reason as the sole constituent of human nature, he accepted it as the highest part of human nature. Based on which part dominates, we get three kinds of people, whose main desires are knowledge, power and wealth respectively. Plato holds that humans can control their appetites and their aggressive impulses by the use of their reason. Plato used his own image of the charioteer (reason) who tries to control horses representing emotions and appetites. Plato also emphasized the spiritual aspect of human nature. He says that reason uses the spirit or will to control the appetites. Nowadays we usually divide these as reason, appetite, and will. Plato also emphasized the social aspect of human nature. We are not self-sufficient, we need others, and we benefit from our social interactions, from other persons talents, aptitudes, and their friendship.

According to Aristotle (384-322), the philosophical study of the human nature itself originated with Socrates, who twisted philosophy from study of the heavens to study of human things. For him, compared to other animals, reason is not the only quality that is most special about humanity. Reason is also the power of human.

Human nature is an example of a formal cause. Aristotle's view is differs from Plato in many ways. Aristotle advocated that human reason can discover the truth about human nature and how we ought to live. For him the truth about human nature required only knowledge of our own world. In the philosophy of Aristotle, the idea of the good for human beings is best described by the term *eudemonia*.⁴⁰ Here, Aristotle finds the relevant meaning of the notion of the good in the study of 'human nature' and also of worldly existence. In his naturalistic theory, Aristotle also clearly explained an understanding of things in human beings in terms of their goals which they want to pursue and the functions that they are designed to perform.

According to Aristotle, man is a rational as well as a social animal. He believed both body and soul were parts of our nature. Without a society, we wouldn't 'be' human but a God or a beast. For him the self is also something we realize by the specific way we actualize our natural potentialities which is predominated by virtues or vices. Aristotle points out that rationality are our nature, because rationality is our natural function or telos. Telos is its nature of a thing. Rationality sets us apart from other animals, it makes us human. Natural things achieve success in life by fulfilling their function or telos. Unlike animals, we must choose our course and life. Therefore, the basic human demand is determining the correct choice.

From the above study it becomes clear that Both Plato and Aristotle emphasis reason as the most important feature of our human nature. Reason is certainly more important than our desires and aggressiveness. According to them, reason is that what is unique in human beings. It makes us unique and different from all other animals.

4.4.2. Rationalist Metaphysics of Human Nature

Rationalism is the theory according to which reason or intellect is the main, if not the only source of valid knowledge.⁴¹ According to rationalism, the human self is

essentially active and rational and our sensations are accidental. Our knowledge is actively produced by the self out of its own inner ideas with the help of reason. In this sense, reason is the true essence of the self.

The word 'rationalism' is often loosely used to describe an outlook to state the basic features of some eighteenth century thinkers of Enlightenment, specifically in France. Here, the word rationalistic is often used as a term of criticism which is to refer superficial or an extremely simple and trusting view of human nature. In this sense, the spirit of rationalism is specifically associated with certain popular philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, Socrates and Plato were the earliest rationalistic philosophers. According to them, true knowledge originates in reason.

The rationalist philosophers differ amongst themselves regarding the proper function of sense experience. But it is considered by all rationalists that our knowledge derived through the exercise of reason unaided by observation. It is absolutely certain and perfect. True knowledge must be universal and necessary, according to the rationalists' philosopher. Descartes being a thorough going rationalist divided ideas into three kinds. They are adventitious ideas, factitious ideas and innate ideas. The innate ideas according to him are clear and distinct and implanted in the human mind by God at the time of his or her birth. Rationalism formulated by Socrates and Plato became increasingly articulate and popular in the philosophies of Renee Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz.

A. Descartes View of Human Nature

The first philosophical figure of the modern European era was Renee Descartes (1596-1650). Descartes' rationalist system of philosophy is found as the

foundational for the Enlightenment. Being the French philosopher, mathematician and a great scientist he has also committed to establish the sciences upon a reliable metaphysical ground. Descartes have employed his famous method of doubt for this purpose and exemplifies an opinion of characteristic of the Enlightenment. He points out that the investigator in foundational philosophical research ought to be doubted all propositions which can be doubted as well. In this way, Descartes puts forward to this problem which is depends on our prior and certain knowledge of regarding God. He also argued that all human knowledge is not only the knowledge of the material world which is depending on the metaphysical knowledge of God. Hereafter, Descartes' grounding of physics and all knowledge is in a relatively simple and elegant rationalist metaphysics. It provides a model of a complete strict and secular system of our knowledge.

According to Rene Descartes, the ability to reason of man is the very proof of his existence. In his *Discourse on Method* in 1637, Descartes advocated the notion of "Cogito, ergo sum" which means "I think, therefore I am." Descartes rejected all forms of intellectual authority except the conclusions of his own thought, which he then used to prove the existence of God. Descartes also argues the actual nature of mind and body, and their relation to each other, both in terms of human being in a unified world view. Descartes claims that matter is motionless. Now, there is a question regarding the actual source of motion and the nature of causality in the physical world.

Descartes expanded Plato's ideas, describing people as thinking spirits. According to Descartes, human being is an immaterial mind. The essential nature of the mind is its conscious ability to think. This mind which has its conscious ability to think is very different from the body where it resides. Being one of the

iconic personalities in the seventeenth century scientific revolution and a path founder of the modern scientific method, Descartes systematically explains the traditional view of human nature. In the analysis Descartes mentioned that a human is composition of two different kinds of things, one is a material body and the other is an immaterial mind or 'soul'. The metaphysical account of human nature as consisting of body and mind is one of the most importance of his philosophy. According to Descartes, body and mind are two distinct but interacting substances, which can exist separately without the other. Therefore, every human being is having selves that are immaterial and essentially conscious. This self can exist without the body, which is material and essentially conscious.

Elaborating the concept of human nature and preparing the way for the increased interest in ethics and human behavior that is typical of modern thought, Descartes has shifted his focus of philosophy from metaphysics toward the human self. According to him, since our bodies aren't required for thinking, we are thinking spirits or thinking substances. Descartes advocates that our body occupies a separate space and it is subject to the same laws of nature that science studies. But the body does not have any kind of mental properties. According to him, it is our mind or soul which can only think, feel, perceive and decide what to believe and what to do in our life. In this sense, the soul is incorporeal. It is not made up of matter. The soul or self does not occupy any space. For him the soul cannot be studied by the scientific methods.

Descartes was thus led to make an absolute distinction between humans possessing souls and other animals, who in his view lack all consciousness, even sensations, perceptions or emotions.⁴² In his great work *Discourse on Method* (1637), Descartes gives a preliminary exposition of the ideas of human nature. Here Descartes

argues that whatever else one may doubt, one cannot doubt his or her own existence as a conscious being. Again in his another great work, *The Meditation*, Descartes argued how he thinks the immateriality of the soul can be proved by reason. In his part-V of the *Discourse*, again Descartes developed another empirically based argument for dualism which also explains the behavior of human and animal. He argued that there is a sharp distinction of kind rather than degree between the innate mental faculties of humans and all other creatures, picking out language as a distinctive component of human rationality.⁴³

Accordingly, Descartes also developed the notion of 'Angelism' by making human beings as angels. Gilbert Ryle, another great critique of Descartes, described this notion of Descartes' human by pointing out it as the "ghost in the machine." The self is the mind or consciousness. I cannot doubt the existence of my mind or consciousness, but, I can doubt the existence of my own body. In the 6th chapter of his great work, '*Meditation*', Descartes argued that mind-body union is constituted by what the scholastics called a 'substantial union'. It is the union that form (mind) has with matter (body). According to Descartes, this kind of substantial union produces a whole that is more than the sum of its parts. The capacity for modes of sensation and voluntary bodily movements are new properties of the whole, which essentially combined mind and body. Therefore, the 'Cartesian' problem of mind-body efficient causal interaction is not accepted as a whole, since the efficient causal occurrences between mind and body does not play any role while explaining the existence of these modes.

In this way, Descartes separates the human mind from the body and also establishes that there is life after death. Our success in life acquiring certainty and that requires the correct use of our thinking powers. According to Descartes, this kind of

enterprise is ultimately an individual one, undertaken outside of society, and outside of nature. He points out that our self is autonomous, but alienated. This is a philosophical approach towards our life. Our life presents us so many pieces of 'knowledge'. Our primary duty is that we must approach it with the method of radical doubt in order to find out what is certain and what to believe. In this sense the foundational certainty is one's own existence. Apart from the self, everything else in our life is less certain, including the existence of God. Rather we can infer that God exists, and through that the rest of the world only from our existence and its characteristics.

B. Spinoza's view of Human Nature

Again, the systematic rationalist metaphysics of Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) is very important in this enlightenment period. In his book *Ethics* (1677), Spinoza partially, in response to the problems in the Cartesian system is also an important basis for Enlightenment thought of that period. In contrast to the Cartesian dualism, Spinoza also develops an ontological monism, according to which there is not only one *kind* of substance, but also one substance that is God or nature, with two attributes, corresponding to mind and body. Spinoza's rationalist principles also lead him to assert a strict determinism and to deny any role to final causes or teleology in explanation.⁴⁴

C. Leibnitz's View of Human Nature

The rationalistic metaphysics of W. Leibniz (1646–1716) is also fundamental for the development of Enlightenment. An indefatigable politician and courtier, Leibniz established the Academy of Berlin, wrote fluently in French, German and Latin, and developed a philosophical system of astonishing power and originality. It

provided the basis of German academic philosophy throughout the century that followed upon till his death. The German Enlightenment philosopher, Leibnizean rationalist system influenced Christian Wolff to a great extent. In this period of development, Leibniz also communicates, and places as the head of metaphysics. He introduced the great rationalist principle, and the principle of sufficient reason. Through this principle Leibniz advocates that everything that exists has a sufficient reason for its existence.

4.4.3. Empiricist Metaphysics of Human Nature

The eighteenth century philosophical movement in Great Britain is mainly signified by the British Empiricism. The British Empiricist advocated that all of our knowledge comes from sense experience. The empiricists also rejected the concept of innate ideas advocated by the Rationalists, another group of advocator of knowledge and argued that our knowledge is based on both sense experience and internal mental experiences, such as emotions and self-reflection. Three prominent philosophers of west were associated with British Empiricism. These Philosophers were namely, John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume. Of course, the nineteenth century philosopher J.S. Mill is also joined with this later on. In this context, we will discuss Locke and Hume and their metaphysical understanding of human nature.

A. Locke's View of Human Nature

Again, John Locke (1632–1704) was another major English political philosopher of the seventeenth century. Locke received the prestigious education throughout his early stage and remained involve in academics after graduation. He is considered generally as the founder of Enlightenment movement in philosophy. Being an optimistic English political philosopher, Locke argued for the essentially good

nature of individual. His early writing emphasizes on the religious intolerance and negative arguments which were spoiled England severely at that period of time. John Locke in his great book, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), brings tremendous influence on the development of enlightenment. It has displayed the epistemological harshness, which is at least implied as anti-metaphysical. In his rejection of innate ideas, Locke goes beyond the rationalist thinker Rene Descartes, by developing a profoundly anti-teleological idea of 'human nature', with respect to both knowledge and morality. Locke, in this work undertakes to examine the human understanding in order to determine the limits of human knowledge. Thereby, Locke has tried to establish a well-known pattern of Enlightenment epistemology.

In his later works such as *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), Locke expressed his optimistic idea that human mind is like a blank slate. So, man can subsequently learn and improve through conscious effort. Again, Locke followed with another great work for which he is even known better, *Two Treatises of Government* (1690). This famous work of Locke was extremely influential; especially the second treatise of him is still considered the foundation for modern political thought. It is generally accepted that the philosophy of Enlightenment is divided into the Philosophy of Enlightenment in England and in France and Germany. So, it is normally called as the British Empiricism and its development. Apart from this, we also examine the Philosophy of Enlightenment and its movement with the special importance of the period in France and Germany.

John Locke, a generation after, developed a completely different view of the basic nature of humankind, which he saw as good that is coming from the mind. John Locke developed a more optimistic view of human nature accepting humans as good, rational, social, cooperative and tolerant, at least in a particular state of nature. Locke

also believed in an inevitably new equality of all individuals, male and female, in the state of nature, where everybody had a right to autonomy and freedom. “The organization of the State evolved as a result of free individuals consenting to be governed by an abstract authority in the interests of protecting private property.”⁴⁵

Locke’s philosophy of empiricism also saw human nature as a tabula rasa. According to him human mind is at birth a “blank sheet” without rules, so data are added and rules for processing them are formed solely by our sensory experiences.⁴⁶ Locke also accepted that every individual rationally follows happiness and pleasure. It promotes co-operation, so that in the long run individual and the general welfare occupies the same place. Locke holds individual mind as the beginning, blank and empty. In terms of the mind and knowledge, it gains ideas through experience. Knowledge could be increased by further experience, and the mind collects these impressions. According to Locke, women are having “natural differences” from men. The property rights were an extremely important individual right for Locke. He also points out that there are natural differences between men and women. For Locke, property rights should be extended to women, which thus deny women equality.

B. Hume’s Theory of Human Nature

Again, another British philosopher, David Hume (1711-1776) was an influential figure of the eighteenth century movement of thought in the Enlightenment philosophy. David Hume proposed to reform the traditional thoughts and practices. It is done by the application of reason to human affairs through his writings. Being a thoroughgoing empiricist, Hume also advocates that all our knowledge about the world must be based on experience. In the introduction of the *Treatise*, Hume maintains that scientific advance will come only through an accurate and comprehensive conception of human nature. His *Treatise* is significantly subtitled

“An Attempt to Introduce the Experimental (i.e. Experimental or Empirical) Method of reasoning into Moral Subjects.”⁴⁷

David Hume was a critic of the over simplifying and systematic approach of Hobbes, Rousseau and some others thinkers of that time. These thinkers were pointed out that all human nature is assumed to be driven by variations of selfishness. In this context, Hume observed that humans are distinguished by their own capacity for benevolence. Hume advocated that our feelings of benevolence and sympathy are universal tendencies of human nature. Human being has a natural concern for the welfare of others. They only they care about themselves. In this sense, Hume advocated self love as a powerful principle of human nature.

Hume also accepted that for many economic and political subjects, people could be assumed to be driven by such simple self-interest. He praised that some philosophers in England, who have begun to put the science of man on a new grip and declared his purpose to build upon their effort. Hume also points out that no philosopher would apply himself so earnestly to the explaining the ultimate principles of the soul. It establishes Hume, as a great master in that very science of human nature. Hume also pretends to explain what is naturally satisfactory to the mind of man. He farther believed that our concept of human nature is the proper focus of the philosophers. For him the very first principles of human nature necessarily carry over to every human endeavor, cognitive and conative alike. A careful and exact experiments, and the observation of the particular effects based on different circumstances and situations can only leads to the exact nature of human nature.

4.4.4. Enlightenment View of Metaphysics of Human Nature

The eighteenth-century Enlightenment thought also popularly known as the Age of Reason. The Scientific Revolution had provided a new model in the seventeenth century, to solve the problems through rational thought and experimentation. This revolution came to an end in the seventeenth century with the publication of Sir Isaac Newton's universal laws of motion in 1687. Like Descartes, Newton also presented a vision of the universe, of which most basic workings could be calculated and understood rationally.

The age of Enlightenment is the age in which the humans became overconfident in respect of human reason and rationality. At this age, something which cannot be understood by our rational knowledge and the current status of sciences was defied as meaningless or superstitious. Preceding and setting the stage for the Enlightenment were writers and scientists who investigated the natural world and systems of thought, writers such as Galileo (Italian), Newton (English), Francis Bacon (1561-1626, English), René Descartes (1596-1650, French). Enlightenment writers include Hobbes, Locke, Diderot, Montesquieu, and Rousseau -the French writers were sometimes called the philosophers. The leading representatives were religious skeptics, political reformers, cultural critics, historians and social theorists.⁴⁸ The Enlightenment philosophers advocated human reason as dominant in contrast to the systems of thought where the sacred had played a dominating role. According to Enlightenment, all aspects of human life are appropriate for examination and study. The Enlightenment was a new system of human inquiry which put emphasis and faith on science, the scientific method and education. All social obstacles to human perfectibility were to be progressively eliminated.⁴⁹

The Enlightenment thinkers thought that people could understand and control the world by means of reason and empirical research. According to these thinkers, social laws could be discovered and society could be improved by means of rational and empirical inquiry. Concerning the basic nature of human beings, some leading thinkers claimed that people are inherently good and that their desire for pleasure, if guided by reason, can lead them to the good life. Other Enlightenment thinkers, however, asserted that humans are inherently neither good nor evil but are made good or evil by the environment in which they live.⁵⁰ The most important idea of Enlightenment was that every people can reason and think for themselves. Hence, people should not unconsciously believe what an authority expresses.

Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) was the first major figure in the English Enlightenment. Being a pessimistic English political philosopher, Hobbes argued that man in his natural state is selfish and savage and therefore a single absolute ruler is the best form of government. Hobbes was popularly known for his epic *Leviathan* (1651), an excessively long, new and innovative work which explores human nature. In *Leviathan*, he has elaborated on the nature of man and justifies its absolutist rule. He also argued that human nature is inherently bad. Hobbes mentioned that men were motivated primarily by the strong wish for power and by fear of other men, and so needed an all powerful sovereign to rule over them. He described their lives without a strong ruler as solitary, nasty, poor, brutish, and short. According to Hobbes, men were ultimately selfish and competitive.

Again, John Locke (1632–1704) was another major English political philosopher of the seventeenth century. Locke argued for the essentially good nature of individual. In his rejection of innate ideas, Locke goes beyond the rationalist thinker Rene Descartes, by developing a profoundly anti-teleological idea of ‘human

nature', with respect to both knowledge and morality. Locke, in this work undertakes to examine the human understanding in order to determine the limits of human knowledge. John Locke developed a more optimistic view of human nature accepting humans as good, rational, social, cooperative and tolerant, at least in a particular state of nature.

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) was a Swiss-born French philosopher, writer, and a great teacher. Rousseau was treated as one of the major influences on western thought, and an important Enlightenment writer in French. Rousseau is best known for the concepts of the social contract and the state of nature. He stated "Man is born free; and everywhere he is in chains."⁵¹ Rousseau advocated an optimistic view of human nature. According to him, man is perfectible. Rousseau points out that human beings are generally isolated in a state of nature, but with the development of co-operation a society starts to develop. It is society which creates inequality and war. According to him, all men in a state of nature are free and equal. In a state of nature, men are "Noble Savage". Men are not born evil, but they are corrupted by society and gradually moved towards evil. Rousseau would attribute the first condition to 'human nature' in its 'natural' state, while portraying the second as a product of social life. Rousseau in his "*Discourse on Inequality*," discussed thoroughly his ideas on the fundamental nature of man, along with the idea of the origin of society, private property and conflict. According to Rousseau, to define 'human nature' we have to think about what humans would have been like before society.

However, there were Smith and Hutcheson along with few other thinkers who were ready to attribute social feelings to human nature. Smith may have got the original idea from Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*. Another very significant group of Enlightenment Philosopher was the German Enlightenment. The German

Enlightenment includes Christian Wolff, Moses Mendelssohn, G.E. Lessing and Immanuel Kant. Christian Wolff (1679-1754) was one of the most important philosophers in the German Enlightenment Movement. Wolff was known for the systematization and vulgarization of Leibniz's philosophy. However, he never accepted Leibniz's concept of monad which Wolff interpreted as material atoms. But, only in connection of the mind-body relationship Wolff admitted the Leibniz' the principle of pre-established harmony. Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), on the other hand, is considered as one of the most beautiful blossoms of Enlightenment age. Of course, Mendelssohn was popularly known and more highly respected than his contemporary, Immanuel Kant during that time. Again, G. E. Lessing (1729-1781) is considered as the most promising figure of the German Enlightenment. His special contribution in the philosophy of religion consists in interpreting the trinity-unity more speculatively and also apply Leibniz' concept of development to the pre-established religion and theology. In this connection, Lessing was looking forward towards the philosophy of Hegel.

Francis Bacon (1561–1626) was the great founder of the empiricist development. Though his work belongs to the Renaissance, Bacon undertook its effect in the sciences, which inspires and influences Enlightenment thinkers. The Enlightenment, as the age in which experimental natural science developed and established its own status also appreciated Bacon as “the father of experimental philosophy.” Again, one of the prominent names in the early Philosophes was Voltaire. In his great work ‘*Candide*’, it is found that Voltaire (1694-1778) have discussed about a feeling of repulsion against large authority figures, particularly especially those in the church at that time. In his thought, we can observe this by the countless scorns of the ordained churchman and their escapades with thievery and

other corruption. In this sense, Voltaire has shown that human being blindly follow someone with a good rep. Denis Diderot (1713-1784) was a French Philosopher, writer, art critic and a prominent figure. Diderot also explores contemporary theories of medicine and biology through his important writings. He also and strictly maintains his idea of an enlightened humanity and of the re-establishment of the rights of human dignity which he believed characterized our 'human nature.' Again, Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1799), an English author and feminist wrote *The Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), was the one of the first great feminist documents. She lived in France during much of the French Revolution. Wollstonecraft adopts the "liberal model of the rational, self-determining individual."⁵² Wollstonecraft did not perceive women as something different from men by nature. Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790), another great thinker of Enlightenment period expressed his believed in democracy and religious freedom. According to Franklin, human should be as useful and as perfect as possible. He also believed in constant self improvement of human because of their reason and progress.

4.4.5. Kantian Thought on Human Nature

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was undoubtedly the most influential philosopher of the modern era. Being a champion of reason and humanity, He perceived the Enlightenment as a defining moment in human development. Kant characterized the Enlightenment in terms of courage and innovative, announcing its motto, 'dare to know', after the Roman poet Horace. Immanuel Kant, the great German philosopher, Kant defines 'Enlightenment' as the release of humankind from its self-incurred immaturity. Being the reputed father of nineteenth-century Idealism, Kant points out that immaturity is the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of other. It means, the enlightenment is the process of undertaking to think for one. It

is to employ and rely on one's own intellectual capacities in determining what to believe and how to act. Kant, like many of his contemporary philosophers in Germany, was exceptionally influenced first by Hutcheson and Hume, but most effectively by Rousseau. He read the remarks of Rousseau on the dignity of ordinary 'human nature'.

Immanuel Kant In his two great works namely, "*Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*" (1798) and "*Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*" (1793), has developed his idea of human nature.⁵³ In his late work *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*, Kant continued to wrestle with the most profound problems of human nature. He talks of the radical evil in human nature, using almost biblical language. For him what is radically evil is not our naturally given desires. It is not the tension between these desires and duty. Kant calls it rather the depravity of human nature. While philosophizing about human nature, Kant also rightly transformed Rousseau's idea on human nature, culture, education and history. He advocated his noble philosophy of treating all persons with equal respect. Unfortunately Kant did not accepted women or member of non-white races, as fully rational persons with equal civic rights.

According to Kant, the respect for all rational beings implies the recognition of the rights and needs of all human beings. In this regard Kant was mostly influenced by the Judeo-Christian ideal of love for one's neighbor. There is a "radical evil" in human nature. This radical evil according to Kant, consist in the tendency to prefer one's own interests over those of everyone else. Of course this is consistent with saying that we also have a potential for goodness and love. Among the living beings that live in the globe, man is easily notable from all other natural beings by his technical inclination for manipulating things by his pragmatic tendency, and by the

mental inclination in his being. And out of these three levels any one can itself already differentiate man characteristically from the other populations of the globe.

4.4.6. Modern Empirical Science on Human Nature

Modern empirical science, through its various theoretical positions of realism, would tell us that human nature is an empirical knowledge constituted continuum of knowledge, which can be scientifically altered unendingly. As it has been mentioned in connection with scientific metaphysics, the scientific or critical realism, advocates that existence of object does not depend upon knowledge in any way, that object is possessed of qualities and is directly known. Scientific realism is a positive epistemic attitude towards the content of our best theories and models, recommending belief in both observable and unobservable aspects of the world described by the sciences. The entities described by the scientific theory exist objectively and mind-independently. This is the metaphysical commitment of scientific realism. It is an affirmative epistemic approach towards the content of our best theories and models, recommending belief in both observable and unobservable aspects of the world described by the sciences. This epistemic approach has important metaphysical and semantic scope, and these different commitments are contested by a number of rival epistemologies of science, which is known collectively as forms of scientific antirealism.

Metaphysically, realism as a theory is committed to the mind-independent existence of the world that is investigated by the sciences. According to Scientific or critical realism, the existence of object does not depend upon knowledge in any way, rather the objects are possessed of qualities and are directly known. In this way, the things are described by the scientific theory exist objectively and independently from the knowing mind. This is the metaphysical assurance of scientific realism. Now, it is

important to note in this connection that human convention in scientific taxonomy is compatible with mind-independence. For example, though Psillos⁵⁴ ties realism to a ‘mind-independent natural-kind structure’ of the world, Chakravartty⁵⁵ argues that mind-independent properties are often conventionally grouped into kinds.⁵⁶ On the other hand, naive realism is a common sense theory of perception. The Naive realists claim that the world is much attractive as common sense would have it. They advocate that objects are independent of our knowing mind. The objects are accurately same what it is seen to be.

As the sciences concerned with humanity split up into more specialized branches, many of the key figures of this evolution expressed influential understandings about human nature. There are so many different varieties of thinkers since the raise of modern science in the seventeen century, who has tried to apply the methods of science to human nature. The prominent thinkers amongst them were Hobbes, Hume and the French thinkers of the eighteenth century Enlightenment. Of course, more recently, Charles Darwin’s (1809-1882) theory of evolution have fundamentally affected our understanding of ourselves. Darwin is very much crucial to all theorizing about human nature. In his great classic, “*The Descent of Man*”, published in 1871 Darwin expressed his speculation on the development of human moral and intellectual faculties. In this book he has developed an evolutionary approach to the human nature. While explaining this theory, Darwin advocated a commonly well accepted scientific argument that humans and other animal species do not any truly fixed nature, at least in the very long term. In this way Darwin has given a new way of understanding in modern biology and pointed out that human nature exist in a normal human time-frame, and also shown how it is caused.

The idea developed by Darwin is very much significant and from this the concept of human nature has become historically important. According to this idea each human being shares with every other human being but with nothing else some essential human making feature. This idea also long back mentioned by Aristotle. According to Aristotle each and every species was defined by an essence. A species was a set of properties found in each individual of the species. That essence makes it the sort of creature that it is. So, there is no such uniformity as like human blood type or eye color found in human moral feelings, mental abilities or fundamental desires. In addition to this, from the theory of Darwin's evolution it becomes that human nature is not special, but the continuation of a biological nature which is common to all species. Of course, despite all the evidences, the idea that man has a special place in the universe is still continue.

Again, Sigmund Freud, a twentieth century psychologist has revolutionized our understanding of human nature through his psychoanalytic speculations. In that period, psychology has established itself as an independent branch of empirical science. Psychology at that time was institutionally demarcated from its early philosophical ancestry. Psychological understanding of the question of human nature is very much important for us to have a proper scientific understanding of the concept. Most academic psychologists have been chary of talking as general as 'Human nature'. Being the founder of Psychoanalysis, Freud, popularly referred to the hidden pathological character of typical human behavior. According to Freud human nature is essentially in conflict consisting of an unconscious mind i.e. our old biological instincts transformed in the name of civilization, an Ego and the Superego. He believed that aggression was a major element of human nature which enables survival, but that is sometimes accompanied by violence.

Another important ambitious theory of human nature that presents a challenge to moral philosophy is developed by a Harvard biologist Edward. O. Wilson. In his book '*Sociobiology*' Wilson defines human nature as "The systematic study of the biological basis of all forms of social behavior in all kinds of organisms, including man."⁵⁷ Wilson has developed his idea which is closely associated with evolutionary psychology. He also offered some scientific arguments against the tabula rasa hypothesis of John Locke and Rousseau in connection with human nature. In his another book *Consilience: the Unity of Knowledge* (1998), Wilson also elaborately discussed the concept of human nature. In his writings Wilson has proposed for a kind of cooperation of all the sciences to explore the concept of human nature. He farther advocated that human nature is a collection of epigenetic rules, the genetic patterns of mental development. Our cultural phenomena and rituals are not the part of human nature. They are merely products.

Again, an alternative kind of materialist view of human nature is Behaviorism. Being developed as a school of psychology, Behaviorism is restricted to the study of humans and particularly the human behavior. This theory holds that traditional ethics should be replaced by an objective science of behavior. That kind of objective science of behavior should be applied to the ills of society and foster moral behavior in individuals.⁵⁸ Behaviorism, as an ethical theory builds upon the prescriptions and insights of psychological Behaviorism. This theory also argues that the only effective means of solving individual and social problems is by implementing environmental conditions which systematically encourage 'desirable' behaviors of human being and discourage the 'undesirable' ones. But, according to the Psychological behaviorists they could not observe states of consciousness and therefore psychology should not be concerned with them. There are some philosophers who have agreed with this view of

psychological Behaviorism. The groups of philosophers have argued that we should restrict ourselves to the study of the physical behavior of human beings that is publically observable when we explain human nature. For them we can easily explain the mental activities in terms of human behaviors.

Again, the last Harvard psychologist is B. F. Skinner (1904-1990), who is also primarily responsible for the development of modern behaviorism. He leads the behaviorists program to new height of technical exactness and become one of the most influential psychologists of his contemporaries. He tried to apply his theories to human life and society in *Science and Human Behavior* (1953), and to human language in particular in *Verbal Behavior* (1957).⁵⁹ According to Skinner, the only way to arrive at a true theory of human nature is the empirical and scientific study of human behavior. He claims that human behavior is explainable in terms of operant conditioning and scientific claims that “biology is destiny” and that “genes hold culture on a leash.”⁶⁰ Science is a search for order for lawful relations among the events in nature. Scientific method has established itself as the proper way of understanding and explaining the world. According to Skinner, the basic human nature is a potentially confusing combination of methodological perception as well as an empirical theory. Both these theories are derived from the Western behaviorism.

Again, Skinner has great faith in science. He supposed that only science can tell us the truth about nature, including human nature, and he made bold claims for the prospective of science to solve human troubles. According to him most of human behavior does not refers to the in born potentialities. Rather they refer to the effects of environmental variables on behavior. Skinner also points out that the basic qualities of human nature are neither good nor bad. These qualities are the results of complex environmental interactions. He also made some challenging claims for the potential of

science to solve the human problems. He says, 'It is possible that science has come to the rescue and that order will eventually be achieved in the field of human affairs.'⁶¹

Skinner argues that fundamental to science is neither instruments nor measurement but the scientific methods. Belief in God is without any scientific basis. It treats religion as merely as a social institution for manipulating human behavior. Skinner thought that all those questions about human nature and about what is worth doing or striving for can be answered scientifically.

In this way, modern biology and psychology offer a variety of allegedly scientific theory about animal and human nature. In this context we have examined Freud, the French existentialist philosopher Sartre, American psychologist B. F. Skinner, among the twentieth century thinkers who claimed to have the key to the human behavior and its conditions.

Another central theory of human nature can be found in the thought of Konrad Lorenz, an American biologist. Konrad Lorenz (1903-1989), was one of the founding father of the branch of biology called 'ethology'.⁶² The etymological meaning of the term 'ethology' is the study of character. It stands for one particular tradition in the scientific study of animal behavior. The early ethologists points out that different animal behavior patterns could not be explained in the behaviorists' way. The ethologists have emphasized on these 'instinctual' behavior patterns and thought its important carefully to observe the behavior of animals in their natural environment before intervening to perform their experiments. The ethology is based more directly than behaviorist psychology, on evolution. Therefore, it seems the appropriate place to sketch the essentials of the Darwinian theory of evolution, as because; no adequate theory of human nature can neglect it.

Konrad Lorenz was a result of the great scientific and cultural traditions of Vienna. As a biological scientist, the most important of his background assumptions is the theory of evolution. As an ethologist, Lorenz has introduced two very important concepts of a fixed action and an innate releasing mechanism. For them, the behavior seems to be caused by the combination of external interest and internal state. Lorenz says that any one piece of behavior is usually caused by at least two drives or inner causes and that conflict between independent impulses can give formless to the whole organism, like a balance of power within a political system.⁶³

Konrad Lorenz also tried to explain the concept of human nature in the background of Darwinian understanding of evolution. He holds that human beings are one particular animal species that has evolved from others. Advocating the theory of human nature, Lorenz points out that like many other animals, we have an innate drive to aggressive behavior toward our own species. In his theory, Lorenz suggests that it is the only possible explanation of the conflicts and wars throughout all human history. It is the continuously existing unreasonable behavior of supposedly reasonable beings. According to him, Freud's theory of the death instinct is an interpretation of the same unattractive fact of human nature. Lorenz seeks an evolutionary explanation for our innate aggressiveness and for its peculiarly communal nature. He speculates that at a certain stage of their evolution, our ancestors had more or less mastered the dangers of their nonhuman environment; the main threat facing them came from other human groups.⁶⁴ In this sense, Lorenz also tried to explain what he calls "militant enthusiasm", in which a human crowd becomes excitedly aggressive against another group perceived. They also work as alien and lose all rational control and moral inhibitions. This tendency as Lorenz refers has evolved from the communal defense response of our pre human ancestors.

However, the evolutionary theories of Lorenz who inquire into human ethology or sociobiology have been criticized by those who maintain that apart from the most obvious biological universals. For him, like eating, sleeping and compulsion, human behavior also depends on culture which is much more than on biology.

4.5. Concluding Observation

From the above discussion, we have come to this point that as a discipline Metaphysics has a long history. Since the ancient period, philosophers have disagreed about the nature of metaphysics. Therefore, it is not easy to say what metaphysics is. Some thinkers' points out that metaphysics is the investigation of the most general features of the earth. It is systematic, and prearranged in space and time, which contains matter and mind, things and properties of things, necessity, events, causation, creation, change, values facts and states of affairs. Metaphysics is a broad area of philosophy marked out by two types of inquiry. The first aims to be the most general investigation possible into the nature of reality. The second type of inquiry seeks to uncover what is ultimately real, frequently offering answers in sharp contrast to our everyday experience of the world. In the period of eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the term Metaphysics was used mostly to include questions about the reality of the external world, the possibility of a priori knowledge, the existence of other minds and the nature of sensation, memory abstraction etc.

While the ancient and medieval thinkers aspired for the ontology of human being on the basis of the 'cosmogonic' metaphysics of human nature, Modern Philosophy as rationalism and empiricism fashioned themselves as 'human mind'-centred metaphysics of human nature. Kant, on the other hand, qualitatively differently linked human nature and metaphysics with the dialectic between the possible impossibility of the structure of human mind. When it comes to scientific or

critical realism, it advocates that existence of object does not depend upon knowledge in any way, that object is possessed of qualities and is directly known. Scientific realism is a positive epistemic attitude towards the content of our best theories and models, recommending belief in both observable and unobservable aspects of the world described by the sciences. The entities described by the scientific theory exist objectively and mind-independently. This is the metaphysical commitment of scientific realism.

As the sciences concerned with humanity split up into more specialized branches, many of the key figures of this evolution expressed influential understandings about human nature. Charles Darwin gave a widely accepted scientific argument for what Rousseau had already argued from a different direction, that humans and other animal species have no truly fixed nature, at least in the very long term. Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, famously referred to the hidden pathological character of typical human behavior. E. O. Wilson's sociobiology and closely related theory of evolutionary psychology give scientific arguments against the "*tabula rasa*" hypotheses of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. In his book *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge (1998)*, Wilson claimed that it was time for a cooperation of all the sciences to explore human nature. He defined human nature as a collection of epigenetic rules: the genetic patterns of mental development. Cultural phenomena, rituals, etc. are products, not part of human nature. Finally, the chapter ends with the hint at invariable abidingness of human nature in the respective metaphysical principles.

Notes and References:

-
- 1 Edward, Paul. (Ed). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. vol-5. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. & New York: The Free Press, 1967. p. 289.
 - 2 *Ibid.*
 - 3 Edward, Craig. (Ed). *Rutledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London: Routledge. Retrieved December 13, 2011, from <http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/DB047>.
 - 4 Edward, Paul. (Ed). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. vol-5. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. & New York: The Free Press, 1967.p. 289.
 - 5 *Ibid.* p. 290
 - 6 Van Inwagen, Peter, "Metaphysics," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2012 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/metaphysics/>.
 - 7 Geisler, Norman L. *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. Baker Books, 1999. p. 446.
 - 8 Gay, Peter. *The Enlightenment*, vol. 1. *The Rise of Modern Paganism* Chapter 3, Section II, p. 132–141.
 - 9 Edward, Paul. (Ed). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Vol-5. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. & New York: The Free Press, 1967. p. 300.
 - 10 Chalmers, David., Manley, David and Wasserman, Ryan. *Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. p. 68
 - 11 Barnes. *Metaphysics-Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia*. mht. 2016.
 - 12 As universals were considered by Plato to be ideal forms, this position is confusingly also called Platonic idealism. This should not be confused with Idealism, as presented by philosophers such as Immanuel Kant: as Platonic abstractions are not spatial, temporal, or mental they are not compatible with the later Idealism's emphasis on mental existence.
 - 13 McKeon, R. Metaphysics. in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. New York: Random House, 1941. p. 682.
 - 14 Edward, Paul. (Ed). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Vol-5. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. & The Free Press. New York, 1967. p. 296.
 - 15 *Ibid.*
 - 16 Taft, Richard. *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, Fifth edition, (Trans) Indian University Press, 1997. p. 4.
 - 17 Jorge. J. E. Gracia, Gregory M. Reichberg, and Bernard N. Schumacher. *The Classics of Western Philosophy* (Ed). Allen W. Wood. Immanuel Kant, The Critique of Pure Reason. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. p. 332.
 - 18 Heidegger, Martin. *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, Fifth Edition, England, Trans. by Richard Raft, Indiana University Press, 1997. p. 8.
 - 19 Borchert, Donald M. (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* Vol-5. Detroit. New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 2006. p. 36.
 - 20 Borchert, Donald M. (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* Vol-7. Detroit. New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 2006. p.710
 - 21 Larrain, Jorge. *The Concept of Ideology*. London: Hutchinson, 1979. p. 197.

-
- 22 Nicholas, Bunnin and Tsui, James. *The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy*, (Ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002. p. 66.
- 23 Borchert, Donald M. (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* Vol-5. Detroit. New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 2006. p. 712.
- 24 Nath S. and Acharjee, S. "Has Logical Positivism Eliminated Metaphysics?" (Article) *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (Online)*. Volume 3 Issue. November 11, 2014.p. 39
- 25 Edward, Paul. (Ed). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. vol-5. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. & New York: The Free Press, 1967. p. 299.
- 26 Yablo, S. and Gallois, A. "Does Ontology Rest on a Mistake?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplementary Volumes, Vol. 72, 1998. pp. 229–261.
- 27 Nath S. and Acharjee, S. "Has Logical Positivism Eliminated Metaphysics?" (Article) *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (Online)*: Volume 3 Issue. November 11, 2014.p. 40.
- 28 Popper, K.R. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York, NY: Rutledge, 1977. p.112
- 29 Brekke, John S. "Scientific Imperatives in Social Work Research: Pluralism Is Not Skepticism". *Social Service Review* 60 (4): 1986. pp. 538–554.
- 30 Kuhn, T. S. *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1st Ed.). Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1962. p.44.
- 31 Hull, David. "The Metaphysics of Evolution". *British Journal for the History of Science* 3 (4), 1967. pp. 309–337.
- 32 Rodebush, Worth H. "The electron theory of valence". *Chemical Reviews* (American Chemical Society) 5 (4), 1992. pp. 509–531.
- 33 Hawking, Stephen. "Does God Play dice?" Retrieved September 2, 2012.
- 34 Desmet, Ronny and Weber, Michel. (Ed). Whitehead. *The Algebra of Metaphysics*. Applied process Metaphysics Summer Institute Memorandum, Louvain-la-Nature, Éditions Chromatika, 2010. p. 187
- 35 Edward, Paul. (Ed). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Vol-5. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. & New York: The Free Press, 1967. p. 300.
- 36 Chalmers, David., Manley, David and Wasserman, Ryan. *Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.2009. p. 68
- 37 Cahn, Steven M. and Markie, Peter. *The Republic*, (Translation revised by Andrea Tschemplik.), 2002. p.63
- 38 Stevenson, Lesiel & Haberman, Daved L. *Ten Theories of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. p. 91.
- 39 *Ibid.*
- 40 This is a Greek word combining 'eu' meaning 'good' with 'daimon' meaning 'spirit'. It is most often translated as happiness.
- 41 Sanayal, Jagadiswar. *Guide to General Philosophy*. Culcutta: Sribhumi Publishing Company, 1996. p. 45
- 42 Stevenson, Leslie. (Ed). *The Study of Human Nature, A reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. p. 85
- 43 *Ibid.*

-
- 44 Jonathan, Israel. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. p. 94
- 45 Sydie, R. A. *Natural Women Cultured Men: A Feminist Perspective on Sociological Theory*, Toronto, Methuen, 1987. p. 1
- 46 Winkler, Kenneth P. (Ed.). *Locke, John. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 1996. p. 33–36.
- 47 Stevenson, Leslie. (Ed). *The Study of Human Nature, A reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. p. 98
- 48 Zeitlin, Irving M. *Ideology and the Development of Sociological Thought*, fourth edition, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice Hall, 2002. p. 1
- 49 *Ibid.* p. 2
- 50 Roth, John K. (Ed). *International Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London. Fitzroy: Dearborn Publishers, 1995. p 262.
- 51 Zeitlin, Irving M. *Ideology and the Development of Sociological Thought*, Fourth Edition, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice Hall, 2002. p. 23.
- 52 Eisenstein, Zillah. *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism* .Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1986. p. 89-90.
- 53 Stevenson, Lesiel. & Haberman, Daved L. *Ten Theories of Human Nature* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. p. 112
- 54 Psillos, S. *Scientific Realism: How Science Tracks Truth*, London: Rutledge, 1999. p. xix
- 55 Chakravartty, A. *A Metaphysics for Scientific Realism: Knowing the Unobservable*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. ch. 6
- 56 Humphreys, P. *Extending Ourselves: Computational Science, Empiricism, and Scientific Method*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. pp. 35–36.
- 57 Roth, John K. (Ed). *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1995. p. 406.
- 58 *Ibid.* p.76.
- 59 Stevenson, Lesiel & Haberman, Daved L. *Ten Theories of Human Nature* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. p.192.
- 60 Roth, John K. *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. London. Fitzroy: Bearborn Publishers, 1995. p. 405.
- 61 Skinner, B. F. *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Macmillan, 1953. p. 5.
- 62 Stevenson, Lesiel & Haberman, Daved L. *Ten Theories of Human Nature* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. p. 207.
- 63 Loernz, Konrad. *On Aggression*, (Trans. by Marjorie Latzke.). New York: Bantham Books,1978. ch. 6.
- 64 Stevenson, Lesiel & Haberman, Daved L. *Ten Theories of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. p. 215.