

**ALASDAIR MACINTYRE :
A CRITICAL STUDY OF ENLIGHTENMENT**

**A thesis submitted to the University of Hyderabad in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy

By

Gautam Satapathy



**Department of Philosophy
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad, 500046, India
July 2013**

**Department of Philosophy
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad, 500046, India**



CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **Alasdair MacIntyre : A Critical Study of Enlightenment**, submitted to the University of Hyderabad in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy is a bona fide record of original work done by **Gautam Satapathy** during the period of his study in the Department of Philosophy, University of Hyderabad under my guidance and supervision and that the thesis has not been submitted to any other University or Institute of learning for the award of any degree.

Supervisor

**Head
Department of Philosophy**

**Dean
School of Humanities**

**Department of Philosophy
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad, 500046, India**



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis entitles **Alasdair MacIntyre : A Critical Study of Enlightenment** submitted for the award of the Degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in philosophy to the University of Hyderabad embodies the result of bona fide research work carried out by me under the supervision and guidance of **Professor A. Raghuramaraju**. It has not been submitted for any other degree to any other University or Institute of learning.

Signature of the candidate

Date:

Place: **Hyderabad**

Gautam Satapathy

96HPPH01

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is a pleasure and dear delight to take this occasion in acknowledging those who have profusely contributed to the framing of the thesis.

I acknowledge first of all the western sources especially Alasdair MacIntyre, University of Notre Dame and the contributors to the internet who woke me up from my dogmatic slumber. I thank Professor Navjyot Singh of NISTAD for his kind suggestions and discussions on the philosophy of science. I am also thankful to both of my referees Prof. S. G. Kulkarni and Prof. P. K. Basu for constant reciprocations and inspirations.

My indebtedness is due to Professor R.C. Pradhan for his kind permission to represent and make a provision for defense of the thesis for continuation. I am also thankful to the rest of my Department members as Professor Goswami and Professor Dasgupta for their kindness towards me. I am thankful to student friends such as Vineet Sahu, Vineet Chand, Saroj Kanta Kar, Ratikanta Panda and my seniors like Tomy, Lenkabhai, Koshy and Mohammed Ali for their kind support and equi-reciprocations. I am also grateful to Debasish Acharya, Rashmi, Ranjan, Ratikant, Ajitbhai and Sarita and all of my friends and contemporaries. I am also grateful to my parents and family for their consistent support.

I am indebted to administration and former registrar Prof. Y. Narasimhulu for waiver of the fees especially which they did after reflecting on the path breaking works of mine. Specifically, I am grateful to Vice-chancellor and the Registrar, the Controller, and Mr. Satya Das and Mr. Devesh Nigam, for their kind support and inspiration through communications.

My appreciation goes to my friends working in the several other departments like Physics, Chemistry, Computer Science, Management and Social Sciences for their inspiration in my very bad days. I am thankful to the infrastructural setup of the university which provided me with necessary amenities to carry out my thesis.

Finally, with profound gratitude to my respected guide, the ‘soul provider’ Prof. A Raghuramaraju, one of the eminent academicians of country and the world for his constant support and make me work harder though it was difficult for me in the beginning, for the subject and literally worked parallel with me in the hardest days of my configuring the possible first international publication in the volume in Kluwer Academic publisher in United States, which brought glory to the department being the first Indian and first from the department as a Research Scholar. I am also grateful for his kind reciprocations and I am glad despite artificial problems I could stand to his expectation to the considerable extent.

Working with him was wonderful and elevating. I am proud I could learn so much from the grind. It was nice growing under him and coming up with scores of international papers and articles which he inspired me to write.

**TO
MY GUIDE, TEACHERS, FAMILY AND FRIENDS**

CONTENTS

	Page
Certificate	ii
Declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
 CHAPTER – I BACKGROUND TO ENLIGHTENMENT/MODERNITY	 1
I.1 Introduction	1
I.2 The Place of Romanticism in Enlightenment	5
I.3 Man at the Epicentre	5
I.4 Universalism relating to Transcendental Pretence	7
I.5 Descartes and New Science	8
I.6 Kant and German Enlightenment	12
I.7 Science, Religion and its Relation to Modernity	16
I.8 Conclusion	17
 CHAPTER – II A CRITIQUE AND HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENLIGHTENMENT	 21
II.1 Cherbury	50
II.2 The Cambridge Platonists	52
II.3 The Enlightenment	55
II.4 Background to Antiquity	55
II.5 The Renaissance Humanists	56
II.6 Michael De Montaigne	58
II.7 The Seventeenth Century	60
II.8 The Political and Economic Background to Enlightenment	62
II.9 The Role of the Aristocrats	64

II.10 Rousseau versus Voltaire	65
II.11 The Enlightenment in England	66
II.12 The Enlightenment in America	67
II.13 The Struggle in Europe	69
II.14 The Heritage of the Enlightenment	70
II.15 Progress of Enlightenment	72
II.16 Scientific Movement	73
II.17 Scepticism	76
II.18 Enlightenment and its Critiques	80
II.19 Conclusion	82
 CHAPTER – III NIHILISM – CONTESTING MODERNITY AND TRADITION -	
NIETZSCHE AND ARISTOTLE	89
III.1 Nihilism – Ethics	94
III.2 MacIntyre : Enlightenment Discourse and Nietzsche	95
III.3 Nietzsche and Weber	100
III.4 Nietzsche and Aristotle	101
III.5 Criticism	109
III.6 Summary	116
 CHAPTER – IV AESTHETICS, ETHICS AND MANAGEMENT	118
IV.1 Aesthetics and Ethics? What to Choose: MacIntyre’s Critique	118
IV.2 Kierkegaard’s Theory of Aesthetics and Ethics	119
IV.3 Aesthetic Life	119
IV.4 Ethical Life	121
IV.5 Tradition and Solution	129
IV.6 Modernity and MacIntyre – Reflection on Applied Ethics – An Analysis of Three Characters : Aesthetes, Managers and Bureaucrats	131
IV.7 Emotivistic Background to the Problem	132
IV.8 The Characters	135
IV.9 A Modernist Diagnosis of Business Ethics	143

CHAPTER - V A PRIMER TO MODERNITY	148
V.1 Defining Characteristics of Modernity	152
V.2 Modernity and the Contemporary Society	153
V.3 Criticism	153
CONCLUSION	155

CHAPTER – I

BACKGROUND TO ENLIGHTENMENT/MODERNITY

INTRODUCTION

Enlightenment is a massive and influential project that affected Western traditional society, Greek philosophy and Christian theology. Though massive it continues to have its own adversaries. The adversaries while repudiating the project of enlightenment either wittingly or otherwise have thrown new light on the nature of enlightenment. The present work discusses the work of Alasdair MacIntyre's critique of enlightenment. Let us begin with some background to the project of enlightenment.

MacIntyre identifies in Enlightenment project a confrontation between two or amongst many incompatible and incommensurable moral premises and moral commitment among the Enlightenment thinkers. He also finds an ineradicable discrepancy among them. This incompatibility and grim state of affairs, according to him, is caused due to the expression of criterionless choice between modern premises leading to lack of rational justification. (MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, Duckworth, London, 1981)

Charles Taylor's critique of modernity is classified under three malaises. The first malaise is individualism, which provides freedom to people to

make choices about their lives and convictions to espouse. The second malaise consists in primacy of the instrumental reason which leads to weighing issues through rationality in order to achieve maximum efficiency. The third malaise relates to the political level, the state, family and the institutions. This leads to the factor of soft-despotism with immense tutelary power ending in paternalistic society and political liberty. (Taylor, Charles, *Malaises of Modernity*, Anansi Press, Canada, 1991)

Pippin, another scholar on enlightenment relates the historical growth of Enlightenment as consisting in coming out of Dark Ages. For him modernity is essentially a bourgeois experience. Self-understanding here requires middle class with its private property, market economy and liberal democratic institutions as it is a kind of end which is intriguing and extraordinarily ambitious.

According to David Cooper, Enlightenment critique is the synonym of being ambitious. It is a movement. It is overcoming from Dark Ignorance, imagination and reason which stemmed from natural scientific revolution. It is also a systematic scientific understanding of human and moral fruits as it treats liberty, equality and fraternity as products of Enlightenment. Cooper points out that liberty, individualism, self-incurred immaturity, self-understanding and elitism, moral Awareness, felicity, calculus of

maximizing the balance of pleasure over pain are the essential features of modernity.

In addition to these versions of enlightenment, as pointed out right in the beginning it has given rise to many influential schools of thought including, existentialism, nihilism and atheism. It also has influenced disciplines such as literature, mass popular culture and other areas. Enlightenment also influenced the theorists of modernity. They include Nietzsche, Sartre, Dostoevsky, Nihilists, Holderlin, Earnest Hemingway, Pragmatists and several others.

European philosophy towards the last half of the eighteenth century became intellectually and psychologically thrilling and developed into an adventure in nature. However, all the philosophers of the Enlightenment did not belong to academics. The central theme of the movement of Enlightenment is the rise and the fall of self. The self which is discussed here is extraordinary nature of the self. The self that is under investigation here is no less than the transcendental ego and has the nature and ambitions which were unprecedentedly arrogant, presumptuously cosmic and consequently mysterious. According to Solomon,

The transcendental self is timeless, universal and in each one of around the globe. In modest and ordinary terms it was called as 'human nature.' In much less modest, extraordinary terminology, it was nothing less than God and

world-soul. By 1805 the self was no longer human being, individual standing against a hostile world but had become all-encompassing. (*History of Western Philosophy Number:7, Continental Philosophy Since 1750: The Rise and the Fall of the Self*, Robert C. Solomon, Introduction, Oxford, 1988, p - 4)

Descartes in his *Meditations* establishes the centrality of human mind over all things. His concept of subjectivity centres around three theses. They are:

1. Descartes deployed his method of doubt.
2. He put forward his egocentric predicament.
3. In his theory he emphasizes the first person standpoint following from 1 and 2, from the objectivity of that experience.

Kant took philosophical discussion of modernity to a new high. He remarked the self, pervades the world which includes other selves too. It constitutes transcendental pretence as Solomon remarks here “Even though it signaled a radical egalitarianism and long awaited global sensitivity. However, it also justifies unrestricted tolerance for paternalism and self-righteousness, meaning a kind of white philosophical burden.” (*Continental Philosophy Since 1750: The Rise and the Fall of the Self-History of Western Philosophy Number -7* by Robert C. Solomon, Oxford, 1988, p - 6).

The transcendental pretence maintains that universality and necessity constitutes the focus of human experience and its application whether in politics, religion or morality.

THE PLACE OF ROMANTICISM IN ENLIGHTENMENT

The Enlightenment consists of many ideologies. This period began with deep and serious philosophical excavations which spread beyond Europe and America and reached Germany before nineteenth century. It was a period of intellectual debate and also an epoch of enthusiastic scientific activity and findings in different fields. It was also a time for far-reaching personal, political and philosophical experimentation as it all happened in Montaign's delineation of the private self through *Essais*, Owne's and Fourier's socialist communes, Hume and d' Holbach's radical challenges to the established philosophy. However, French Enlightenment includes rejuvenation and critiques which resulted in enormous change and advancement.

MAN AT THE EPICENTRE

Enlightenment treated and posited man in the center of all activities as European Humanism, however, stems from twelfth century. Even Pope declared that proper study of mankind is man which contains a definition of psyche of Enlightenment. In other words, the humanists treated human will, desire as well as aspirations to go beyond church and state. In relation to the foreclosed discussions David Hume appropriately remarks here that human nature remained the same from time immemorial through these

articulations as universal humanism emerged from these deliberations. (*Routledge History of Philosophy – Vol.-V, British Philosophy and The Age of the Enlightenment* – Edited by Stuart Brown, Routledge, London and New York, 2003) Hume, despite being a skeptic believed in progress of knowledge in Enlightenment and followed the pack by supporting to tap the factors of nature through proper methods.

Humanism breathed a human world despite all divergences. The concept of God is ruled out here as the concept of man takes the driver seat for any kind of progress as it stands changed and is considered to be bettering. Race, culture and national differences do not affect the process of progress of humanism and the spirit and mutual brotherhood along with toleration as these remained the forte of humanism. ‘Nothing human is foreign to me’ defined the spirit and temperament of humanism which is significant part of modernity that figured in that particular phase of time.

People being considered to be identical due to the factor of predominance of reason in modernity since everybody believed in the identical scientific truths and morality. This has not gone against human autonomy as reason plays a key role in the development of the humanism. Thus, both human centeredness and rationality form the two formidable pillars on which modernity stood firmly.

UNIVERSALISM RELATING TO TRANSCENDENTAL PRETENCE

The universality of human nature leads to transcendental pretence. The belief in the universal reason here becomes coupled with a confidence in the 'individual autonomy,' which is the ability of every human being to come to the right conclusions, which happened only after considerable education and argument. It could be remarked here that the good news is that human conflict was about to come to an end since all disagreements became negotiated through the universal reason. Thus, the transcendental pretence could mean from the foreclosed perspective, one or all of the following:

Transcendental pretence:	Transcendental unwarranted claim.
	Transcendental make-belief.
	Transcendental deception.

Kant, however, developed these three above mentioned themes of modernity more systematically than any other thinker. Enlightenment philosophers as it culminated in Germany yet its concepts were fully operative throughout the Europe. Solomon points out that when these foreclosed canons come under attack then a defense of Kant became a necessity, it is because Kant was considered to be the pioneer of Enlightenment. The irony of the fact is that the wholly successful French

and English Enlightenment received its most brilliant defense in Germany where Enlightenment never had stronger ground.

DESCARTES AND NEW SCIENCE

This section discusses Descartes and the concept of science because it is necessary to relate philosophy of enlightenment with science. Descartes deployed mathematics and geometry as the methods of philosophizing. He has allied philosophy and science as he doubted commonsense and insisted on intellectual humility. He sought this very process to be carried out in mathematics and geometry. This contributed to advances in physics and material science. He employed the method of mathematics in philosophy with a method of narrowing the dimension of philosophy that he sets as patent for times to come.

Descartes' philosophy is understood from the following three perspectives; firstly, he had training from the church as his revolutionary ideas permeated by it. Secondly, he was influenced by Galileo who discovered telescope and revolutionized human perception, this very new analysis of science which raised age-old questions of dependability of reason versus the senses scaling the extent of knowledge. Thirdly, Descartes was very much concerned about the development of the religious turmoil in Europe as he prescribes to replace it with reason. Reason, according to him, however, by

its power of calming and comforting nature did soothe as well as came handy to his contemporary warlike nature of people of his time and circumstances. Descartes' thesis goes against church as his own method emphasizes on intellectual autonomy since it stresses on thinking about oneself.

Descartes demands that each of us must realize ourselves and establish for our own self the truth of what we believe and try to establish certainty through mathematical methods. He invented a method of doubt through which he considers all beliefs to be suspicious which was delineated as 'epoche' by skeptics. Descartes, furthermore, remarks that he has been lied and misinformed and fooled by his senses. So he insists of being suspicious of all knowledge whatever it is. Taking the dream experience he says that we cannot know whether we are dreaming or in the real life.

Descartes demonstrated the basic truth which begins with his deployment of mathematical method as every principle must be deduced from the established basis of other principles or premises. All principles must be derived from a fundamental set of definitions that is from principles that spell out the meaning of the terms employed. Thus, the key to the Descartes' grand deduction lies in some axiom which will be served as the premise and it turns out as his famous claim of 'I think, therefore, I am.' The foreclosed

claim is a revelation and it formed the foundation to modernity. What is so new and important for Descartes is not his theory of certainty rather his approach to ancient skeptical questions.

Descartes differentiated mind and body as different substances and faced problem in relating them together again. This dualism was product of several centuries of intellectual development as well as the by-product of the progress of science and new foundation for individual autonomy. The distinction between mind and body provides a realm for aspects of science which is concerned with physical world and then it went forward to prove the peculiarities of human mind, human freedom, the human ability to transcend physical reality and so on and so forth. The clear difference of human body and mind provided a realm for religion and human freedom and responsibility that would not be threatened by science.

Following Descartes and the new science the Enlightenment philosophers put great trust on their own ability to reason and formed their own experience and own intellectual autonomy which resulted in opposition to church and its authoritarian teaching. The Enlightenment philosophers insisted on being 'cosmopolitan' citizen of the world ignoring national boundaries as well as rejecting sectarian affiliation. They were also insistent

on their truths to be universal in nature which is not imposed on others but to be discovered independently by them.

What all of the Enlightenment philosophers did agree about and believed in, however, was 'Reason'. Through reason, they believed that they would not only tap the basic secret of nature along with help of science but may also establish a living paradise on earth, a society in which there would be no misery or injustice.

Hume is one of the brilliant thinkers of the Enlightenment enthusiasts. He recognized that reason deployed both as scientific method and as rationality has overstepped its frontier. There are things that reason cannot carry out and cannot deliver assurances and its proofs. Hume's skepticism surfaced as, paradoxically, the clearest example of solid, self-scrutinizing Enlightenment thinking. He, moreover, concluded that the best thinking in modernity cannot carry out what the Enlightenment thinkers thought to establish. Hume was skeptic so also Descartes method as the later conducted all inquiries through his method of doubt – Cogito, Ergo, Sum. Thus, Hume and Descartes provide a comprehensive account of Enlightenment though differing radically on some important aspects.

KANT AND GERMAN ENLIGHTENMENT

As aforesaid, Kant is pioneer of Enlightenment. His article on Enlightenment as well as the description of self, wealthy as noumenon, his method, his transcendental deductions and deployment of categorical imperative and the employment of the tool of reason makes him one of the important thinkers of the enlightenment. Kant, who came in transitional period, in his philosophizing provided a defense of science, morality and rationality along with religion. He provided us with a definition of a concept of rational human being.

Kant's magnum opus entitled the 'Critique of Pure Reason' while dealing with problem of knowledge led to a paradigmatic shift in Western thinking. This led to an extraordinary advance of the concept of self in power as well as in richness. The shift from positive to active mode of the self, which Kant propagates, essentially rejected the traditional concept of human mind which is immutable. He remarks in this transition phase that 'the understanding does not derive its laws from, but prescribes them to nature.' Kant's second critique, 'The Critique of Practical Reason,' analyzing the aspects of morality, frees latter from sentiment and social elements as well as demarcates it as a by-product of pure practical reason. The third critique, 'The Critique of Judgment' is considered to be having least amount of consequentialist content in it. From a superficial perspective it may seem

that it is an unlikely amalgamation of art and beauty along with ‘teleology’ in ‘science’ as well as entangled with ultimate remarks on life and universe.

‘The Critique of Pure Reason’ claims that knowledge of the world is possible due to self, which is nothing but transcendental self or ego. This work of Kant explains structure of our every experience. Kant, thus, changing the whole thought process exclaims that world has no existence external to mind; rather mind makes the world as world being a structure of human mind. The intriguing thesis that surfaces here is that the human mind is responsible for observation of objects and their structures are totally independent of us, as through the human medium of reason we can comprehend that the appearance of independence is dependent upon us. However, reason since it operates independent of experience being tied in paradoxes extends itself in spheres where our concepts are inappropriate. Thus, ‘Critique of Pure Reason’ is an effort to curb the historical pretensions of reason as reason is demarcated to be alone gaining knowledge of God, eternity and the nature of the world beyond the realm of human experience.

The term transcendental is fundamental to Kant. It is ‘necessary and universal’ according to his articulations. He points out that transcendental experience is basic to any experience. Thus, the self which is the source of

concepts and experience could alternatively be segregated to be 'Transcendental Ego.'

Here, the transcendental ego is different from the empirical self. However, the experiences established that they belong to the agent who experiences it. Kant, thus, discusses about transcendental ego unlike egos in general. Kant defines self to be noumenon as the self he specifies it to be the preeminent agent relating to immortality of soul. This, however, raises the controversy of interpretation of the self, pertaining to precise relationship between transcendental ego and noumenal self.

The linkages between morality, rationality and freedom and Kant's emphasis of morality is not a matter of inclination or social conformity rather it leads him to emphasize that the key to morality and rational life in modernity lies in the concept of 'autonomy.' Kant's notion of knowledge has come out of the Enlightenment's faith in reason and the confidence that permeates here can be used by individual on his own for his resources, through observation, experiment and careful reasoning in order to discover what is true about the world. Knowledge pervades purely in the relationship between the autonomous individual and the world of nature and morality is said to be a bridge between the individual and the universal law.

On the other hand, it could be analyzed that Rousseau discovered within himself the inner worth of whole of the humanity. Kant swears that the idea that every problem is autonomous and is capable of discovering for himself what is right, which is bereft of the conditions and opinions of his society. Nevertheless, the transcendental pretence maintains with the extraordinary self-confidence that one is in touch with the absolute principle of Goodness.

Enlightenment humanism is often equated with atheism. The underlying assumption here is thinking rationally and believing in God as it confers a divine purpose to the universe. Even Voltaire agrees to the foreclosed discussions including many of his French compatriots. For Kant the Enlightenment defends religion and believes in Christianity to be justified purely on rational grounds. The latter bases his notions on the rational grounds and insists those to be based on 'faith,' thus, making a dogmatic break away from those who hold faith to be based on belief which goes against reason. However, Kant's effort to limit knowledge to make room for faith does not imply that religion is less rational than science.

SCIENCE, RELIGION AND ITS RELATION TO MODERNITY

Commenting on modernity, Solomon and Higgins maintain that there was no cosmic curtain that was raised in 1500 as the changes were natural and evidently emanated from the time of middle ages through renaissance

through 18th and 19th century. Humanism which is one of the important aspects of modernism makes an antithesis of modernism since it is opposed to Christianity quite startlingly took its shape within Christianity and developed in the time period of 18th century. Rene Descartes reflected in terms of medieval philosophy and quite surprisingly Avant-Garde Existentialist Soren Kierkegaard wanted to 'go back into monastery out of which Luther broke.' However, it is worth remarking here that the prevalence of Christian images and metaphors in the world of modern science which is part of modernity is significant and surprising.

The sources of objectivity, paradoxically, however, is found here in one's subjectivity, thus, the modern age was founded on an apparent contradiction, as we come to know the world 'outside' by looking 'inside.' Nevertheless, it is not hard to analyze the concept of virtue in this twin emphasis on subjectivity and objectivity. The insistence on subjectivity makes the new philosophers to ignore the established authority of the church of those time period as well as divinely appointed political leaders. The new emphasis on subjectivity opened the avenue to an egalitarianism which establishes the truth serving mankind.

As Solomon and Higgins point out, modern philosophy is said to be born out of paradox, objectivity out of subjectivity coupled with an arrogance of

knowledge along with the seeming humility of critical self-examination as it is not unrelated to the colonialism of the 'new world.' The subjectivity celebrated was European subjectivity. The story of the modern philosophy is not to be told in the terms of rise of science rather through the apotheosis of reason as it results in the successful pursuit of knowledge. However, it relates to the factor of power and politics. The whole thought process arose from a violence of the thirty years of war until the verbal violence of Nietzsche and the post-modernists.

CONCLUSION

I have opened the chapter with MacIntyre's notion which is paradigmatic about modernity that Enlightenment lies in posing the problem of confrontation between incompatible and incommensurable moral premises and as there lies also an ineradicable discrepancy among them, as we are left with criterionless choice between modern premises leading to no rational justification. Taylor, on the other hand, discusses the malaises of individualism, instrumental reason and soft-despotism to be three important factors of modernity. On the other hand, Cooper and Pippin remark that modernity is something essentially coming out of a kind of dark ignorance. The next important aspect that surfaces from modernity is the factor of self not as it is, rather like transcendental ego being ambitious, arrogant and

cosmic in nature, the aspect that comes along with aforementioned issue is transcendental pretence.

The next two parts that are discussed in this chapter are romanticism in literature and humanistic philosophy. Apart from it, there was another aspect called as 'Universalism' which led to 'Individual Autonomy.' Kant being one of the pioneers of Enlightenment developed many theses which enriched Enlightenment. Descartes comes knocking here as he developed mathematics and geometry in unison and doubted commonsense and called for intellectual humility. He declared reason to be the tool in finding answer to all of the questions of Enlightenment. Descartes proposed 'Grand Deduction' to be an extraordinary method and was referred to have deployed 'epoche' which stemmed from employment of method.

Philosophers of Enlightenment did learn the intellectual autonomy and demanded to be 'cosmopolitan' in preaching their theories. They also deployed 'reason' to be the tool in tapping the basic secret of nature, though Hume pointed in this juncture that due to foreclosed grounds reason overstepped the borders to operate. Kant discussed and acknowledges us about 'self' to be transcendental ego. Assuming self to be noumenon Kant made transcendental part of the self to be fundamental of it and made the part to be necessary and universal aspect of it. The primacy of Humanism began

with atheism in God yet faith was later fused into Humanism to achieve better ends in life. Quite peculiar to Enlightenment, objectivity is found with one's subjectivity as we come to know the world 'outside' by looking 'inside'. However, the final judgment was passed by Solomon and Higgins as they pointed out conclusively that it is the factor of objectivity out of subjectivity along with longing for knowledge and seeming humility for critical self-examination leads to right kind of knowledge.

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cooper E. David, *World Philosophies, A Historical Introduction*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2002.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *Whose Justice Which Rationality*, University of Notre Dame Press, December, 1989.

Routledge History of Philosophy, Vol.-V, *British Philosophy and The Age of the Enlightenment*, Edited by Stuart Brown, Routledge, London, 2003.

Solomon, Robert C., *A History of Western Philosophy – 7, Continental Philosophy Since 1750, The Rise and the Fall of the Self*, Oxford University Press, UK., 1988.

Solomon, Robert C. and Higgins, Katherine M., *A Short History of Philosophy*, N.Y. OXFORD, 1996.

Stumpf, Enoch Samuel, *Philosophy History and Problems*, McGraw Hill Book Company, N.Y., US, 1989.

Thilly, Frank, *A History of Philosophy*, SBW Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.

[Http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~brians/hum_303/enlightenment.html](http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~brians/hum_303/enlightenment.html)(Created by Paul Brians March 11, 1998., Last revised May 18, 2000).

CHAPTER – I I

A CRITIQUE AND HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENLIGHTENMENT

In the first chapter, I have discussed the concept of Enlightenment beginning from Descartes till Kant through the concepts of transcendental pretence, Enlightenment history, the concept of self, science, the aspect of progress and finally, the factor of future of modernity. I have introduced the concepts through four prominent thinkers of our time such as Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, Robert Pippin and John Rundell,

In the present chapter, I would like to carry out the discussion historically forward by elaborating the concept of Enlightenment by MacIntyre and the failures of modernity in explaining the crises through the theories of Utilitarianism, Marxism, Existentialism and Phenomenology so also Analytic Philosophy. Furthermore, there is a deliberation of modernity along with its bifurcations through the thinkers such as Sigmund Freud, Vico, Herder, Nietzsche, Relativists, Cambridge Platonists as well as other Modernists. The discussion, however, includes the scientific aspects of modernity which consist of essential and necessary facets of the same.

MacIntyre begins the discussion regarding Enlightenment from a catastrophe, which constitutes of series of environmental disasters. He

relates this very crisis to an imagined widespread riots, which led to the laboratory of the scientists to be burnt down and physicists to be lynched. However, the revival process only found fragments of the whole thing as the acknowledgements of experiments seem to be unrelated and detached from any knowledge of the theoretical context. The revival gave them significance as parts of them became related to the other bits of theories and experiments and provided significance to the instruments whose use has been forgotten. The chapters from books those are not legible since they are torn and charred and the remedies as a set of practices which go under the name of physics, chemistry and biology since nobody realizes what they were doing and did never try to know whether those conform to certain canons of consistency and coherence.

Many of these foreclosed beliefs were lost and there lies an element of arbitrariness in their application. Here MacIntyre says, for the rival and competing premises no further arguments would abound. Referring to the futility of analytic philosophy in solving the crises of modernity, he points to the success of them which led only to the limited version of the configuring of imaginary possible world of scientific fiction. It is said to be a world in which language of natural science continues to be used yet lies in a great state of disorder. He points out how if in this imaginary world analytic philosophy has to flourish then it has to describe the disorder, but

since the techniques of analytic philosophy is descriptive only of the language so it has not taken care of this crises. The analytic philosophy may explicate the conceptual structures of scientific thinking and discourse in the imaginary world in the same manner that the way it deals with the conceptual structures of the natural science, which provides no solution for the crises of modernity.

In continuation of it, more so over, MacIntyre says that Existentialism and Phenomenology, too, cannot provide any solution to his problem. It is because providing epistemological basis for the false simulacra of natural science would not differ in the phenomenological terms from the task as it is presently envisaged.

MacIntyre, thus, justifies the foreclosed discussions consisting of pseudo scientific as well as real genuine philosophy by relating the very situation to the problem of the language of morality, which, he says, presently lies in a grave state of disorder. He says that what we have presently with us are fragments of conceptual scheme, parts of which lack those contexts from which their significance is essentially derived. We possess simulacra of morality but we have lost our moral and theoretical comprehension. The use of the moral language has to be guided by moral reasoning. In order to define our transaction with others in moral terms it is so crucial that even

to envisage the possibility of radical incapacity is to ask for a shift in our view of what we are and do which is difficult to achieve. MacIntyre has denounced analytic philosophy to be powerless in order to detect the disorder of moral thought and practice as they were imposed prior to the disorders of science in the imaginary world. However, MacIntyre quite hopefully remarks that the powerlessness of this kind of philosophy does not leave us resourceless as in order to understand the present disordered state of imaginary world we have to understand its history, which forms its background. MacIntyre points to the previous analysis of the imaginary world and says that, what holds for the fictitious world holds even strongly for our own real world. The catastrophe which had thrown the language and the practice of morality into grave state of disorder continues to constitute to be the central part of the history. However, by history in our culture is meant as academic history which is less than two centuries old. Nevertheless, MacIntyre relates these hypotheses which had occurred before the founding of academic history. It is associated with the moral and evaluative propositions of academic history. As from its value neutral point of view moral disorder, however, remains largely invisible as each form of morality follows the other as Seventeenth Century Puritanism precedes Eighteenth Century Hedonism, the Victorian Work-ethics, so on and so forth. In this context MacIntyre points out,

The most striking feature of contemporary moral utterance is that so much of it is used to express disagreements; and

the most striking feature of the debates in which these disagreements are expressed is their interminable character. I do not mean by this just that such debates go on and on and on – although they do – but also that they apparently can find no terminus. There seems to be no rational way of securing moral agreements in our culture. (1981:6)¹

MacIntyre points out here that in many pre-modern traditional societies it is only through his or her membership in varieties of social groups that the individual identifies himself or herself and is identified by others as ‘somebody.’ The socially situated person is then visualized to be set on a journey to an end. Fulfilled life is said to be an achievement and death is a point where man is judged to be happy or unhappy. MacIntyre further goes on to remark in this juncture,

This conception of a whole human life as the primary subject of objective and impersonal evaluation, of a type of evaluation which provides the content for judgment upon the particular actions or projects of a given individual, is something that ceases to be generally available at some point in the progress – if we can call it such – towards and into modernity.(1981:34)²

Evaluating the evolution of the Enlightenment MacIntyre remarks that the backward Enlightened nations,³ followed the English models; however, the English were overshadowed by the achievement of the Scottish

¹ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1981.

² Ibid.

³ Such as European Enlightened nations of that time such as Italy and others.

Enlightenment. The prominent thinkers that are associated with it are David Hume, Adam Smith, Adam Fergusson, John Millar, Lord Kames and several others.

Identifying the breakdown of the projects of Enlightenment, MacIntyre claims that the former provides the historical background against which the predicament of our own culture become intelligible. He recounts in detail the history of that project and its breakdown in a backward manner where confrontation between incompatible and incommensurable moral premises and moral commitment is discussed. Here, however, we are provided with a criterionless choice for which no rational justification could be given. MacIntyre says that the habits of mind envisaged by the academic curriculum separates the history of political and social change from history of philosophy. The dualism is best expressed in the theory of Marxism, constituting the theory of modernity as it distinguishes the basis and the ideological superstructure. If the modern self separates itself from inherited thought and practices in the course of single unified history then it becomes a conglomerate of largely new coherent beliefs and concepts.

Further, he maintains that yet another Enlightenment school, namely, Utilitarianism links the eighteenth century project of justifying morality to

twentieth century's decline into Emotivism. The philosophical failure of utilitarianism and its consequences at the level of thought and part of the relevant history are situated where utilitarianism appears in a variety of social embodiments and has left its mark on social roles and institutions. Utilitarianism of the middle and the late nineteenth century and Analytical philosophy of late twentieth century are said to be two unsuccessful attempts to rescue the autonomous moral agent from the modern moral predicament. It is this predicament which along with the failure of the Enlightenment project of providing the self with a secular, rational justification for his moral allegiances which finally had left a great void of modern man. MacIntyre remarks here,

The claim that the major protagonists of the distinctively modern moral causes of the modern world...offer a rhetoric which serves to conceal behind the masks of morality what are in fact the preferences of arbitrary will and desire is not of course an original claim. For which each of the contending protagonists of modernity, while for obvious reasons unwilling to concede that the claim is true in their own case, is prepared to make it about those against whom they contend...(1981:71)⁴.

MacIntyre claims that from the seventeenth century onwards it was a common place where the scholastics had allowed themselves to be deceived about the character of the natural and social world by interposing an

⁴ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1981.

Aristotelian interpretation between themselves and the concept of extended reality. He, more so over, says that 'we moderns' (meaning, we seventeenth and eighteenth century moderns), have stripped away interpretations and theories and confronted facts and experience just as they are. It was precisely in virtue of this that these moderns claimed themselves to be enlightened and defined the medieval period to be 'Dark Ages.' He, however, regrets at this point that the Enlightenment is consequently the period 'par excellence' yet in its major claims most of the intellectuals lack self-knowledge.

The thrust of modernity lies in awakening of the reflective spirit. It is a revolt against authority and tradition. It is also a protest against absolutism and also a movement of demand of freedom in thought, feeling and action. This force continued across centuries through 'Renaissance' and the reformation and, however, they still continue. The spirit of independence which had raised its voice against the authority of church has consequently attacked the paternalism of the state. Subsequently, the doctrine of political non-interference became the ideal of individualism. The same spirit entered into the economic sphere of the state as slavery, serfdom and the old guild system gradually disappeared. This modern theory of economic individualism is commonly referred to as the 'Laissez Faire' (let alone).

Here, in this sphere 'reason' is assigned the authority over science and philosophy. Truth is said to be something that is not to be handed down by authority yet something to be acquired by free and impartial inquiry. The physical and mental world, society, human institutions and religion are experienced through natural causes. The higher intellectual life of this period followed Middle Ages which has the abiding faith in human reason inclusive of an intense interest in natural things which incorporated a lively yearning for civilization and progress. However, here knowledge being an intellectual enterprise is known for its practical value.

The thinkers of the modern era from Francis Bacon onwards were interested in the practical application of the results of the scientific investigations. The individual here throws the yoke of religion and morals as the appeal to reason in matters of intellect is matched by an appeal to faith and the conscience in matters of belief and conduct. All these subsequently made him to refuse to accept an intermediary between himself and God.

Thilly remarks here that Modernity is independent in its search for truth and in its manner it resembles Greek thought to some extent. The very process is rationalistic as it makes the human reason to be the method in the pursuit of knowledge. Modernity seeks to explain inner and outer nature of man

without supernatural presuppositions. It is scientific in nature as it is much concerned with science of the external world.

Though modern philosophy arose as a protest against the medieval scholastic system, however, traces of scholastic philosophy remains in its blood for a fairly long period of time. The theological bias is not entirely absent as Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Berkeley and Leibnitz accept the basal doctrine of Christianity which is explicit in their expositions of metaphysics.

MacIntyre lamenting about the present culture remarks in his work 'Whose Justice? Which Rationality?' that,

To the readership of the New York Times, or at least to that part of it which shares the presuppositions of those who write that parish magazine of affluent and self-congratulatory liberal Enlightenment, the congregations of evangelical fundamentalism appear unfashionably unenlightened...(1988:5)⁵

MacIntyre being highly critical of modernity says that there is seldom agreement on the nature of justice and practical rationality, which are considered to be the key factors of Modernity. They are treated in the public

⁵ *Whose Justice and Which Rationality*, MacIntyre, Alasdair, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1988, p - 5.

realm not as topics of rational inquiry rather due to their assertion of incompatible sets of premises.

The answer to the foreclosed problem falls into two parts as first it relates to Enlightenment and the subsequent to history. However, it was central motive of Enlightenment that this very aspiration, the formulation of which was itself a great achievement, provides platform for debate in the public realm. The standards and methods of rational justifications here are acquired through alternative courses of action in every sphere of life which could be adjudged as just or unjust, rational or irrational, enlightened or unenlightened. So, subsequently, from foreclosed discussions it was inferred that reason would replace authority and tradition.

Here, rational justification was provided to principles undeniable by any rational person and it is independent of all the social and cultural particularities which the Enlightenment thinkers took to be the mere accidental clothing of reason. Rational justification here is nothing other than what was essentially preached. The legacy of the Enlightenment provided an ideal of rational justification which it has assumed impossible to attain. Therefore, the unison of conviction and rational justification does not take place here. The academic philosophy being heir to the philosophy

of the Enlightenment, inquires into the nature of rational justifications and continued through ever-increasing refinements and undiminishing disagreements. MacIntyre raises a fundamental question that is,

Is there some mode of understanding which could find no place in the Enlightenment's vision of the world by means of which the conceptual and theoretical resources can be provided for reuniting conviction concerning such matters as justice on the one and rational inquiry and justification on the other?... (1988:7)

In order to answer these questions we may become trapped as we continue to accept the standards of the Enlightenment that cannot be met since the alternatives to it will not be vindicated. However, the attempt to provide an alternative standpoint to it is bound to be found rationally unsatisfactory in variety of ways from the standpoint of enlightenment itself. It could be deduced from above that it is inevitable that such attempt is unacceptable to and rejected by those whose allegiance is to the dominant intellectual and cultural modes of the present order. Raising the question whether there is an alternative mode of understanding or more importantly what did the Enlightenment deprive us? Answering the question MacIntyre reinforces his criticism of modernity as he contrasts it with the classical tradition by pointing out that in moral philosophy the central question that is supposed to be answered, which comes as a sequel to the discussion regarding rationality in relation to Aristotle and Aquinas, is: what are the principles governing the action to which no rational human being can deny his or her

assent? In contrast to this most of the modern philosophers including Hume prioritize passion over reason; even Kant's prioritizations of the categorical imperatives and the principles of utility, however, all these are susceptible to errors by adherent of rival answers whose claims to rational justifications were as much as little contestable like those of its opponents. More so over, the similar wrangle goes on amongst the heirs of Hume, Kant, and Mill. I would like to point out to one interesting response to the recognition of this situation by the people who are in agreement with heirs of Hume, Kant and Mill in their allegiance to their ideals of the Enlightenment has been the recent redefinition of the task of moral philosophy by rendering coherent and systematic the agent's intuitions about what is right, just and good, where 'we' figure as the inhabitants of a particular social, moral and political traditions, of the domain of liberal individualism.

Modernity, as such, needs a historical re-evaluation unlike the discussion that is provided by MacIntyre and other thinkers. The other aspects of it are discussed in the works of Solomon and Higgins, which is discussed and elaborated in the following. The term 'modern' suggests the beginning of a battle and also a bit of arrogance along with, a cry of rebellion (even destruction) of what lies in past. The Greeks of Alcibiades' generation fearlessly called themselves 'modern' in opposition to the previous (which is more democratic in nature) politicians who opposed them. The Arab of

the Middle Ages declared themselves to be modern (Nota'akherun) in opposition to the ancients from whom they distinguish themselves. During the Renaissance those who rediscovered the classics called themselves 'modern' in opposition to those who were stuck in the Middle Ages which occurred towards the end of the Medieval time which is toward the end of the scholastic age as William of Occam was called a 'modern' because of his rejection of earlier scholastic doctrines. In the eighteenth century rationalists called themselves to be 'modern' because of their revolutionary activities. Young romantics declared themselves emphatically modern, too, which is in opposition to those who were still steeped in the classics. However, recently every new invention and appliance is termed as 'modern,' meaning it to be the latest and the most-up-to date. Modern philosophy declares as a war, as it is not descriptive and may not designate a period. Nevertheless, 'modern philosophy' is an attack on and a rejection of the Middle (which now declared as Dark) Ages that was there in the preceding thousand years. It is also an attack on church that ruled those ages and dictated its authoritative ideas.

The modern period is said to have begun by 1500. The people those who were associated with it are Martin Luther and Christopher Columbus. Along with this reformation comes not only the rejection of medieval philosophy but also the establishment of the 'Protestant Ethic' and also the beginning

of the modern capitalism. The renaissance tradition came handy for the moderns as Aristotle got verified by the new scientists which was a part of the modernity. Science and the scientific developments have led to the emphasis on objectivity, however, the theorists of the late renaissance came to believe that genuine knowledge was accessible, not only for its own sake but also for political purposes.

The so-called Enlightenment emerged first in England followed the scientific achievements of Isaac Newton and Swift and the relatively bloodless political changes of the 'glorious revolution' at the very end of the seventeenth century. It then moved into France as it is propagated by intellectuals who had visited England. Then, it spread to Spain, Italy and Germany, where it ran into considerable opposition from the church and the tradition. The Enlightenment philosophers put their great trust in their own ability to reason, in their own experience as their own intellectual autonomy and this was posed in opposition to church. The enlightenment philosophers were insistent of being 'cosmopolitan' citizens of the world as they ignored national boundaries and rejected sectarian affiliation. Their truths are universal truths, essentially discovered by them. Through the method of reason, they believed that they could not only understand and explain the secrets of nature by means of science but also establish a living paradise on earth so also a society without misery and injustice.

The protestant revolution insisted on the aspect of 'work ethic,' which legitimized a worldly emphasis on success. A number of philosophers such as not only Hobbes and later Hume, Rousseau and Kant defended the notion of society as a 'social contract' but also destroyed traditional authority (such as 'divine right') and supported the new emphasis on individual's will and self-rule.

Sigmund Freud, who is not usually considered to be a philosopher, established the foundation for the twentieth century thinking about mind, human nature and human condition. His anti-Enlightenment idea reminds us about what is going on in our own minds would become protocol premise for generation of philosophers and social thinkers for times to come.

Johann Herder (1747-1803) of Germany emphasized on feeling and immediate experience to be Gehful. It was through feeling that we become one with the world and came to recognize our own 'vital powers' and it was through consciousness and language we reflectively respond to original unity in search of objectivity and knowledge. He, more so over, said that the life of feeling, the *Sturm* and *Drang* (storm and stress) described by poetry, was necessary in making the being as a complete person who is at

one with the world. Giambastita Vico (1668-1744) along with Herder went against the grain of virtually the whole of philosophy of modernity which tended to ignore history and culture and treated the truth as a timeless and changeless reality. They opposed technology and like Rousseau challenged the general Enlightenment wisdom that upheld science and technology for the improvement of human life.

Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe (1749-1832) advocated the classical ideal of reason, rigor and clarity as he declared romanticism to be 'sickly,' yet his later work 'Faust' displayed key features of romanticism. Nietzsche predicted the modern age to suffer from dire consequences as it led to the 'Death of God' along with the agony of decadence and disbelief, which resulted in violent consequences of herd morality. He also presupposed a desperate search for New Gods, myths as many consequently got supplemented God with ideologies.

The concept of 'relativism' which constituted the key factor of modernism seemed to have emerged from Nietzsche's polemical 'perspectivism' and manifested itself in other quarters including the brilliant scientific writings of young Albert Einstein. Leibniz had argued against Newton that a version of the thesis of space and time were not absolute but matters of relation as

it could be termed as 'relative', in other words. The prevalent uncertainty and confusion at this turn of the century of modernity combined with sophisticated argument turned relativism into a thesis to be not to be dealt with skepticism.

The Enlightenment first of all is an expression of hope and optimism which consists of the faith in the rational ability of human beings to learn about the world and configures a society that assures peace and prosperity. The details of philosophy and the rigors of epistemology so also the imaginative metaphors here are understood with self-belief that had come of age in Enlightenment. The philosophical idealism the Nineteenth century expressed a new global idealism along with it Nietzsche who, too, could be observed as a harbinger of good things despite his nihilistic notions.

Modern philosophy flourished in Britain and Ireland in the Eighteenth Century as Wales had Price whereas Ireland boasts of Hutcheson to whom Hume and the Scottish Enlightenment owe a considerable debt. The Scots influence the Enlightenment or Aufklärung in Germany, so also the thought of Kant. Cambridge Platonists considered the Enlightenment to be emphasizing on reason and toleration. 'Enlightenment' is, thus, a unifying concept yet history of philosophy do not always make use of it as it used

the term ‘empiricism’ to characterize that philosophy of that period and contrasted it with the ‘rationalism’ of the earlier period. There could be other notions that might be put forward here as the central understanding of development of philosophy related with the development of laity as the deployment of the use of the ordinary language to be the vehicle for understanding of philosophical ideas to make it possible centers of focus. Alternatively, this very process leads to the secularization of philosophy and the growth of the demand of rational religion. Critics considered ‘empiricism’ and ‘rationalism’ to be distant historical theories and misrepresented some of the individual philosophers concerned with Enlightenment. Louis E. Loeb, for example, revolts against the standard labeling of ‘continental rationalists’ or ‘British Empiricists.’⁶ Critics consider that these labels are distant historical realities and misrepresent some of the philosophers associated with Enlightenment. There are also thinkers those who hold that ‘Enlightenment’ is too diverse to be accurately presented as a coherent and unified cultural phenomenon.’⁷

⁶ Please see from *Descartes to Hume: Continental Metaphysics and the Development of Modern Philosophy*, Ithaca, N.Y. Cornell University Press, 1981.

⁷For more elaboration please see *Routledge History of Philosophy – Vol.-V, British Philosophy and the Age of Enlightenment* – Edited by Stuart Brown, Routledge, London and New York.

Defenders of ‘the Enlightenment’ such as the *Philosophe de Alembert*, commonly used the metaphor of spreading light in order to refer to a kind of intellectual and cultural progress modernity believed in. Furthermore, there was a debate in Germany about what ‘*Aufklärung*’ (Enlightenment) was and what it means. Therefore, enlightenment was a concept which was establishing itself during that period in terms of the avant-garde thought of philosophers of that time.

The phrase ‘the Enlightenment’ was adopted in the nineteenth century, when it began to be used. Historians challenged the fact of Enlightenment to be presented as a single European cultural phenomenon. There were important interconnections to be mentioned here, as the English influences on the philosophers of Enlightenment portray the Enlightenment in England itself which followed a different course unlike the movement in France.⁸

The English Enlightenment was to a considerable length spearheaded by Herbert of Cherbury and the Cambridge Platonists. But it is customary in Enlightenment texts to fix 1688 – the year of the ‘Whig Revolution’ to be the starting date as until that date high-church party had dominated till the

⁸ For more elaboration see *Routledge History of Philosophy – Vol-V, British Philosophy and the Age of Enlightenment* – Edited by Stuart Brown/Routledge, London and New York.

history of philosophy and history. Books were censored and religious diversity was also discouraged. Historically speaking after the British revolution when William and Mary were offered British crowns at that time liberals had more influence there in the sphere of politics and the 'latitudinous,' as they were known in the church predominated period. *Tractatus-Theologico-Politicus*, which argued in favor of the case for freedom of expression in religious matters, favored publicly the case for the first time in English tradition in 1689.

The early English Enlightenment is marked by vigorous antagonism between two extremes – the anti-authoritarian 'deists' and the high church defenders of hierarchy and orthodoxy of that time. In the later period of the Enlightenment Radicalism emerged and was represented by the scientists and the Unitarian minister named, Joseph Priestley (1733-1804). The Radical Enlightenment is also reflected in the writings of William Goldwin (1756-1836) and Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797). During the peak period of the French Enlightenment of the mid-eighteenth century, English philosophy lacked the anti-clerical, anti-establishment materialism which is common to the French philosophers.

The English radicals of the late eighteenth and nineteenth century were, too, influenced by their French counterparts. Bentham (1748-1832) derived some of his utilitarian ideas from Helvetius. Utilitarianism being one of the prominent theories of the Enlightenment and Bentham figuring in the series might be regarded as the late Enlightenment thinker being treated as a traditional figure who particularly in relation to his later thoughts can be treated as the harbinger of a new phase of British philosophy. In relation to the foreclosed context Stuart Brown remarks:

‘But it is worth noting that the anti-metaphysical character of the ‘positivist’ movement of the nineteenth century (which Bentham helped to encourage) was also showed by some of the Enlightenment philosophers, such as Condillac and Hume.’⁹

The Enlightenment has emerged due to certain values, such as toleration, freedom and reasonableness and it was also opposed to authoritarianism. Its rejection of an excessive emphasis on authority of clergy was combined with greater respect for lay opinion. The great thinkers of the Enlightenment are, in one way or another, not entirely typical, and they can be better understood once it is seen where they are deviant and out of step with their times. This is true of Kant who wrote ‘Was Ist Aufklärung’?

⁹ For more elaboration please see Routledge History of Philosophy – Vol. V, *British Philosophy and the Age of Enlightenment* – Edited by Stuart Brown/Routledge, London and New York, p- 4.

Lay peoples from the privileged background might occasionally benefit from an education which brought them in touch with scholastic philosophy. In the modern period, everybody had ideas and Descartes cleared only obstacles as there were the problems how to distinguish those which are 'clear and distinct' and which could, therefore, give true knowledge. Unlike scholastic philosophy modern philosophy by contrast, sought to deal in a currency ('ideas') which they expect the whole of the human kind supposed to have in common. In the due course of time French replaced Latin as the language of modern philosophy in the continental Europe. The use of the vernacular became more common in England and by the end of the 17th century the leading modern philosophers such as Descartes, Galileo, Bacon, Locke and Morris published in their native languages. These changes in modernity led to a use of new language along with a new style of philosophizing in which liveliness and clarity were regarded as particular virtues. Locke, however, in his epistle to the reader at the beginning of his *essay* thought it appropriate to apologize to his reader for the difficulties that remained because of the way the work has been composed. He had not written for the sake of academics but for what he called 'polite company.' Modernity is also called as 'The Age of Reason.' So taking into consideration, the factor of deism we can say that Spinoza is considered to be the quintessential deist yet he did not believe in providence or

immortality as usually understood or retribution, it could also be seen now that how difficult it is to define deism by doctrines.¹⁰

There is an inherent tendency in modernity which consists in the fact that there is a desire for a wholesome rational religion or a proposal for rational replacement for Christianity. From this perspective some of the ‘rationalist’ philosophers could be identified as deists as in case of Spinoza who showed similar tendencies in that direction like Leibniz and Malebranche. It was the rationalizing tendency within religion that determined deism to determine it to be not a necessary accompaniment of ‘rationalism’ in the special sense which was used by certain philosophers especially of the seventeenth century and later. The rationalists in the special sense accepted an ideal of system of knowledge built up, the way geometry was taken to be, which is operational through demonstration from self-evident truths. All of these philosophers did not encroach on theology, to depart from orthodoxy in order to aspire for a kind of philosophical religion. Being a rationalist in philosophy did not necessarily mean being a rationalist in matters of religion and hence a philosopher being deistical in tendency.¹¹

¹⁰ Please see, Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1876.

¹¹ ‘Rationalism’ is often used as a close synonym of deism. Bernard Williams, on ‘Rationalism’ in the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* edited by Paul Edwards, NY, Macmillan, 1967, acknowledges that “Enlightenment ‘rationalism’ and ‘rationalism in theology’ as ‘two other applications’ of

Rationalism is said to have been applied unlike metaphysics and the philosophers such as Locke and Richard Price are said to have made application of rationalism to ethics. Samuel Clarke too, applied reason to rational theology. In the whole period of modernity the application of rationalism in metaphysics and natural science were rejected. The roots of the rationalism in a special sense lie in the Aristotelian idea of *sceintia*.¹²

Leibnitz's 'optimism' to demonstrate the best possible world seems to have been taken up by d' Alembert who took it to be a 'system' in an uncomplimentary sense, which resulted in the fact that he could demonstrate that the world has a perfect creator. Voltaire lampooned such kind of optimism in his *Candidate* and *Philosophes*. The Cartesians rejected Newton's theory of Gravity because it involved action at a distance. They thought they had a clear and distinct idea of matter on the basis of which action at a distance could be ruled out. However, in the period of

the term, in addition to refer to the philosophical outlook or programme which stresses the power of apriori reason to grasp substantial truth about the world" (op.cit.vol – VII, p- 9). Deism, however, though not essentially connected with rationalism in this sense, connects these two lesser applications of the term.

¹² 'sceintia' simply means 'knowledge' or 'science.' Sceintia according to the Aristotelian view is arrived at on the basis of the correct syllogistic reasoning on the basis of premises which are both necessary and certain. It is both universal and necessary. For a helpful account of scientia, please see R.L. Woolhouse, *Locke*, Brighton, Harvester, 1983, chapter- 8.

Enlightenment, Newtonian ‘cause’ of which Voltaire was one of the primary supporters prevailed. Nevertheless, systems that prescribed the nature of the world apriori fell into disrepute and controversy.

The demand for a rational religion being met by Anglican apologetics as the controversy about deism became abated. Though there was late flowering of Enlightenment in Britain and America, the excesses of the French revolution reacted to the mechanistic, materialistic and egalitarian philosophies that had previously predominated. Deism paved way for skepticism which was consisting of traditional beliefs and demanded for critical reconstruction. Skepticism remained one of the fundamental aspects of Enlightenment especially as a part metaphysics, however, there were also a few philosophers who fell to the trap of temptation of producing radical doubts among themselves about the possibility of knowledge.

Skepticism had been adopted by ancient Greek philosophers like Sextus Empiricus in the third century A.D., however, it had been revived during the religious turmoil of the sixteen century by Montaigne and other thinkers. What emerges from this discourse was the marriage of skepticism with ‘fideism’ in which all reliance on reason was totally abandoned and the need for a total dependence on faith was proposed. It was held that

doubts lead to the strengthening of faith. Late seventeenth century French skeptic Simon Faucher (1644-97) made a point of identifying the strength with faith. Faucher also made it sure of showing the assumptions of demarcating the metaphysical writing of Descartes and his successors and insisted that they neither had been nor could be demonstrated – hence that the system being offered was inadequately founded.¹³ Faucher presented himself unfashionably within the late renaissance tradition and concentrated on reviving tradition of reviving ancient skepticism and did not receive the attention he deserved from the contemporaries. None the less, he anticipated as well as influenced the argument of best known skeptic of the late seventeenth century named Pierre Boyle.

Boyle (1647-1706) enjoyed a literary success rivaled by few of his time as he wrote for a wide range of readers who are witty as well as profound. His historical and critical dictionary surveys human folly. Boyle used his skepticism to defend his concept of tolerance towards with whom people of his time disagreed (it is also considered a matter of controversy in religious sphere in his time) as he underlined the necessity of faith. His stress on faith

¹³ See for example his critique *de la recherché de la verite*, 1675, repr. New York, Johnson Reprint, 1996, The Editorial Intro by Watson R.A. regards Foucher as an important critique of Cartesianism, also see his, *The Breakdown of Cartesian Metaphysics*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ, Humanities Press international, 1987.

was understood by the *philosophes* as a mere subterfuge. This kind of subterfuge of concealing total skepticism about revealed religion under the pretence of revealing a subterfuge of concealing total skepticism related revealed with religion under the pretence of defending the necessity of faith became a convention for that particular period of time.¹⁴

Boyle showed what was Descartes' failure to demonstrate the existence of a material world, the way it was posed to the reason that Malebranche was insisting on. Despite this very fact was taught by Bible, the theory of explaining of the existence of such material world must be received on faith even though it did get demonstrated by philosophers.

Boyle conceived skepticism much prior to any thinkers in the Enlightenment period. However, the antidote to skepticism lies in Hume's belief in natural judgment. The people belonging to *philosophe* of the Enlightenment were skeptical about religion and metaphysics but not about science. There existed a moderate skepticism associated by Locke. Locke's French disciple, Condillac, wrote a critique of metaphysical systems which

¹⁴ Hume, for instance seems to have adopted such a conventional subterfuge at the end of his essay 'of Morals' when he concluded that 'the Christian religion not only was at first attended with miracles, but even at this day cannot be believed by a reasonable person without one, 'An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding,' Section: 10.

was having similarity of content produced by Malebranche and Leibnitz. Such systems had as Hume claimed been dismissed from science and other disciplines.

Men are cured of their passion hypotheses and in systems of natural philosophy, they hear no arguments but those which are derived from experience. It weighs time they attempted a like reformation in all moral disquisition; and rejected every system of ethics however subtle and ingenious it is, which is not founded on fact and observations.’¹⁵ Hume relates the links of skepticism about ‘systems’ and ‘hypotheses’ in modernity with a room for empirical arguments. The eighteenth century is also a period when empiricism flourished. Hume is regarded as the most progressive thinkers of that time.

CHERBURY

Beginning the discussion about Cherbury, Sarah Hutton points out, ‘the philosophers of Herbert (1582/3–1648) and of the Cambridge Platonists exemplifies the continuities of seventeenth century thought with

¹⁵ Hume, *An Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Section:1 Macmillan Pub. Co, June 1, 1957.

renaissance philosophy.¹⁶ These philosophers did not stop here rather they were engaged with new developments in philosophy of the seventeenth century. Together they represent the development of philosophy outside the Aristotelian tradition. Each of the renaissance philosophers illustrates the interconnected aspect of seventeenth century philosophy with tradition and its lay character as well as the use of the vernacular as the language of philosophical discourse.

Cherbury stands out from the philosophical grouping of the Seventeenth Century. He was neither a successor nor founder of a school. His works such as *De Veritate* (1624, which begun 1617) and his work of religious philosophy entitled *De Religione Laici* (published with the third edition of *De Veritate* in 1645), contains the motivation of religious Irenics confronting the problem of skepticism. Herbert was not only an acquaintance of Gassendi but also appears to have known Descartes personally.

The *De Veritate* constitutes of a blend of Stoic, Neoplatonic and Aristotelian elements which is founded on the Renaissance microcosmic

¹⁶ *Rutledge History of Philosophy*, volume – V, British Philosophy and the Age of Enlightenment, 2003, p - 20.

analogy between man and nature as having everything knowable in the world was considered to be in modernity to be having its corresponding faculty in the mind. As Cherbury remarks in relation to the foreclosed context that, ‘Truth is a harmony between objects and their faculties’¹⁷ {(I.34), 148}. Herbert’s philosophy is a product of the humanist tradition of renaissance philosophy. His concern with the problem of skepticism is placed at par with the new philosophical climate of the seventeenth century philosophical concerns so also with the arguments for free will and along with the notions based on universal consents. These lead to the diffused grasp of English thinkers known as the Cambridge Platonists who are discussed below.

THE CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS

The ‘Cambridge Platonists’ applies to a cluster of philosophers who are literal in their theology and educated at the university of Cambridge in the first half of the seventeenth century. The most prominent members of the group are Henry More (1614–1688) and the other contemporaries that are associated with it are the Cambridge thinkers such as Nathaniel Culverwell (1619-1651), John Smith (1618-1652), Peter Sterry (1613-1672) and the man traditionally regarded as the forerunner of the group is Benjamin

¹⁷ Ibid, I.34, 148.

Whitecoat (1609-1683). Their young followers of the group include George Rust (d.1676), John Norris (1657-1711), Anne Conway (c1630-1679) and a group of the liberal churchmen named as the latitudinarians especially Simon Patric (1626-1707) and Edward Fowler (1632-1714). The Cambridge Platonists are too heterogeneous a group as considered to be a philosophical school since the common struggle among them is liberal and theological in outlook rather than a consistent set of philosophical doctrines.

The Cambridge Platonists did not enslave reason in relation to faith rather it is said to be illuminated by faith. Moreover, according to them reason is not abstract speculation like logic rather it was denounced as blind according to John Smith as it is treated to be a more elevated capacity of mind than discursive reason. The concept of reason of Cambridge Platonists emphasizes practical reason as according to them the mind contains the principles of moral conduct. They tried to establish the fact of moral purification as the best way to obtain true knowledge.

Modernity is said to have emerged from fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which carried along with it aspects of classical learning. It carried with it many of the philosophers of antiquity. Plato and Stoicism became widespread, the prominent people who began the process were Montaigne

and Charron. The skepticism of Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrho became strongly felt and in some cases employed as a ground for evaluating religion as a matter of faith than reason. The separation of philosophy from theology brought about a far greater impact upon the strictly human dimensions of life. Artists now onwards paid more attention to the human body and form as nature became the object of fresh and free inquiry. The spreading of humanism, naturalism and natural science did not involve the rejection of religion rather it affirmed that the areas of humanity and nature could be fruitfully studied by method and assumptions which are not directly derived from them. Philosophical thought in the Enlightenment bears traces of Epicureanism, Stoicism, Skepticism, Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Humanism along with the influence of the natural philosophers like Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo: Modernity was also a time of discovery and emancipation as on every step new horizon is said to be opened. As Stumpf rightly remarks here,

‘While Columbus’ bold adventure led him to discover a new continent, others opened up new worlds of mind and spirit.’ (S. E. Stumpf, *History and Problems*, McGraw Hill, USA, 1989, p – 205.)

However, Giotto’s (ca. 1276- 1337) paintings and Dante’s (1265 –1321) literature had earlier facilitated the transaction from medieval symbolism to the exaltation of nature in modernity. Petrarch (1304-1374) portrayed joy and sorrow of natural man, expressing deep feelings opposed to brittle logic

of doctrine found in Enlightenment. Furthermore, Boccaccio's (1313-1375) sensual capacities of man, curiosity and desire of beauty led others, too, to explore the structure and the subtleties of human body. Michelangelo (1475 – 1564) managed to provide strong expression to the new humanism of his time as his portrayal of Adam is a striking description of physical beauty and strength in its unashamed nakedness and resolute poise towards life.

THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Although the intellectual movement called here is as 'The Enlightenment' yet it is usually associated with the time period of eighteenth century as its roots lie behind. Prior to exploring those roots we are supposed to define the term. This is one of those rare historical movements which in fact named on its own. Certain thinkers and writers of London and Paris, believed that they were more enlightened than their compatriots and set out to enlighten them. These thinkers believed that human reason could be deployed to counter ignorance, superstition, and tyranny in order to build a better world. Their principal targets were religion and the domination of society by hereditary aristocracy.

BACKGROUND TO ANTIQUITY

To understand why the moment of Enlightenment became so influential in the 18th century, it has become important to go back in time. Beginning with the recovery of Aristotelian logic by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century, in his hands the logical procedures so carefully laid out by the ancient Greek Philosopher Aristotle were used to defend the dogmas of Christianity; for the next couple of centuries due to the foreclosed reason, other thinkers pursued these goals to share up every aspect of faith with logic. These thinkers were called 'Schoolmen' (more formally, 'scholastics,') as Voltaire frequently refers to them as 'doctors,' by which he means 'doctors of theology.'

THE RENAISSANCE HUMANISTS

In the fourteenth and fifteenth century in Italy and France a group of thinkers emerged known as the 'humanists.' The theorists were not allied with the anti-religious associations in relation to contemporary political debate. Almost all of the thinkers were practicing Catholics and they argued that the proper worship of God involves admiration of His creation and, in particular, crown of creation lies in humanity. By celebrating the human race and its capacities they argued that they are worshipping God more appropriately than gloomy priest monk who harped on original sin and continuously called upon people to confess and humble themselves before God. Some of these thinkers claimed that humans are like God who creates

not only in His image but also a share of his creative power. According to humanist philosophers, painter, architect, musician, and the scholar by exercising their intellectual powers, were fulfilling their divine purposes.

The celebration of human capacity despite being mixed with modernity along with elements of gloom and superstition (witchcraft trials flourished quite surprisingly in this period as they never had during the middle Ages), bestowed a powerful legacy on Europeans. The goal of renaissance humanists (Enlightenment Humanists) also consisted of recapturing some of the pride, breath of spirit and creativity of tradition consisting of Greeks and Romans in order to repeat their successes and go beyond them. Europeans developed a make belief that tradition should be used to promote change. They also made others believe that cleaning and sharpening the tools of antiquity, they could reshape their own time.

Galileo Galilee used the same sort of logic in 1632 that the schoolmen had used that of re-enforcing the Copernican notion that the earth rotates on its axis beneath the unmoving sun. The church objected to Galileo's teachings forcing him to take back what he had written and preventing him from teaching further. The Church's triumph was said to be a pyrrhic victory, for though it could silence Galileo, however, it could not prevent the advance

of sciences (though most of those advances had taken place in Protestant northern Europe which is out of the reach of the Pope and his Inquisition). Before Galileo's in the 16th century itself various humanists had begun to ask serious questions. François Rabelais a French monk and physician being influenced by Protestantism and spurred by his own rebelliousness challenged the church's authority in his works of Gargantua and Pantagruel and ridiculed many religious doctrines as absurd.

MICHAEL DE MONTAIGNE

Michael de Montaigne, in a subversive way, asked a single basic question over and over again in his *Essays*: 'What do I know?' By this he meant that we have no right to impose on others' dogmas which rest on cultural habits than absolute truth. Influenced by the discovery of thriving of non-Christian cultures in places like Brazil, he argued that moral notions to some degree are relative in nature. He raises the question that who are Europeans to insist that Brazilian cannibals, who merely consume dead flesh instead of wasting it are morally inferior to Europeans who persecute and oppress those of whom they disapprove?

This shift toward cultural relativism though it was based on scant understanding of the newly discovered people, had a profound effect on

European thought to the present day, indeed, it is considered to be one of the hallmarks of the Enlightenment. Just as their predecessors of the Enlightenment thinkers had used the tools of antiquity to gain unprecedented freedom of inquiry, the Enlightenment thinkers too used the examples of other cultures to gain the freedom to reshape not only their philosophies but also their societies in the due course of time. It became clear that there was nothing inevitable about the European patterns of thought they conceived of many possible ways of being human and doubtlessly new ones could also be invented.

The other contribution of Montaigne to the Enlightenment stemmed from another aspect of his famous question: 'What do I know'? If we cannot be certain that our values are God-given then we have no right to impose them by force on others. Inquisitors, Popes, and kings similarly were enforcing adherence to particular religious or philosophical beliefs.

It is one of the paradoxes of history that radical doubt was necessitated for the new sort of certainty termed to be 'scientific.' The good scientist is the one who is willing to test all assumptions, to challenge them and to get closer to the truth. Ultimate truth considered to be claimed by religious thinkers was unattainable by scientists. The strength of science in this

sphere was at its best that it is always aware of its limits and also aware that knowledge is always growing, subject to change and never absolute in nature. Knowledge dependent on evidence in that period of time and reason being an arbitrary authority was its enemy.

THE 17TH CENTURY

Rene Descartes, in the 17th century, attempted to use reason the way the Schoolmen did in a way more rigorously than had been attempted before. He tried to begin with a blank state, with the bare minimum of knowledge having the knowledge of his own existence ('I think, therefore, I am'). From that time onwards he attempted to reason his way to a complete defense of Christianity, but to do so he committed so many logical mistakes that his successors over the centuries slowly disengaged with his gains even finally challenging the notion of selfhood with which he had begun. The history of philosophy from his time to the early 20th century concentrated partly the aspect of more and more ingenious logic until the time of Ludwig Wittgenstein who succeeded in undermining the very basis of philosophy itself.

In modernity logic is deployed as a powerful tool for achieving truth. Logic alone could be used to defend all sorts of absurd notions and Enlightenment

thinkers insisted on combining it with 'reason' consisting of common sense, observation as it established and supported own unacknowledged prejudices in favor of their skepticism and freedom. In modernity thinkers focused closely on a thin piece of thought which travelled through an era dominated by dogma and fanaticism. The seventeenth century was wrought by witch- hunts, wars of religion and imperial conquests. In that period of Enlightenment Protestants and Catholics denounced each other as followers of Satan and people were imprisoned for attending the wrong churches or for not attending it. All publications whether pamphlets or scholarly volumes, were subject to censorship by both church and the state. Slavery was widely practised, especially in the colonial plantations of the Western Hemisphere, and its cruelties frequently defended by leading religious figures. The despotism of monarchs exercising greater powers than any medieval kings was supported by the doctrine of the 'divine right of kings,' and to show that revolution was supported by God. Speakers of sedition or blasphemy were imprisoned or even executed. Organizations which tried to challenge the authorities of church and state were banned. There had been plenty of intolerance and dogma to carry out the arguments and stands in the Middle Ages, however, the emergence of the modern state expressed its tyranny much more efficient and powerful manner.

Sooner or later, many Europeans began to worry about the repression and warfare carried out in the name of absolute truth or religion. In addition to it, though, Protestants made powerful critiques of Catholicism as they quickly turned against each other building churches each claiming the exclusive path to salvation. It was natural for people thrown from one faith to another to wonder whether any of the churches deserved the authority they claimed and to begin to praise the skepticism of Montaigne over the Certainty of Luther or Calvin. There were other powerful forces too, at work in Europe: which are economic ones and interacted profoundly with these intellectual trends.

THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUND TO ENLIGHTENMENT

During the late Middle Ages, peasants had begun to move from rural areas to the towns in search of freedom and prosperity. As trade and communication improved during the Enlightenment Period, the ordinary town dweller began to realize that things will change as subsequently, new charters got written, new governments got formed, new laws became passed, new businesses begun, although each changed institution quickly tried to stabilize its power by swearing by tradition as the pressure for change continued to mount. It was not only in contact with alien cultural patterns which influenced Europeans but also it was the wealth brought back from Asia and the Americas which created a new class of merchants

partially displaced previous aristocracy whose power had been rooted in the ownership of land. These merchants had their own ideas about the world they wanted to live and they became major factors of change in the sphere of governance and the economy.

They are convinced that their earnings were the result of their individual merit and hard work unlike the inherited wealth of aristocrats. Individualism has been chiefly emphasized in the Enlightenment by artists, especially visual artists as it now became a core factor. The ability of individual effort to transform the world became a European dogma till contemporary period.

The major obstacles for reshaping of Europe by the merchant class were the similar to those faced by the rationalist philosophers, they are absolutist kings and dogmatic churches. The struggle, however, was complex and many-sided as each participant absorbing others' values as the general trend is individualism, freedom and change replacing community, authority and tradition as core European values. Religion survived in this period yet weakened and transformed beyond recognition as the monarchy dwindled over the course of the hundred years beginning in the mid 18th century to a pale shadow of its former self.

This is the background of the 18th-century where Enlightenment Europeans were changing, yet Europe's institutions were not keeping abreast with that change. The Church insisted that it was the only source of truth that all who lived outside its peripheries were damned. Writers and speakers grew of that time restless at the censorship and sought means to evade and denounce it.

It is most important to remark that the middle classes, the bourgeois, were paying taxes to support an expensive aristocracy which contributed nothing to society. Those incompetent aristocrats were unwilling to share power with those who manage to their way of thinking, in fact, created the national wealth. They found allies in France among the impoverished masses who lived like their ancestors, yet even they were aware that with each passing year they were paying higher taxes to support a few thousands of people at Versailles.

THE ROLE OF THE ARISTOCRATS

It was interesting to note that among idle aristocrats the French Enlightenment philosophers found some of their earliest and most enthusiastic followers. The Church and State were not allied with each other

and they were keenly aware of their differences. Even kings were undermined by the authority of the Church. The aristocrats were unaware of the precariousness of their position, made them overconfident and interested in dealing with the new ideas because they were new and exciting. Voltaire belonged to aristocratic circles who had a title. He opposes tyranny and dogma and had no intention of reinventing discredited Athenian mistake of democracy. He did not have faith in the ordinary people. He held that educated and sophisticated persons could be brought to perceive that the world could be improved.

ROUSSEAU VERSUS VOLTAIRE

Voltaire is different from other Enlightenment thinkers. His principal adversary was Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who distrusted the aristocrats not because for change rather because he believed in the fact they were betraying decent traditional values. Rousseau opposed the factor of theatre which was Voltaire's passion and shunned the aristocracy which Voltaire took up and argued for something dangerous which is like revolution. Voltaire argued that equality was impossible, on the other hand, Rousseau argued that inequality to be unnatural, however, when this factor, too, made decent government impossible. Voltaire charmed us with his wit, Rousseau on the other ponderously insisted on his correctness even while contradicting himself. Whereas Voltaire insisted on the supremacy of

intellect, Rousseau emphasized the emotions becoming a contributor to both the Enlightenment and its successor, Romanticism. On one hand, Voltaire endlessly repeated the same handful of core Enlightenment notions, Rousseau advocated of original thoughts in all spheres such as, education, the family, government, the arts, and whatever else attracted his attention. Despite their personal differences these two thinkers shared more values which they did not acknowledge. They perceived absolute monarchy as dangerous and rejected orthodox Christianity. Rousseau is a believer as well as, the much a skeptic as Voltaire as both shares 'deism' to be the faith which transferred European religion and exercised powerful influences on other aspects of society. In Holland, the merchants, who exercised most political powers published books which could not be printed in France. However, in Enlightenment dissenting religious groups raised radical attacks on Christian orthodoxy.

THE ENLIGHTENMENT IN ENGLAND

Great Britain had developed its own enlightenment fostered by thinkers like John Locke, the Scottish David Hume and many others. England had anticipated the rest of Europe by dethroning its king back in the time period of 17th century. Although the monarchy became restored, the foreclosed experience a kind of certain openness towards change in many places that could not be entirely ignored. English Protestantism, too, express such a

way which widened the boundary of freedom of speech and press of that time. Radical Quakers and Unitarians dismissed old dogmas in ways similar to Voltaire. The English and French Enlightenment exchanged influences through many channels. Having its revolution early, England was able to proceed smoothly and gradually to democracy; however, English liberty was explosive when transported to France, where resistance by church and state was fierce. The result of all these ironically was that while Britain remained saturated with class classification, France, however, became the most egalitarian and anticlerical state in Europe after its own revolution. The power of religion and aristocracy diminished gradually in England and in France they were violently uprooted during the progressive time period of Enlightenment.

THE ENLIGHTENMENT IN AMERICA

In the meanwhile, apart from Europe many of the intellectual leaders of the United States of America of the colonies were having brush with Enlightenment. The colonies of United States may have been founded by various religious leaders, however, when it became necessary to unite against England, it became clear that no one of them could prevail over the others. Nothing more powerfully propelled the movement to separation of church and the state than the realization that no one church can dominate the state.

Most distinguished leaders of the American Revolution, namely, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Franklin Roosevelt all were influenced by English and to an extent of French Enlightenment thought. The concept God who is underwritten in the concept of equality in the Declaration of Independence of US is the same deist concept of God which Rousseau had worshipped and who is not that respected in the traditional churches which supported and defended monarchies in Europe. Jefferson and Franklin both had spent time in France they are a natural allies because US was a traditional enemy of England after absorbing the influence of the French Enlightenment. The language of natural law of inherent freedoms of self-determination went into American language of the Enlightenment. The American Religion is, however, called as the civil religion.

Enlightenment was lying in the core of United States. Enlightenment constitutes their dreams of what they aim to become. Separated geographically, however, from most of the aristocrats against whom they were rebelling under United Kingdom governance, their revolution nevertheless was far less eating into and less influential than that of France.

THE STRUGGLE IN EUROPE

Voltaire and his allies in France, struggled to assert freedom and tolerance in a culture where the twin aspects of monarchy and Church stood opposed to each other. To oppose the monarchy openly is difficult unlike Church which was an easier target. Protestantism raised religious controversy. Voltaire skillfully pitted one Christian against another to prove his arguments. One way to undermine the power of the church in Enlightenment was to undermine its credibility and Voltaire devoted a great part of his time attacking the fundamentals of Christian belief which includes the inspiration of the Bible, the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ and the denouncing of unbelievers. Voltaire fought the battle and decreased the power of church in order to increase the freedom available to Europeans.

Voltaire was joined by a group of rebellious thinkers known as the philosophes consisting of Charles de Montesquieu, Pierre Boyle and Jean d'Alembart. Denis Diderot, however, commissioned many of the foreclosed thinkers to write for his influential Encyclopedia after this, they came to be known as 'the Encyclopaedists.'

THE HERITAGE OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Enlightenment often faced historical anomaly such as for a moment when a number of thinkers infatuated with reason vainly supposed that the perfect society could be built on common sense and tolerance, it collapsed due to French Revolution and Romanticism. Enlightenment faces a lot of opposition as religious thinkers repeatedly claim the Enlightenment to be dead, Marxists denounce it for promoting the ideals and power of the bourgeoisie at the expense of the working classes, postcolonial critics reject Enlightenment's idealization of specifically European notions as universal truths, and post-structuralists reject its entire concept of rational thought.

The notions of human rights Enlightenment developed are attractive to oppressed people everywhere, who appealed to the notion of natural law which inspired Voltaire and Jefferson. Wherever religious conflicts erupt, mutual religious tolerance is advised to be solution. Rousseau's notions of self-rule are proved to be universal. These ideas sound European yet they gradually becoming global. Whatever their limits are they have formed the concept of international ideals by which modern states became judged.

In Enlightenment the key factors of modernity are said to be interchangeable with renaissance and Enlightenment. The time in its

progressive limbo slowly finds fault with the premodern traditions, language and literature, art, theological systems, political relationship of church and state. The spirit of reflection and criticism which revolted against authority and tradition went on to become revolt against nation, church, reason against prescribed truth and the individual working against Eclectical organization. However, between the conflict church and state became settled in favor of state.

Gradually, the authority of church weakened in due course of time as the individual began to assert his intellectual independence. Reason took over philosophy in this period and guardianship slowly vanished. Truth was supposed to be something to be achieved by free and impartial inquiry and not something decreed by authority. The new age of Enlightenment, however from heaven to earth as man did seek for a personal communion with the object of faith.

PROGRESS OF ENLIGHTENMENT

The modern spirit is a spirit of revolt against medieval society including its institutions and conceptions. It was also promoting self-assertions of human reason in the field of thought and action. The movement seems to have begun by modernity and continued in and through sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the reformation continued through the thirty years of war along with the social and political upheavals in England and France which led to the change. The new ideas were disseminated and popularized which was done during eighteenth century which was called the century of enlightenment. It is said to be an age of possession of principles and world views which infused confidence into human mind to solve its problems which made the factors of state, religion, morality, language and the universe at large intelligible.

The philosophy of the eighteenth century is said to be a striving time yet said to have influenced the action of the common man. It came out of the intellectuals and expressed itself in the speech of people intelligible to everybody. In France, however, due to social, celestial oppressions the Enlightenment said to have found most radical expressions and revolutions is said to have become grown due to new ideas. Having human right and human freedom to be the catchword modernity became prevalent in eighteenth century through notions like humanity, goodwill, natural rights, liberty, equality and brotherhood. The paternalistic authority in this period

of time also thought that it is their essential function to contribute to the welfare of society. The demands of the modern man consisted in liberty of conscience and worship, equal opportunity and economic freedom, representative government and equality of all individual against law.

SCIENTIFIC MOVEMENT

In the middle age there arose a scientific movement which eliminated magic and myth from society. The prominent thinkers were Leonardo Da Vinci (1452-1519), Coperinicus (1473-1543), Galileo (1564-1641), Kepler (1571-1630) and Newton (1642-1727). In this period the previous Aristotelian explanations were improved upon and got replaced by mechanical explanation, which explained that all natural occurrences are caused by the motion of bodies according to the fixed laws. Kepler discovered the orbits of planet as astrology became astronomy. Robert Boyle (1627-1691) introduced atomic theory into chemistry. The anti-teleological theory reached the climax when Darwinian theory got introduced in nineteenth century. The work of Galileo and Kepler proved the Copernican theory of heliocentricity of putting Sun in the center of solar system unlike earth.

Galileo rejected mystical speculation as all his propositions to rest on observation and experiment. The age of Enlightenment is not limited to the propagation of general ideas yet it is also devoted to the study of the sciences. The people who were associated with it were Euler in Language and Laplace in Mathematics, Herschel and Laplace in astronomy, Volta in Physics, Lavoisier, Priestley and Davy in Chemistry, however, Humboldt specified in many streams of sciences.

The scientists of modernity brought about fundamental changes and deployed the method of observation and hypothesis unlike reading, which was the method prevalent in the medieval period. To enhance their observatory power the modernist scientists invented several instruments. Dutchman named Tippershay invented telescope in 1608, although, Galileo was the first to make the use of the instrument. The principle of the barometer was discovered by Galileo's student Torricelli. The air pump which was necessary in creating vacuum for the sake of experiment was invented by Guericke (1602-1686). Gilbert (1540-1603) wrote a major work on magnet and Boyle (1627-1691), the father of chemistry, devised his famous law pertaining to temperature, volume and the pressure of gases. Added to these inventions and discoveries, Isaac Newton and Leibnitz discovered the differential calculus and integral calculus which helped in mathematical formulations, helping immensely in advancement of science.

Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) showed that the nature consists of ‘particles and bodies’ and wished all phenomena of nature could be expressed through same kind of reasoning which could be derived from the mechanical principles. Newton refined and developed the earlier laws of motion in *Principia Mathematica* which had influenced the science a lot.

Giordano Bruno (1548–1600) held that not only the earth moves in its orbit but also multiple universes around us. Each of the universes is unitary and animated the so called affections claiming to be enhancers. In the middle ages it was believed that the sky is said to be hung low since there was a close relationship between philosophy and theology. Philosophy separated itself from theology and religion and religion separated itself from philosophy too. Enlightenment relates to the literary theories which relates to political theories where political thinkers like Machiavelli figures.

Enlightenment is presumed to have begun from 1400 and it was countered around 1800 A.D. The date of beginning is little unclear and is like the beginning of the medieval period. Petrarch (1304-74) is said to be the pioneer figure of Enlightenment followed by Descartes, Spinoza, Hume,

Rousseau and Kant put together to be are modern thinkers and the previous two centuries are said to be as early modern period.

SCEPTICISM

Michael de Montaigne (1533-1592) doubted the possibility of the certain knowledge. He denounced reason and approved revelation. According to Pierre Charron (1541- 1603) the skeptical attitude supports the spirit of inquiry and ultimately leads to faith in Christianity. In his celebrated work *Essays* Montaigne supported Enlightenment and termed it to be classical skepticism. He formed in the ancient works of skepticism an emancipated mode of life. For skeptics of tradition like Pyrrho and Sextus Empiricus, skepticism meant to be something else unlike the meaning it has in the modern times. Skepticism over the centuries deployed as a method of doubt. In modernity the concept of doubt is indifferent to the drift of events and in extreme cases it meant indifference to the physical condition of life. Central to the classical skepticism was the method of inquiry coupled with a desire to live a thoroughly exemplary human life. Montaigne's major concern matches the central aspect of classical method of inquiry along with a desire to live a complete exemplary human life.

Montaigne was forced to face wars, neighborhood riots and religious persecution. So he genuinely believed that the method of constructive skepticism could prevent such outbursts of cruelty to man as well as society. For Montaigne skepticism did not mean either pessimism or as a rule for behavior. On the other hand, he observed skepticism to be a source for a positive mode for observation of all the facts of human life. Although he foresaw serious limits to the foreclosed activity, despite that he glorified human capacity for judgment. Judgments in contrast to reason permits fuller expression of the aspects of man, including affections and emotions. Although Montaigne maintains that 'chance has greater right over me' than his theory of skepticism, he, nevertheless, thought it to be a matter of judgment to accept the basic condition of life.

Montaigne, also remarks that wisdom lies in accepting life as it is and realize what is certainty. He exposed man to the richness of human life and remarked that respectful acceptance of human capacities could make possible a better world. Descartes foresaw philosophy's task to be the quest for certainty and thereby deployed human doubt. Nevertheless, Montaigne's association with human questions instead of cosmic questions did not deter other Renaissance thinkers from pursuing questions about the physical world.

The credibility of Greek skepticism is suspected being contested with modernity, when their works were discovered, suspicion about their ability to knowledge rarely rose which is extended to the extent of the possibility of the existence of God. The sixteenth century revival of the skepticism had immense impact on modernity it is since commonly held that the philosophy from Descartes to Kant can be observed as attempts to answer the challenges of modern skepticism.

Cooper remarks that it is very significant to understand whether to answer or to abide by the skeptical challenge to be an urgent. The proper evaluation of human condition and the right conduct of life depends on proper estimation of skeptics in Enlightenment. There were people like Hume who thought skepticism was idle and it could not be lived but this itself had deep implication for our condition and conduct.

The discussion on skepticism is more than just mere intellectual exercise. To begin with, science is yet to prove itself, so that if Bacon's optimism has to be taken seriously, then skepticism which establishes the laws of nature has to be refuted in the due course of time. Thinkers like Gassendi and Mersune argued that it hardly mattered if laws of nature described reality as such, since they could serve as guide to experience. However, to most of

the thinkers and writers this foreclosed expression either concedes too much to the skeptics or, with its expression of 'reliably' begged the question against skeptics. The Enlightenment period was, by and large, a deeply religious one in which, nevertheless, orthodox belief were under constant counters from different directions. They came from Atheism, Protestants and Deism (Deism denies the divinely revealed knowledge). In the due process of time uncanny alliances were formed since skepticism arose as one recognized discipline in tradition.

The factor which is the result of the endeavors of Enlightenment is to delineate essential aspect of the human being called as self. Two factors emerge from Enlightenment which, are dignity and frailty. People are frail in many ways in this the fragility of the human understanding looms large here, too. A man being positive used to have dignity, skeptical view of our intellectual capacities as Pascal would remark here that it is the deduction of human greatness from their 'Wretched' capacities which came out in Enlightenment.

ENLIGHTENMENT AND ITS CRITIQUES

Enlightenment is said to be an ambition as described by Kant as man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity (An Answer to the question 'What is Enlightenment' in Kant, *Political Writings*, p - 54). Enlightenment refers to a movement of people consisting of scientists, educationalists and as well as philosophers. They are aroused by the prospect of people growing out of condition of dark ignorance and prejudice through their own resources. However, the stimulus for this optimism came from the success of the natural science of the previous century. This foreclosed fact applied to the analysis of the human nature, this very thing claims that the methods not only enabled people to understand themselves and the behavior, but also to improve human condition. Confidence both in systematic understanding of a common human nature and in the moral fruits of this understanding provided the basis for Enlightenment optimism. The French philosopher and educationist Helvetius (1715-71) insisted here, 'morality ought to be treated like other sciences, and founded on experiment.'¹⁸

Natural science progressed through experimental method which it used and moral scientists followed the same method. The only human goals were those which individuals set for themselves or would do if properly

¹⁸ On the mind in J.B. Schneewind(ed) in *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant*, Vol- II, p - 416.

enlightened.¹⁹ Cooper says about Enlightenment that philosophers must break free from traditional authority and look at human nature afresh. Denis Diderot said that the true philosopher is that one who ‘trampling underfoot prejudice, tradition,...authority...dares to think for himself, to ascend to the clearest general principles...to admit nothing save on the testimony of his own reason and experience.’²⁰

In French revolution Descartes’ the famous triplets of the ideals such as, ‘Liberty, Equality and Fraternity,’ as to be of Enlightenment, it is important to note here that for the early enlightenment thinkers these were not primary notions. Some of the Enlightenment thinkers like Voltaire and Hume were patrician in their political outlook as liberty and individualism were constructed on the intellectual foundations in which is reflected on Diderot’s sketch of the true philosopher shown above. What here mattered was individual freedom educated with a state of mind, will be antidote to man’s self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity was defined by Kant to be the inability to use one’s own understanding without the guidance of another...the motto of Enlightenment is therefore: Sapre Aude! Have courage to use your own understanding²¹ (Kant, *Political Writing*, p. 54).

¹⁹ Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, Duckworth, 1981, Telos, Chapters-8.

²⁰ Quoted in Taylor, *Sources of the Self*, Cambridge, 1989, p- 323.

²¹ Kant, *Political Writing*, p-54.

Equality and Fraternity likewise in Enlightenment were not originally slogans of demotists. Even Voltaire and many others were ambivalent towards mass opinion on moral, aesthetic and political matters. Nevertheless, it was possible to reconcile this elitism with the notion of equality and fraternity. However, by insisting that human beings are bound together by common nature and sentiment, and then supplementing the errors of popular opinion by distorting factor that could be eradicated through a kind of enlightened education was one of the solutions of the Enlightenment. Hume argued that 'Few are qualified to give judgment on any work of art.'²²

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have discussed historically the concept of Enlightenment through different thinkers. MacIntyre begins the discussion from the catastrophe constituting widespread riots, degradation of scientists. He elaborates that analytic philosophy was unable to solve the problem of having no consensus between rival premises of modernity. Same has also happened in case of phenomenology and existentialism. More so over, he remarks that we possess simulacra of morality yet we have lost our moral comprehension. He remarks that in pre-modern it was only through his or

²² Of the standard of taste,' in Hume's *Essay*, pp. 246-7.

her in society the individual identifies with himself or herself. MacIntyre says that the backward enlightenment nations followed English models yet English were overshadowed by Scottish Enlightenment. MacIntyre laments that the history of breakdown of Enlightenment consists of incompatible and incommensurable moral premises. He, nevertheless, remarks that utilitarianism of middle and nineteenth century and analytic philosophy of twentieth century are two unsuccessful attempts to rescue the autonomous moral agent from the moral predicament.

The thrust of modernity is said to lie in the revolt against authority and tradition. Being a protest against absolutism it demanded freedom in thought, feeling and action and being 'individual' as a subsequent demand. 'Reason' is assigned a kind of authority and truth is said to be acquired by free and impartial inquiry. MacIntyre being critical of modernity says that agreement was not found on the nature of justice and practical rationality, which are key to modernity.

The Greeks of Alcibiades generation called themselves modern which is democratic in nature. Arab of middle ages called others to be ancient as they nurtured a modern spirit. Renaissance called them to be modern against people stuck in middle ages. Eighteenth century rationalists called

themselves modernists due to their revolutionary activities. Modernity is also said to have begun by 1500 along with Martin Luther and Christopher Columbus. Modernity emerged in England and passed through 'glorious revolutions,' then it spread to France and then to Spain, Italy and Germany. Johann Herder called for increasing our vital powers through 'Gehful' to be one with modernity.

The concept of 'relativism' being key to modernity said to have arisen from Nietzsche's perspectivism, which later manifested with Einstein. There was also a claim that to fix 1688 to be one of the beginnings of enlightenment; it was the year of 'Whig Revolution' as till that time high church dominated all around. The Enlightenment has emerged due to certain values like toleration, freedom and reasonableness. The Cambridge Platonists who surfaced during modernity did not enslave reason which is not a speculative enterprise like logic, rather got illuminated by faith. Michael de Montaign asked an important question here which is fundamental to Enlightenment enterprise: What do I know?

By this he meant that we have no right to impose on others' dogmas which rest on cultural habits than absolute truths, he, more so over, remarks that moral notions are relative in nature. In modernity logic was deployed for

achieving truth as it alone was deployed to defend absurd notions. The merchants meant much to modernity as their wealth from Asia and Americas replaced Aristocracy. They meant that the earning meant individual merit and hard work unlike the lifestyle of the Aristocrats. It was interesting to remark that among idle Aristocrats the French Enlightenment philosophers found their enthusiastic followers.

Enlightenment faced a lot of opposition from different quarters as religious leaders claimed Enlightenment to be dead, Marxists denounced it for promoting the ideals and powers of the bourgeois opposing working classes, post-colonial critics rejected enlightenment's idealization of European notion to be universal truth as post-structuralism rejected its rational thoughts. Enlightenment is also promoting self-assertion in the field of thought and action. The new ideas are disseminated and became popularized which carried out during eighteenth century which was called the century of enlightenment. In modernity science did make significant progress. Kepler discovered the orbit of planet as astrology became astronomy. Robert Boyle introduced atomic theory into chemistry. The work of Galileo and Kepler proved the Copernican theory of heliocentricity of putting sun in the center of solar system.

Galileo in his mystical speculation based his theory on observation and experiment. People those who were associated are Euler in Language and Laplace in mathematics, Herschel and Laplace in astronomy, Volta in Physics, Lavoisier, Priestley and Davy in chemistry, however, Humboldt contributed to streams of sciences.

A Dutchman named Tippershay invented telescope in 1608 although Galileo began the use of the instrument. Barometer was invented by Torricelli. Isaac Newton and Leibnitz discovered the differential calculus and integral calculus helping in mathematical formulations. Sir Isaac Newton showed that the nature consists of ‘particles and bodies’ and wished all phenomena and bodies could be explained through mechanical principles.

Montaigne doubted the possibility of certain knowledge as he denounced reason and approved revelation. In his work *Essay* he supported Enlightenment and termed it to be classical skepticism. Montaigne also remarks that wisdom lies in accepting life as it is and Descartes foresaw the task to be the quest for certainty and thereby deployed human doubt for the purpose of achieving certain knowledge. However, there were people like

Hume who thought skepticism to be idle and seems to have deep implication for our condition and conduct.

I have also made a critique of Enlightenment as Kant says it to be an ambition emerging from self-incurred immaturity, Cooper said that philosophers must break free from traditional authority must think for himself look at things afresh, Diderot also says that true philosopher must trample prejudice, tradition, authority and must think for himself to ascend to general principle and admit nothing save one's own reason and experience. In French revolution Descartes points to the triplets of liberty, equality and fraternity as to be significant part of Enlightenment. Kant echoed one of the important drawbacks as well as necessity of Enlightenment, what could be pointed here is that individual freedom educated within a state of mind becomes an antidote to man's self-incurred immaturity. By immaturity Kant defined as inability to use one's understanding without the guidance of another. So Kant declared otherwise, too, that 'Sapre Aude': have courage to use your own understanding.

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cooper E. David, *World Philosophies, A Historical Introduction*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2002.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *Whose Justice Which Rationality*, University of Notre Dame Press, December, 1989.

Routledge History of Philosophy, Vol.-V, *British Philosophy and The Age of the Enlightenment*, Edited by Stuart Brown, Routledge, London, 2003.

Solomon, Robert C. and Higgins, Katherine M. *A Short History of Philosophy*, N.Y. OXFORD, 1996.

Solomon, Robert C., *A History of Western Philosophy – 7, Continental Philosophy Since 1750, The Rise and the Fall of the Self*, Oxford University Press, UK. 1988.

Stumpf, Enoch Samuel, *Philosophy, History and Problems*, McGraw Hill Book Company, N.Y., US, 1989.

Thilly, Frank, *A History of Philosophy*, SBW Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.

[Http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~brians/hum_303/enlightenment.html](http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~brians/hum_303/enlightenment.html)(Created by Paul Brians March 11, 1998. Last revised May 18, 2000).

CHAPTER – I I I

NIHILISM – CONTESTING MODERNITY AND TRADITION – NIETZSCHE AND ARISTOTLE

In continuation to the Historical interpretation attempted in second chapter about MacIntyre and several thinkers, nihilism surfaces as one of the key to modernity which need to be critically evaluated which I have attempted in the present chapter. Critique of nihilism, essentially discussed, contests the aspect of modernity where Nietzsche misevaluates nihilism, pervading Modernity. Nihilism surfaces from the annihilation of society, individuals and state for the sake of new beginning which includes Russian thinkers who propagated nihilism. I have provided a critical account of nihilism contesting Aristotle and Nietzsche since Nietzsche succeeds Aristotle, even Aristotle scores over Nietzsche as latter lacks a *telo* since he swears by the borrowed Aristocratic and Archaic grandeur and denies God (As MacIntyre remarks). Aristotle provides a *telo* and an ought to humanity which essentially however is the solution to modernity. Nietzsche develops the being with a negative element that has provided solutions which he has glorified and I draw the conclusion with several example from different disciplines and areas. Thus, MacIntyre says,

“...Nietzsche and Sartre deploy philosophical vocabulary which are large part alien to the English-speaking philosophical world; and in style and rhetoric as well as in vocabulary each differs from the other. None the less when

Nietzsche sought to indict the making world be objective moral judgments as the mask worn by the will-to-power of those weak and slavish to assert, themselves with archaic aristocratic grandeur,...”(MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1981, pp-21-22,)

This chapter discusses the key elements of nihilism which is discussed in *After Virtue* by Alasdair MacIntyre.

Notwithstanding, our commitment to rationality, we do find incidents of violence in society. Not all the instances of violence are due to some purpose. One aspect of teleologiless violence is nihilism which celebrates violence for its own sake. The chapter discusses critique of nihilism of Nietzsche. Nihilism figures as an aspect of Enlightenment Project in MacIntyre’s *After Virtue*. In the first section the chapter begins the discussions about Nihilism by relating it to ethics. Later the chapter elicits an examination on Nietzsche by MacIntyre, where the utter ambivalence between Nietzsche and the moderns are delineated. An account of familiarity between Nietzsche and Weber and their prioritization of modernity, subjectivity, irrationalism and power is presented in the beginning of the second section. The second part of the section-II, discusses an alternative to the Enlightenment project. It provides exhaustive accounts of arguments of Aristotle by MacIntyre to supplement nihilism. The third and the last section is termed as criticism. It consists of a critical debate not only from *After Virtue* but also my observations regarding Nihilism. It

provides a narrative of mutual crossfire between ethics, subjectivity, modernity and as well as about Nietzsche's sustainability and justification as an existential moralist.

Nihilism is a historic outcome of world wars, scientific, social and industrial revolutions and had made a massive influence being a producer of modernity and surprisingly is still with us. The impact was not only confined to certain movements and sea changes but also it made significant influence in the theorization of existentialism and otherwise on other theories too. Having archaic initiation from one of the Dialogues of Plato called *Georgias*, through the literary hard-cores like Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Bakunin, Pisarev, till its fruition in the Enlightenment existentialists like Nietzsche and Sartre, it has left long lasting Nihilistic impact.

Nihilism has the origin from the Latin word *Nihil* or nothing. It has the dogmatic tendency to deny not only the existence of God but also the permanence of any entity. Furthermore, it means that nothing is absolutely true of anything since no claims to truth can have any objective grounds. A classical account of *Nihilism* could be found in one of the dialogues of Plato called as *Georgias*. Enunciating *Nihilism* the dialogue conveys that there can be no truth at all. This was formulated on purpose to counter the argument of Protagoras: Man is the measure of all things

The Greek Philosopher *Georgias* had propounded an extreme form of skepticism which could be referred to as *Nihilism*. He denied the possibility of knowledge and doubted whether if anything existed at all. The argument of Nihilism runs like the following: (i) nothing can be said to exist. The stronger version of the *Nihilism* would say that (ii) Nothing exists. So the whole of the argument runs like the following:

- a. If anything did exist.
- b. We would not be able to know it
- c. If we were able to know it we will not be able to communicate it.

MacIntyre remarks that, on the ethical side that the nihilist denies all higher and objective values. In the nineteenth century famous philosopher-existentialist Friederick Nietzsche held the view that the interpretation of existence that Christianity granted to Europe was fundamentally is a life-negating pessimism. A particular form nihilism said to have arisen from Russian Literature and the exponents were Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), who said that the only one hope of society lies in its destruction. In the same gusto, Dimitri Pesarev (1840-1868) propagated that society is so evil that its destruction is a good in itself. Unlike the Enlightenment literature of late Modernity, Existentialism as a school of philosophy does not seem to have adorned a nihilistic garb. Although some forms of the thinkers like Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus breathe *Nihilistic* elements in them as these

two thinkers simultaneously infiltrated into the core of human freedom and tried to figure out the limit of it by putting it against determinism and constraints. *Nihilism* denies validity to any positive alternative and is said to have been coined as a modern concept by Turgenev in his novel *Fathers and Children* (1862). It was coined as suppliant for a Russian movement in the second half of nineteenth century which needed a change without a plan. However, the novel had become quite successful where a central character, which is a young man under the influence of the *most advanced ideas* of the time, bore proudly, what most people of the period called in the bitter resentment as *Nihilism*. The concept did not get neither precision nor clarity yet became widely denoted as the doctrine that moral norms or standards cannot be justified by rational argument. It advocates a kind of despair²³ over the emptiness and triviality of human existence. Above all, if by *Nihilism* one means a disbelief in the possibility of justifying moral judgments in some rational way, then our age is truly *Nihilistic* in nature.²⁴

²³ Despair, anguish, abandonment and quietism are also used in the discussions of existentialism. They are some of the key terms of the theory.

²⁴ The early Nietzsche was concerned with basic problems that he discerned in the contemporary Western culture and society and thereby sought solutions to it. He was further convinced that human condition is fundamentally sound and determined to discover new way out of Schopenhauer's pessimistic conclusions. In his work called *The Birth of Tragedy*, he looked into the ancient Greek for inspiration in order to find way out of this bitterness. Nietzsche professed the advent of Nihilism as the traditional modes of interpretations and valuations of them collapsed in conjunction with the Death of God. It is also associated with the inability of science to form absolute knowledge. The prospect of the forthcoming crises disturbed him. He thus searched for an alternative of traditional

Nihilism means literally nothingness. It means that nothing is knowable as all knowledge is illusory, worthless, meaningless, relative and insignificant. It is a psychological state in which, there persists a loss of all ethical, religious, political and social values. It is also a form of skeptical denial of all that is regarded as real-unreal, knowledge-error, being-non-being, illusions-non-illusions, this is the denial of the values of all distinctions.

NIHILISM – ETHICS

Nihilism declares that the value judgments have lost their validity.²⁵ Nietzsche equated moral Nihilism with negation of life as Europe was suffering from a sickness and loss of superior values. In the ethical sphere *Nihilism* means that in no way moral values can have justification. It could not be carried by reason, by a God, by intuition, by consciousness or even by the authority of the state of law. Moral values can only be:

- a. Expressions of arbitrary and capricious behavior.
- b. Expressions of loose feelings and reasonless, social conditioning.
- c. Worthless, meaningless and irrational.

MACINTYRE, ENLIGHTENMENT DISCOURSE AND

metaphysics and scientific rationalism along with the Nihilism that arises due to the abandonment of these two theories. After the death of Nietzsche a cult of him became developed in central Europe. He was often referred to as latter day Romantic, iconoclastic Nihilist, a social Darwinist, a racist and a proto-fascist.

²⁵ Schopenhauer's ethics of pessimism is close to this doctrine although the value of renunciation remains positive for Schopenhauer and supplies at least a partial answer to the problem of life.

NIETZSCHE

MacIntyre had found the Enlightenment and contemporary thinkers as subjective in their approach and their argument to be rationally interminable. Their moral and evaluative concepts fail to make any development to bridge the gap that lie between 'is' and 'ought'. He treats *Nihilism* of Nietzsche as one of the last Enlightenment theories as he bypasses him in his theorizations. Nietzsche was dealt at-par and prior to with Aristotle in *After Virtue* as MacIntyre finds some similarity of deployment of concepts in both of them. However, the tools that Nietzsche implements being faulty in nature fuels the failure of Enlightenment Project.

Against this backdrop I begin the discussion regarding *Nihilism*. MacIntyre encounters *Nihilism* as one of the supplements to the failures of Enlightenment theorists. Nietzsche said to have expressed disgust towards the vulgarization of modern morality as propagated by Emotivists. The general disgust with the modern morality arises due to the fragmented representation of morality of the Enlightenment thinkers. So their accounts remain as a puzzle, and it ceases to remain so due to the lack of effort to understand and solve the puzzle. In this context MacIntyre provides a relevant account of *Taboo* to resolve this maze. The English seamen during their exploration of the world, found the Polynesians sexually lax yet were astonished to find the prohibition of men and women to sit and dine

together. When they inquired about it they were informed that it was a *Taboo*. They take it to be granted to be a kind of prohibition and thus, the coinage continued. But in reality it is not a prohibition rather it is a kind of reason providing prohibition. Here MacIntyre raises the fundamental question asking about the prohibition, he inquires: What kind of Prohibition?

MacIntyre points out that Cook's seamen and anthropologists were confused about answering the question. So to this question one answer could be that, any hypothesis is to some extent speculative in nature. It could well be said here that the term is embedded in a context which confers intelligibility on them. Taking into account the remark of MacIntyre that we are living in a morally impoverished culture, it could well be deduced from above example that, when the resources of a culture are too meager and fails to carry through the task of representation thus the task to find a consensus regarding morality and otherwise becomes impossible. Here MacIntyre sarcastically remarks about the modernists that:

But had the Polynesian culture enjoyed the blessings of analytic philosophy it is all too clear that the question of the meaning of *taboo* could have been resolved in a number of ways. *Taboo* it would have been said by one party, is clearly the name of a non-natural property; and precisely the same reasoning which led Moore to see *good* as the name of such

property Another party would doubtless have argued that ‘This is taboo’ means roughly the same as ‘I disapprove of this; do so as well’; and precisely the same reasoning which led Stevenson and Ayer to see ‘good’ as having primarily an emotive use would have been available to support the emotive theory of *taboo*...²⁶

The pointlessness of this debate arises from a shared presuppositions of contending parties and their shared rules, presuppositions, investigations of that which lead to an autonomous field of study. However, this is not a valid way of debating as *Taboo* rules could only arise from previous cultural background along with many historical narratives, which are necessary. In this juncture to reinforce the argumentative analogy, MacIntyre shifts the locus of discussion from the real context of Polynesia to the modern moral problems like good, right, obligation which are quite circumstance specific to the argument platform, as these lead to the investigation of the alternative of theory of morality that Nietzsche had propagated.

According to MacIntyre, Nietzsche understood modernity better than his counterparts, yet the appeal to his objectivity is nothing but an elaboration of subjective will. This posed a grievous problem to moral philosophy. I will elaborate in the future discussions along with MacIntyre about how

²⁶MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p-112.

Nietzsche generalized from the condition of moral judgment in his own way to the nature of morality as such. Nietzsche rules out to base morality as such on inner moral sentiments, on conscience on one hand and on Kantian categorical imperative and universalizability, on the other. Disposing off the Enlightenment project, he seeks to supplement morality by discovering rational foundations for objective morality. He, thus, took into confidence that the moral practice and utterances of the everyday moral agent in post-enlightenment culture is in good order. With this assumption Nietzsche goes on to heal the damage that his doctrine had wrought. The doctrine of Nietzschean philosophy lies in the following quotation:

...If there is nothing to morality but expressions of will, my morality can only be what my will creates. There can be no place for such fictions as natural rights, utility, the greatest happiness of the greatest number. I myself must now bring into existence 'new tables of what is good.' 'We however, *want to become those we are* – human beings who are new, unique, incomparable, who give themselves laws, who create themselves.'²⁷

Vehemently criticizing on Eighteenth century Enlightenment rationality which originated from Descartes onwards, Nietzsche resolves to replace reason and pave way for autonomous moral subjects by gigantic and heroic act of will. This act of will leads to an archaic and aristocratic self-assertiveness, which in the due course leads to a prophetic new era. The

²⁷ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985. pp-113-114.

problem arises here is of employing the aspect of *transvaluation of values* through which it is very difficult to construct in an entirely original way to invent a new table of what is good and a law and how to make a compromise between them. This problem lies coiled inside the core of Nietzschean philosophy and unfortunately the pursuit of the problem is prioritized in his articulations unlike the pursuit of a solution. MacIntyre remarks about his position and solution regarding moral Philosophy of Enlightenment and Nietzsche that:

For it is in his relentless serious pursuit of the problem, not his frivolous solutions that Nietzsche's greatness lies, the greatness that makes him *the* moral philosopher *if* the only alternatives to Nietzsche's moral philosophy turn out to be those formulated by the philosophers of the Enlightenment and their successors. (*After Virtue*, p. 114)

So MacIntyre points out the above keeping in mind, the key critical aspect that the alternatives to modernity of Nietzsche, if and only if it tallies with the alternatives that are formulated by Enlightenment thinkers, would make his theory of *Nihilism* proper.

NIETZSCHE AND WEBER

MacIntyre says that Nietzsche's philosophy belongs to the present age, as he demarcates the present age to be Weberian in nature. It is such because Nietzsche in the due course had to share the failures of Enlightenment

Project. In this context MacIntyre critically remarks that Nietzsche professes a kind of ‘prophetic irrationalism’. His theory could be called as irrationalism because his problems remain unsolved and the solutions defy reason - which at the same time was also found immanent in the Weberian managerial forms of our culture. We confront the suppressed Nietzschean premises whenever we try to decipher the moral foundations of bureaucratic culture. In this bureaucratically managed modern society whenever social movement emerge, it will arise inspired by ancestry of Nietzschean ‘prophetic irrationalism’. Weber and Nietzsche together provide us with the key theoretical articulations of the contemporary social order.

NIETZSCHE AND ARISTOTLE

MacIntyre exclaims while relating Nietzsche and Aristotle that the former only makes reference to Aristotle on the context of Aesthetics. Nietzsche also said to have borrowed the notion of *The great souled man* from Ethics of Aristotle, yet it is altogether different from that of Aristotle's deployment. Nietzsche's interpretation of history of morality wears a lot of disguised form of arguments from Aristotelian account of Ethics and Politics. MacIntyre points out here that it will not be just to say that Nietzsche's Moral Philosophy is false if the Aristotle's is true and vice-versa but we can

count on them from their historical roles in moral Philosophy.

The Enlightenment thinkers from fifteenth to seventeenth century had intellectual core of Aristotle in which period new, rational and secular foundations for morality were undertaken. Nietzsche as well as emotivists were successful in mounting a critique against rationalism, at least against one of the most intellectually powerful protagonists of rationality called Kant. In this context MacIntyre remarks about Nietzschean position, which centers around the fundamental question: Was it right on the first place to reject Aristotle? MacIntyre puts forward the answer in following:

For if Aristotle's position in ethics and politics or something very like it - could be sustained, the whole Nietzschean position would be pointless.²⁸

Nietzsche's central thesis rests on the factor that all rational vindication of morality manifestly fail, so belief in the tenets of morality needs rationalizations based on non-rational phenomena of will. MacIntyre points out in this context that he agrees with Nietzsche here as one of the philosophers of Enlightenment period that he could not defy the central thesis of Nietzsche. It is because his 'epigrams are even deadlier than his extended arguments.' Pointing to his earlier arguments MacIntyre says that 'Aristotle was consisting of the core of the Enlightenment during fifteen to

²⁸ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p. 117.

seventeen centuries,' and MacIntyre exclaims that the failures on the part of moderns are in, fact, is the rejection of the Aristotelian tradition. Thus, in this critical juncture the question could be raised: Can Aristotle's ethics, or something very like it, after all be vindicated?

MacIntyre tries to solve this critical question which is large and complex in nature, by showing the issues that divide Aristotle and Nietzsche. It could be said that, philosophy as a theory confronts questions from politics, philosophical psychology and moral theory. These two philosophers not only belong to different socio-cultural milieus and time period but also two different ways of life and theories. Aristotelianism apart from being a theory also enjoys historical significance. So it was not only attacked by medieval theorists but also by the pre-moderns. So MacIntyre remarks rightly about the audacity of Aristotelianism in the following:

But all these historical truths, crucial as they are, are unimportant compared with the fact that Aristotelianism is philosophically the most powerful of pre-modern modes of moral thought. If a pre-modern view of morals and politics is to be vindicated against modernity, it will be in *something like* Aristotelian terms or not at all.²⁹

MacIntyre observes a crisis in finding an alternative from the conjectures of the philosophical and historical arguments. However, the natural

²⁹ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, P-118.

outcome here is collapse of different versions and types of Enlightenment project and the alternative that we are left with are *Nietzschean Diagnosis* and *Nietzschean Problematic*. There is also another impossibility which we may hold that the Enlightenment project was not only mistaken but have never taken place at all as the idea of third alternative is completely ruled out. Related to this is Existential priority of the factor of choice, Nietzsche questions: Which ought we to choose? How ought we to choose? However, making these queries, Nietzsche goes on to Critique the Enlightenment Moralities, as they have to answer the question: What sort of person I have to become? This question could only be answered in *practice* ³⁰ in human life as modern moralities approach it indirectly as they are related with moral rules and often ask: What rules ought we to follow?

Why ought we to obey them? These questions owe its origin from the consequences of the expulsion of the Aristotelian teleology from the moral world. Moral rules become prioritized and qualities of character become prized in modernity, only if it conforms to a certain kind of rule-following.

In this context MacIntyre quotes John Rawls:

The virtues are sentiments, that is, related families of dispositions and properties regarded by a higher-order desire, in this case a desire to act from the corresponding moral principles.³¹

³⁰ Practice is something according to do a thing repeatedly to achieve perfection.

³¹ *A Theory of Justice*, 1971, p-192.

Furthermore, MacIntyre says by quoting Rawls that ‘the fundamental moral virtues’ as ‘strong and normally effective desires to act on the basic principles of right.’³² So in the due course it could well be deduced from the aforesaid discussions that the modern justifications of virtues depend on prior justification of rules and principles and if at all they becomes radically problematic, the former leads to similar consequences. MacIntyre says that if we put Aristotle into question then we have to examine his philosophy expressed in texts but the attempt to inherit and sum up a good deal that had gone before and in turn, serves as a source of stimulus to much later thought.

The pitting of Nietzsche against Aristotle leads to two central theses that language as well as practice of morality in contemporary period is in a grave state of disorder. Apparent arbitrariness among the theories arises due to the ill-assorted conceptual fragments of the past in the present cultural idiom. Thus, the private and the public debate permeating out of it become unsettlable and controversial. This was the reason why we can say that despite the root of all arguments of the modernist’s lies in Aristotle’s theory, yet they become defeated. The aspect of rationality borrowed from Aristotle is never represented properly, especially while countering Nietzsche. So the Enlightenment theorists despite providing sound rational background fail,

³² Ibid. p. 436.

so does their project. MacIntyre observes:

...ever since belief in Aristotelian teleology was discredited moral philosophers have attempted to provide an alternative rational secular account of the nature and status of the moralists, but that all these attempts, various and varyingly impressive as they have been, have in fact failed, a failure perceived most clearly by Nietzsche.³³

MacIntyre says Nietzsche's negative proposal to demolish to the ground the inherited moral belief and argument as desperate and grandiose in nature, had a plausibility. The argument of Nietzsche whether his *Nihilism* was related to everyday moral belief and argument or constructions of moral philosophers, initially rejected Aristotelian moral tradition and virtues as they were misconceived and mistaken. Nietzsche's arguments would have become successful if the tradition would not have been rationally vindicated.

Prioritizing the importance of tradition, MacIntyre says that a large part of modern morality is fragmented survival of tradition. The inability of modern moralists to carry out their project of analysis and justifications are closely related with the fact that their deployment of concept in theories are fragmented survivals and implausible modern inventions. Rejection of the Aristotelian tradition was a rejection of a quite different kind of morality

³³ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p-256.

where rules as former find their places in a larger scheme as virtues play the central role in this sphere. So the cogency of Nietzschean refutation of modern morality of rules whether of utilitarian or Kantian do not extend and attack the Aristotelian tradition.

MacIntyre points out that against the tradition Nietzsche's polemics are completely unsuccessful. He could have become triumphant if all antagonists would have failed. The only way left to succeed against him is the rational power of their positive arguments. MacIntyre further argues that Nietzschean man, the *Übermensch*, who is said to have the peculiar trait to transcend, finds his good in himself and nowhere in the social world, as he dictates his own new law and new table of virtues. This is a kind of pure subjectivist outlook of the self. It is not wrong to assume that this outlook of Superman keeps the door open towards solipsism. Here MacIntyre asks a critical question about Nietzsche that:

Why does he never find any objective good with authority over him in the social world to date?

Answering the very question, MacIntyre observes that Nietzsche's portrait makes it clear that he who makes the kind of transcendence is desideratum of both relationships and activities. MacIntyre urges us to examine keenly the following alternatives:

A great man - a man nature had constructed and invented in the grand style - what is he?...If he cannot lead, he goes

alone; then it can happen that he may snarl at some things he meets on the way ... he wants no “sympathetic” heart, but servants, tools; in his intercourse with men he is always intent on *making* something out of them. He knows that he is incommunicable: he finds it tasteless to be familiar; and when one thinks he is, he usually is not. When not speaking to himself, he wears a mask. He rather lies than tell the truth: it requires more spirit and *will*. There is a solitude within him that is inaccessible to praise or blame, his own justice that is beyond appeal.³⁴

The concept of ‘the great man’ of Nietzsche consists in the contention that the morality in the European society since the time of archaic age in Greece is represented in disguises. It is for this reason, ‘will to power’ and ‘objectivity’ for morality cannot be rationally sustained. It is because that the great-man cannot enter into relationships mediated by appeal to shared standards, virtues or goods. He is his own authority and his relationship to others has to be exercised out of that authority. MacIntyre here points out that the kind of virtues that are placed and defended against Nietzsche can only be sustained by isolation and self-absorption of ‘the great-man’ along with the self-sufficiency in moral authority. If the concept of good has to expand in the terms of practice and narrative unity of human life and tradition then it becomes good on the ground of authority of law and virtues.

³⁴ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, pp-257-58.

It leads to relationships constituting communities whose central bond of shared vision of understanding used to constitute of different goods. To cut oneself off from the shared activity in which one has learned to isolate from communities as well as point and purpose in life, leads to debar oneself from finding any good outside of oneself. Taking into consideration the lurking 'moral solipsism' that is often condemned and yet constitutes the greatness of Nietzsche.

MacIntyre concludes here that Nietzsche does not win the argument even by default against Aristotelian tradition. However, more importantly, it is only from the perspective of tradition that we can best observe the mistakes of Nietzschean position. So we can traverse the historical journey along with MacIntyre by critiquing Nietzsche that the concept of *great man* is also a pseudo concept, he even goes on to brand it to be called as a fiction, but not always. As MacIntyre critically remarks this idea represents individualism's final attempt to flee from its own consequences.

CRITICISM

Thus, it could be concluded that the above discussions are not nihilistic yet, it is a journey towards a moral consensus. It is very problematic, as we can observe from the foreclosed debates that finding a way out of individualism, subjectivism and relativism that looms large in the moral theories of the

Enlightenment thinkers. Though it could be observed that the modern moralities being fragments from the Aristotelian teleology or rationality even scientific rationality,³⁵ be it of Kant or anybody provides food for the rigorous discussion to dispel the rationality as such. Nietzsche issues forth his vehement assault on rationality due to the weakness to sustain the reason and failure to carry-out the authentic foundation of the tradition on the part of the modernists. Discerning the rampant weakness, Nietzsche tries to overthrow not only the modern rationality yet puts forward a radical theorizing. But, we just cannot blame Nietzsche as he has propagated a theory that was a historic sequel to late Enlightenment Russian literary, World Wars crises, growing anguishment, abandonment and despair; rather we must mention here that it was virtually time specific. These could be the reasons for employing the Nihilistic terms by explaining Existentialistic motif that the atheistic Existentialists like Nietzsche and Sartre often used to sport in their argumentative enthusiasms.

It may be right that these existentialists might be a bit unrefined to explain the crisis of that time but they had to face criticism from all quarters. It could well be said here that the Existentialists were responsible for certain

³⁵ Please See: *Whose Justice and Which Rationality* of Alasdair MacIntyre for a critical discussion of the Aristotelian Instrumental Reason and Reason as such. Even *Malaises of Modernity* by Charles Taylor is also a source for that matter.

things that were awe inspiring, emotionally exciting and trance-like yet it may not be healthy for a moral-societal living. It might thrill for a while but does militate to hold a *telo* in a long span of life-time. For example, the typical exposition of the *transcendence* could be interrogated in the following manner: It is what kind of transcendence?

Whom to transcend? What to transcend? And, after all where to transcend? It is peculiar of course that we have to transcend in a society. If we have to transcend in society then does it mean that we have to transcend our fellow beings? If at all we are transcending our fellow beings, then on what grounds? Do we have to transcend them being equipped with unsocial values and virtues as there is no objective code for it? Even if we transcend by harping the tune of Nietzsche then, are we going to be a typical Aesthete; of which MacIntyre often makes reference? Otherwise, do we have to go high on power by justifying Max Weber? It, thus, becomes is a typical case of becoming anti-social inside society.

The criticism and the justification of Nietzsche have one more pointer than just an aggressive modernism that is the imperfect borrowal from Aristotle as it is just like any other unassuming and un-acknowledging modernist. Being just one of them it seems that Nietzsche had borrowed the Platonic and Aristotelian aristocracy and superimposed it in the wrong time, in

wrong place, with wrong fixtures. The whole theorization, however, needs a neat mooring. There is no explanation available in the *Will to Power* and other works of Nietzsche like *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. In a societal living and in theoretic arguments it is next to impossible to find that kind of persona, as, the fictitious person could only be an ephemeral phenomenon unlike having actual real existence. Sartre, who is the topic of discussion here, better still, has limited himself to the human predicament and did not venture to expound such kind of individual. However, his theory was limited to human freedom, its constraints and of course concepts of bad-faith, Being and Nothing.³⁶

The expository remarks about Superman of Nietzsche are pretty pernicious to modern morality and society as such. Nietzsche is seldom clear and critics often excuse him for scathing criticism. But it could never be the case that his theory is clear and he even got confused of placing the aspect of Superman; who through certain procedure of *trans-valuation of values* along with new table of virtues becomes *Overman* and thus in the due course becomes superman. The later concept seems like an individual having supreme powers and supreme values together. It can only be an ideal.

³⁶ Please See *Being and Nothingness* of Sartre for more.

Up to this point the ideas of Nietzsche can go scot-free of the criticisms, but how about the issue of raising the weak from the *slavish slumber*³⁷? Of which whole world including MacIntyre is highly critical. His obsession with perfection has given birth to promotion of Nazi ideal. If everybody becomes superman, which may make society to cease to exist, and the question becomes raised that, where will the society exist? It is the worst ever nightmare that any theorist can ever propound.

Nietzsche, to some extent, agrees to deconstruct the actual world and pave way for a different world, which may sound virtual in nature. Where one and the only superman lives, with an alternative religion to Christianity along with alternative society where courage, valor, power, ideal lives are subservient for the superman. This idealism may remind us of the Platonic Ideal State and Philosopher King and Thomas More's 'Utopia' but unfortunately neither of them were implemented nor acknowledged in any one of the works of Nietzsche.

The *Nihilism* as we can observe, is extended not only to the metaphysical or ethical level yet to the level of religion where the latter is alternated for

³⁷ It is quite unclear in the texts of Nietzsche that, unlike following Marx whom he was trying to render emancipation as Superman is well fed with information that he is gender specific elite. It was also not clear as his own theory militates with his own conception that the Superman comes once in a while and need not rise from the slavish slumber.

a betterment of the superman. However, on the other side, let us look within and ask ourselves candidly that: Do not self, share a little bit of Nietzschean problematic? It is true, if though, we seldom agree among ourselves about it. Who does not want to be great? Who does not take pride of his deeds? I will not point out the heroes and sagas that are written about the cultural macho icons like Jim Morrison, Buffalo Bill, Indiana Jones, King Arthur or Robin Hood. Who does not want to out run a normal man; as they were the men of courage, valor and sagacity?³⁸ Whether it is of the cowboy of the Marlboro or Arnold everybody wants to be invincible, which is virtually eulogized in the dramas, films and cultural innuendoes of the social pattern that, there are certain people those to be called as common men and some geniuses. But the ideals of the liberal modernity and Enlightenment political soft-liners like Rousseau's counter-factual of 'social contract' is forgotten and thus buried here. Perhaps the aspect of globalization does not make citizens to come out of the house as we, rather all of us are glued to our stations, due to raising concern for personal privacy.³⁹

So the question arises here that whether globalization is a boon or a bane?

³⁸ Nietzsche could be accused here that how he was using the concept of courage, valor etc. which is also used in the tradition. But he is not employing them in the same manner that it is used in societal or state specific unlike being individualist.

³⁹ For more discussion on privacy and modernity Please See: *Malaises of Modernity*, Charles Taylor.

And is it not proto-superman like? Are we not into Taylor's soft-despotism and thus become permissive to uphold our own kind of values which is nothing but a Nietzschean rebound of *transvaluation of values*. Maybe MacIntyre's prediction came true as he said that, whenever we will undergo social upheavals we will find suppressed Nietzschean premises. Why shall then we blame Nietzsche just because he caught the factor as young. Are not we in a process of becoming Superman?

Perhaps we can examine the Aristotelian alternative in order to seek some solutions to the foreclosed crises. We can enrich ourselves with proper telos by making our 'Is' to meet 'Ought' by following practical rational ethics.

Man, thus, can be rational, ethical and societal and supposed to work for his *Arete*,⁴⁰ moral, educational and otherwise in socially local institution. For that matter, state could only be his guide. And it is also considered by tradition that without society or city-states there is no existence of an individual.

Lastly, it could be remarked here that the endeavor to put forward a criticism of Rationalism, Theology, Metaphysics and Ethics were to be

⁴⁰ In Homeric society Arete/Excellence is prioritized. It may be awarded in the variety of areas such as of Military or even of intellectual arena.

credited in case of Nietzsche. As he not only lays bare his arguments successfully but also provided alternative for and from modernity as well as tradition. His bold and uncompromising theoretical aptitudes made him one of the pioneers and perhaps the most radical and the best Existentialist *Nihilist*; who could dare to say, an unheard statement in the whole of the academic circle: Now all Gods are dead and it is the time of the Superman to live.

SUMMARY

The chapter begins with a brief background of Nihilism as it essentially takes into consideration the background history and levels of Nihilism in different levels of life, in society, life and self. The violence that is associated with Nihilism, however, is wrought with Russian writer Turgenev as well as Nietzsche and others. Nevertheless, the key factor there remained to be imposed upon are the contesting conceptions of Nihilism of Nietzsche with Aristotle as MacIntyre posed them to each other.

The foreclosed deliberations pervade whole of the chapter as MacIntyre takes and the discussion about Nietzsche to be the beginner of nihilism, referring to his several works to his credit like, *Thus Spake Zarathustra* more and *Will to Power* less. MacIntyre, moreover, analyses them from

ethical perspective and treats Nietzsche to be paradigmatic who at the same time borrowed profusely to prove his point. Nietzsche's concept of superman sounds to MacIntyre more as a sky flower having no feet on the ground as he progresses in denouncing him to be one of the part of the failure of the Enlightenment project where thinkers dealt together to be suffering from a lack of consensus among themselves. Though MacIntyre has bestowed respect to Nietzsche despite and due to extraordinary expressions and daring nature to be authentic at times to go beyond the available philosophic parameters, however, for MacIntyre, Nietzsche is nothing but a kind of failure of Enlightenment Project and suffers from many impracticable claims.

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angels A. Peter, *Dictionary of Philosophy*, Harper and Row, New York, 1981.

Bhadra, Mrinal Kanti, *Phenomenology and Existentialism*, ICPR and Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1990.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *Whose Justice Which Rationality*, University of Notre Dame Press, December, 1989.

The Encyclopedia of Religion, Editor in Chief, Mircea Eliade, Volume 4 and 10, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1987.

Reese, L. William, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion*, Humanities Press, New Jersey, US, 1980.

Russell, Bertrand, *A History of Western Philosophy*, Touchstone, 1967.

Solomon, Robert C., *A Short History of Philosophy*, Oxford, USA, 1996.

Stumpf, Samuel Enoch, *Socrates to Sartre: History of Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill Inc, 1982.

Taylor Charles, *Sources of The Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*, Harvard University Press, 1992.

Warnock, Marry, *Existentialism*, Oxford, USA, 1970.

CHAPTER – IV

AESTHETICS, ETHICS AND MANAGEMENT

Having discussed some aspects of modernity and the critique of modernity, in this chapter let me discuss two issues as explicated by those belonging to different times, thus bolster the continuing and pervasive impact of modernity. The issues that belong to the applied side of modernity are: aesthetic or ethics in Kierkegaard and the practices in modern management.

AESTHETICS OR ETHICS? WHAT TO CHOOSE: MACINTYRE’S CRITIQUE

MacIntyre begins with the publication of Kierkegaard’s *Enter Eller (Either-Or)* in 1842, a work which is found to herald the capriciousness of moral choice in contemporary culture, in that it provides an account of two contrasting ways of life – the ethical, or the realm of duty and the aesthetic or the realm of pleasure and satisfaction – without offering any grounds to

justify one over the other. What makes the argument of Kierkegaard seem so disturbing is the apparent incommensurability of two distinct value systems and the arbitrariness and irrationality of any moral choice between them.⁴¹

KIERKEGAARD'S THEORY OF AESTHETICS AND ETHICS

The theistic existentialist, Kierkegaard distinguishes three types of lives, such as, Aesthetic, ethical and religious. However, the chapter is confined only to his accounts of aesthetic and ethical. It is done in order to enforce the rigors of debate between these two concepts in Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue*. Contrasting the two ways of life, in the first section, the chapter imparts an exposition of the ethics and aesthetics. The second section delineates the points of criticisms put forth by MacIntyre as former treats Kierkegaard as a part of the failures of Enlightenment project. The third section evaluates the alternatives that are put forward to the Enlightenment Project, pertaining to Kierkegaard's exposition.

⁴¹ Horton, John and Mendus, Susan, *After MacIntyre*, Polity Press, 1994, UK, p-111.

Kierkegaard's philosophy consists in the concept of choice. His masterpiece *Enter Eller*⁴² renders a choice for the moral agent to undergo a decision between two ways of life that is discussed in the following section.

AESTHETIC LIFE

The factors that play key role here are art, music and drama. This stage is said to be the first state where a moral agent behaves according to his senses. Due to this reason he is not aware about universal moral standards. He, thus, refuses to commit about anything that binds him down and gives shape of definiteness. From this perspective he rejects morality and religion. In this context, D. W. Hamlyn points out:

By 'aesthetics' Kierkegaard means a concern for the senses and for what is immediate, including pleasure and emotion.⁴³

At this stage a person behaves according to his impulses and emotions. However, he is not simply sensual in nature, rather he is ignorant about moral standards. He does not have religious beliefs. He is what his taste is. He somehow objects everything that limits his freedom of choice. At this stage he exists according to his choice. The agent at this level is aware, as

⁴² *Either Or* is often mentioned as *Enter Eller* in *After Virtue* of MacIntyre.

⁴³ Hamlyn, D.W., *A Penguin History of Western Philosophy*, Penguin Books, England, 1990, P-272.

about which his life ought to consist of. He is not mere his emotive experiences. Demarcating between man's capacity to become spirit and sensuous and identifying former as building and latter as cellar, Kierkegaard remarks that man prefers to live in a cellar.

This distinction in an individual leads to a kind of dialectic. In the sphere of experience the foreclosed conflict produces anxiety and despair as the individual discovers that he is in fact living in the cellar. This living does not lead to a true existence of authentic self as MacIntyre argues. The individual, however, now comes face to face with the choice of either-or. So, either he strays into aesthetic level with the fatal attractions or chooses to move to the next stage. Thinking alone cannot make this kind of transition. Nevertheless, it will be done by a kind of decision through an act of will constructed out of commitment.

ETHICAL LIFE

The ethical person recognizes and accepts the rules of conduct that reason formulates. The man of aesthetics is deprived of universal moral standards. Moral rules impart the ethical man's life an element of form and consistency. Ethical man accepts limitation on his life that moral responsibility imposes. The ethical man never gives in to the desires at the

sexual level, rather accept the obligation of marriage as it is an expression of reason. If Don Juan exemplifies the aesthetic man, it is Socrates who typifies the ethical man. The ethical man is always self-sufficient and takes firm stand on moral questions.

Kierkegaard expects his subject to be more ethical than aesthetical. He anticipates his agent to be more a conscious doer than just an objective onlooker. The ethical as well as aesthetical subjects are said to be objective in their outlook. The aesthetical subject is interested in enjoying rather than knowing the objects. The ethical subject is the chooser of it's own will. It is independent of the external while enjoying absolute certainty. Moreover, Kierkegaard says that the only reality that exists for an individual is his own ethical reality. The real subject for Kierkegaard is the ethically existing subject. D.M. Datta remarks regarding the moral agent of Kierkegaard:

It is such an ethical, spiritual subjectivity, which is variously called by Kierkegaard as existence, truth and reality.⁴⁴

Kierkegaard forms one of modern theorists in the investigation of Enlightenment project of MacIntyre in *After Virtue*. MacIntyre recounts the theories of modernists in a recoiling manner. Through a historical method

⁴⁴ Datta, D.M., *The Chief Currents of Contemporary Philosophy*, Calcutta University Press, Calcutta, p-516.

he seeks a solution for the contemporary moralists in the Enlightenment Discourse. Here Kierkegaard surfaces as one of its significant parts. MacIntyre points out here that:

This element of arbitrariness in our moral culture was presented as a philosophical discovery – indeed as a discovery as of a disconcerting, even shocking, kind – long before it became a common place of everyday discourse. Indeed, that discovery was first presented precisely with the intention of showing the participants in everyday moral discourse in a book which is at once the outcome and the epitaph of the enlightenment’s systematic attempt to discover a rational justification to morality. The book is Kierkegaard’s *Enter Eller*...⁴⁵

According to MacIntyre *Enter Eller* has three central features. The first deals with a relationship between its mode of presentation and its central thesis. According to him, Kierkegaard’s characters wear a number of masks. Moreover, he also divides the self into parts, allocates a series of masks, and made each of them independent selves. Kierkegaard puts forward his pseudonyms in order to provide the reader with an ultimate choice. He says:

A commends the aesthetic way of life.
B commends the ethical way of life.

⁴⁵ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, P-39.

Contrasting the ethical and esthetical life, Kierkegaard observes that it is not a choice between good and evil. In aesthetic way of life one loses himself in the immediate present situation. The paradigm of aesthetic expression lies in the romantic lover, immersed in passion. By contrast to the foreclosed situation the paradigm of the ethical life lies in the marriage because it is a state of commitment and obligation through time. Hence the present is bound by the past, to the future. Each of those two lives is informed by different concepts, incompatibilities and rival premises.

Raising objection regarding the factor of choice,⁴⁶ MacIntyre says that, whether one can have the choice to not to choose between them. There is no answer for it in *Enter Eller*. Even there is no strong and reasonable reason for preferring one to the other. MacIntyre supposes the reasons for ethical living to be following:

- (a) To live in that particular way will serve the demands of duty.
- (b) To live in that particular way will be to account moral perfection as a goal.
- (c) To live in that particular way will give certain kind of meaning to one's actions.

If the reasons have force for the moral agent in Kierkegaard's theory then the agent has already chosen the ethical; which ex-hypothesi has not been

⁴⁶ Choice forms one of the fundamental factors in the discussions of the Existential theories.

chosen. The agent may still check the force in the arguments and thus can choose on his own. Somehow, he is made to choose his first principle, just because they are first in the chain of reasoning. Therefore, no more ultimate reasoning can be provided to support them. This is one of the paradoxes of the Kierkegaard's theory.

Kierkegaard does not seem to endorse either position, as he does not situate his agent in neither A nor B. He also rules out to put the choice between either/or, even not on rational grounds. Contrastingly, Kierkegaard insists that, anyone who faces the choice between the aesthetics and the ethical will in fact have to choose the ethical. It is to be done for the sake of gathering energy, passion, and serious choice-will. Here MacIntyre opposing the very idea that Kierkegaard propagated, remarks,

Kierkegaard thus presents himself as not endorsing either position. For he neither 'A' nor 'B' and if we take him to be presenting the position that there are no rational grounds for choice between either position, that either/or choice is ultimate, he denies that too⁴⁷

According to MacIntyre the next feature of *Enter Eller* deals with a kind of deep inconsistency. This very discrepancy lies between Kierkegaard's concept of radical choice and the ethical. In the ethical realm principles

⁴⁷ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p-41.

have authority over us independent of our attitudes, feelings and preferences. Therefore, what an agent feels in a given moment is incommensurable to the question of how he must live for rest of his life. Due to this reason, marriage, unlike a relationship of love counts more than the latter. MacIntyre in this juncture provides us with an example of Bertrand Russell. In 1902 Russell, while riding a bicycle thought that he is no longer in love with his first wife. Due to this reason the breakup in the marriage between Russell and his wife had happened. MacIntyre points out regarding this moral question:

Kierkegaard would have said, and surely rightly, that any attitude whose absence can be discovered in a sudden flash while riding a bicycle is only an aesthetic reaction and that such experience has to be irrelevant to the commitment which genuine marriage invokes, to the authority of the moral precepts which define marriage. But now whence does the ethical derive this kind of authority?⁴⁸

MacIntyre raises the question about authority under which we used to have our choices in life. Therefore, in relation to the authority one may observe asceticism and fasting and one may do this for the reason of health or religion. MacIntyre asks: What authority such principles possess derives from the reasons for any choice? The principles have authority over us in so far as they are good reasons. No sooner that they are not, the principles

⁴⁸ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p-42.

become deprived of the authority. It follows from the foreclosed analysis that a principle meant for the choice, of which no reasons could be given is vulnerable of becoming a principle devoid of authority. It may also happen that one may adopt a principle out of whim or caprice for some arbitrary purpose. One may live a life on some peculiar principles⁴⁹. MacIntyre says that such is the definition of the principle belonging to the Kierkegaard's realm.

One of the controversial views of the *Enter Eller* consists in the fact that the ethical way of life has to be adopted for no reasons. The choice here lies beyond reasons because it is the choice that counts as a reason. If ethical becomes the authority then the question of a *telo* in life becoming the authority comes under question. Thus, MacIntyre observes that there lies the contradiction in Kierkegaard's theory. To this, it could be replied that Kierkegaard characteristic appeals to authority runs out of reasons to be supported. For example, whenever the foundation of reason breaks down, in Christianity, revelation is called on to provide support. Thus, the notion of the authority and reason are intimately connected and are mutually exclusive in nature. However, the notion of authority without reason is a

⁴⁹ In fact this type of life is much seen in the post-enlightenment period. People live more emotively and the concern for privacy has risen to a new high. For more ideas please see Taylor's articulation on privacy and values in *Malaises of Modernity*.

misnomer. In modern context appeal to authority is alien and repugnant; therefore, appeal to authority becomes irrational. Nevertheless, this theory of Enlightenment militates with the traditional concept of the authority of ethical. The traditional concept of authority which must be embodied in Kierkegaard's concept of the ethical to provide an answer to this foreclosed crises. It was Kierkegaard who discovered and implemented the factor of radical choice, therefore, in his own theory the links between reason and authority are severed. So, there lies a deep incoherence in *Enter Eller*. In this juncture MacIntyre remarks that if the ethical has some basis, it cannot be provided on the ground of the radical choice.

The third feature of *Enter Eller*, consists in the conservative and traditional account of the ethical. Radical choice here appears in the dilemma of moral precepts where an agent has to choose from a variety of moral alternatives.

MacIntyre declares:

But Kierkegaard combines the notion of radical choice with an unquestioning conception of the ethical, Promise keeping, truth telling and benevolence embodied in universalisable moral principles are understood in a very simple way...⁵⁰

⁵⁰ MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, P-43.

MacIntyre remarks that the ethical agent, as has already made his choice faces least problems. This very fact becomes noticed when that becomes known. Here Kierkegaard employs a new practical and philosophical underpinning by employing older and inherited way of life. In a way it is a kind of interpretation of tradition. This admixture of tradition and modernity makes his theory inapplicable and morally interminable. MacIntyre regrets that Kierkegaard may be one of the incoherent theorists of Enlightenment who fail to provide a rational vindication of morality.

The foreclosed analysis between the two selves does not only point to simply a factor of controversy alone. Rather it points to an example of the modern morality that how discrete a theory can be. MacIntyre critiquing the Enlightenment thinkers says that they lack a sense of purpose in their theorizing. However, there is also a lack of consensus among the theories of Modernity. Nevertheless, MacIntyre in his search for the alternatives have found the traditional theories having a teleology and purpose. They are discussed in the following.

TRADITION AND SOLUTION

The following constitutes the alternatives that supplement the failures of the Enlightenment discourse in general and Kierkegaard in particular. The following are the theories of tradition that are put forward by MacIntyre.

1.Homeric

Here the values are essentially pre-determined so also man's place in society. 'Arete' or excellence plays a key role in the society and is applied in military or education. Courage, friendship, fidelity etc. are considered to be central virtues.

2.Athenian

City-state is considered as a guardian here. The virtues that are prioritized are cooperative and competitive in nature. The prized virtues which are prioritized are friendship, courage, self-restraint, wisdom and justice.

3.Aristotle

According to Aristotle man used to have specific nature and moves towards his *telos*. For him virtue is *eudaimonia*, which is equated with blessedness, happiness and prosperity. The good for an individual consists in a complete human life lived at its best.

In conclusion, it could be remarked here that the theories of tradition are teleological and are preached to be practised inside a society or a city-state. They constitute objective values and commend to have a *telo* in life. This solves the underlying subjectivity and confusion that Kierkegaard's theory has created while distinguishing the Ethical and Aesthetical way of lives. The next section discusses yet another aspect that continue to have its impact, namely, the practice of management.

MODERNITY AND MACINTYRE – REFLECTION ON APPLIED ETHICS – AN ANALYSIS OF THREE CHARACTERS: AESTHETES, MANAGERS AND BUREAUCRATS

This section as the title suggests discusses the modern approach to Applied Ethics with reference to Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue*. The text being one of the most important and controversial of contemporary period provides a vivid account of the three characters and their historical origins.

The discussions that begin from Emotivism as it opposes the obliteration of the genuine distinction between 'manipulative and non-manipulative' reasons leading to the evaluation of 'impersonal criteria' in a social context are discussed in the first section of the chapter. The second section opens

with a deliberation of ‘characters’ which relates to the self that is available in characters, roles and the imposition of the character from outside of it. It also discusses the paradoxes of characters which are subjective and relative in their ramifications. The section, however, ends with a controversy regarding autonomy involving stagnation which is one of the consequences of modernity. Much to the philosophical relief, the tradition was finally found as an alternative to the ‘modern predicament’ and the ‘telos’ to the social situatedness of the self which literally gives the ‘self,’ a much sought after face-lift.

EMOTIVISTIC BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

In ‘the quest for an Applied Ethics in modernity’ MacIntyre begins from the discussions about the futility of Emotivism. To quote MacIntyre

Analytic Philosophers have defined the central task of philosophy as that of deciphering the meaning of the key expressions in both every day and scientific language; and since Emotivism fails precisely as a theory of the meaning of the moral expressions, analytical philosophers by and large rejected Emotivism. (MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p - 20)

Emotivism did not seem to ‘die out’ completely in modernity as MacIntyre would remark that the tendency of Emotivism to equate morality into personal preference surfaced over and over again in the writings of Modern Moral Philosophers, for a long period of time.

This section discusses the question, “What is the key to the social content in Emotivism?” To begin with, the very question presupposes the moral philosophy and emotivism with a kind of sociology. MacIntyre says here that almost all the moral philosophy explicitly provide the account of the agent to be related with his or her reasons, motives, intentions and actions. The very process also presupposes that these characteristics of agent could also be found in a social world. Even Kant seems to restrict moral agency to noumenal world, however, was found otherwise in his expressions in law, history and politics. It is a predicament as moral philosophy which could not situate the moral agent in a society and draw presuppositions about it. Breaking away from the beaten track of the moral philosophy, emotivism insists on the obliterations of any genuine distinction between manipulative and non-manipulative social reasons. The first step into the applied ethics seemed to have proposed also by Kant’s polemic; which MacIntyre points out in *After Virtue*,

‘The difference between a human relationship uninformed by morality and one so informed is precisely the difference between one in which treats the other as an end.’ (MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, p-23)

MacIntyre shows us that not only in a public forum but also inside a moral agent argument process used to take place. The problem nevertheless lies

in the predetermination of the agent beforehand as he gets into a public sphere. As each of the people are predetermined so we are, in case of bureaucracy or managerial level, who used to have set of forced reasons by means of which we convince our opponents. The issues here used to get complicated when we ourselves rule out other alternatives while making up our mind. So if any agent lacks good reasons to invoke against other's estimate, then he does not seem to have good reasons on his part to justify his points. However, underlying one's position there lies a non-rational decision to where the agent sticks to certain stand. MacIntyre remarks the investigation of interminability of public argument shows a disquieting private arbitrariness; in continuation to this, it could be said that, it is not surprising thus to find in the managerial authority to be defensive and also irritable.

MacIntyre remarks that the aforesaid discussion leads us to the region of 'impersonal criteria.' He says that there are two different ways in which one person has to be provided with a reason to perform particular action. In the first case one is instructed that:

'Do so-and-so'

The agent replies

'Why should I do so-and-so?'

He is replied that

‘Because I wish it’

Here the agent is not provided with an appropriate reason to do what he is commanded or requested if he or she independently possesses particular reason to paying regard to the wish. Otherwise, if the order happens to come from a superior officer having the authority over the agent; otherwise if the agent loves or fears the order giving authority, if he is provided with a reason, although it may not be sufficient in undertaking the task. In order to understand the foreclosed situation in an applied manner let us analyze it from different perspective. As someone if required to do so and so, the agent asks,

‘Why should I do so and so’

The clause that implies ‘because I wish it’ is replaced with following,

‘Because it will give pleasure to a number of people’ or ‘because it is your duty.’

Here the reason is provided for action is bereft of being a good or bad, is dependent on who utters it. The appeal is independent of the relationship between speaker and the hearer and presupposes the existence of impersonal criterion. The relationship between the context of utterance and the force of the reason giving, which always holds in the case of expressions

of personal preference or desire is severed in the case of moral and evaluative utterances.

THE CHARACTERS

The characters that I am going to discuss in relation to the modern moral predicament relates to the Rich Aesthete, Manager and Bureaucratic Authorities. They are the agents who exist within our 'selves' yet are pointed out as distinct beings. MacIntyre quotes William Gass thus, 'of what it means to be a consumer of persons, and what it means to be a person consumed (Gass, *The Portrait of a Lady*, 1971, p. 181). The consumerism which is one of the significant parts of the globalization relates to the aspect of aesthete who is leisurely and used to generate behavior which is responsive to rest of the characters' wishes, providing food for their appetites. However the wishes of these characters are not benevolent.

So the distinction between characters who entertain themselves by wishing the good of others and pursue the fulfillment of their desires does not hold in the contemporary society, as the manipulative mode of moral instrumentalism comes to fore. Each of the members is endowed with his own set of the attitudes and preferences and they consider world is meant for their satisfaction. 'Aesthetic' is an attitude applicable to different people in different environments. The problem permeates due to the context of

leisure – one of the examples of it being a typical busy holiday in Bahama or Cocomo. Aesthetic attitude may not be rich community specific as it is true that most of us share the attitude of the rich in fantasy and aspiration.

However, in order to understand the very idea of social world in manipulative and non-manipulative norms, there arises a need of the discussion of the other characters who influenced modernity. The Enlightenment social world swears by the organizations whether private or public sector which define the tasks of most of our people. The rich aesthete with a plethora of means seeks relentlessly to employ them; but on the other the organizations engaged in scarce resources to be put to the ends seem to have limitations. Bureaucratic organization, on the other hand, embodies some explicit and implicit definition of costs and benefits from which effectiveness and profit is derived.

Here we have to discuss some parts of *After Virtue*, which discusses Max Weber's remark that questions of ends are questions of value and reason is totally silent on it. More so over, the latter remarks that no type of authority can appeal to rational criteria to vindicate itself except that type of bureaucratic authority which appeals to its effectiveness and it possesses absolute successful power. Weber's theory is criticized being made up of virtual authority unlike actual one by MacIntyre. Yet taking into

consideration some of the theories of sociologists such as Likert, (who says that the managers should influence the subordinates), MacIntyre says that actual managers embody key aspects of Weberian form of authority which comes parallel to Emotivism.

MacIntyre remarks that characters play a central role not only in plays but also in real life. The characters, however, should not be confused with social role as it relates to moral constraints. This could be understood from the example of the differentiation of roles and individual which is a typical issue of Business Ethics. A trade union official by virtue of role negotiation may relate to typical trade union goal of higher wages, improvements in working conditions with compliance with the present economy. Nevertheless, apart from all these prerogatives a particular trade union may believe that trade unions are mere instruments for domesticating and corrupting the working class by directing them from any interest in revolution for no reason. It could be remarked here that the latter has same thing in their mind and heart; but his role expresses the other way around. This instance justifies a recurrent conflict between one's role and one's characters, which is very important to applied, and managerial ethics.

The third character that the chapter going to put forward is that of the therapist. The therapist like the manager obliterates any genuine distinction

between manipulative and non-manipulative social relations. The manager treats as end as given, it occurs outside his scope and apart from that his concern is with effectiveness in transforming raw materials into final products so also unskilled into skilled and investments into profits. The therapist also treats ends as given and outside his scope as the concern he has is with effectiveness in transforming neurotic into direct energy and maladjusted into well adjusted ones. However, neither manager nor therapist is able to engage in moral debate. Lingering as contested figures they purport to restrict themselves to the realm in which rational agreement is impossible which could be treated as a failure of Enlightenment project.

The judgment that the characters in general are those roles which provide a culture with its definitions which implies that the moral belief expressed by and embodied in the characters of a particular will definitely secure universal assent within that culture. However, MacIntyre remarks, it is only through a conflict that the self assumes its destination and history.

The concept of self, presented in emotivism cannot be identified with any particular moral attitude or point of view or character as in the end the judgments are criterionless. MacIntyre critically evaluates the modern self as the following:

To be a moral agent is, on this view, precisely to be able to stand back on any or every situation in which one is involved, from any and every characteristic that one may possess and to pass judgment on it from a purely universal and abstract point of view that is totally detached from social particularity. Anyone and everyone can thus be a moral agent, since it is in the self and not in social role and practices that moral agency has to be located. The contrast between democratized moral agency and the elitists monopolizes of managerial and therapeutic expertise could not be sharper. Any minimally rational agent is to be accounted as moral agent, but managers and therapeutics enjoy their status in virtue of their members within hierarchies of the imputed skill and knowledge. (MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985, pp- 31-32)

The democratized self which, thus, emanates has no necessary social content can thus be anything, can assume any role or take any point of view. It is because it is in itself cares to hear nothing. The self being, thus, conceived at this point being distinct on one hand from its social embodiment lacks a rational history of its own. This aspect of self arises from a contrast and loss as the emotivistic self which has manifestation as characters in society along with its historical predecessors. The crises of self, however, lie with the very factor of the following expressions. There was a stripping in the self, as it goes down lacking social identity, as it is no more available in the contemporary society and thus, stays criterionless in nature.

The effectiveness of manager rests on the possession of the stock of knowledge by means of which organization's social structure functions.

Such knowledge includes a law like generalization that according to MacIntyre, enables the manager to predict that if, an account or state of affairs of a certain type were to take place. Manager claims to authority in two fundamental ways, one concerning the existence of morally neutral fact about which the manager has to be expert, another is related with the law like generalizations and their application to particular cases of management.

MacIntyre claims that the aforesaid view seems like the claim of the natural science and there is no doubt that the managerial authority is to be named 'Managerial Science.' The managerial claim of moral neutrality is parallel to the physical scientists. The ancestry of the problem has its root by beginning of a consideration of how the relevant notion of fact first became socially available and put to use by the 'seventeenth and eighteenth century intellectual ancestors of the bureaucratic managers.' To some extent this relates to the authority of the moral agency, as each one of us is engaged by practice, whether aesthetic or bureaucratic in nature which involves us in the manipulative involvement with other selves. By becoming autonomous, we desire not to be manipulated by others. We catch hold of our own principal stand point in the world of practice. We pursue this by directing towards others the very manipulative mode of relationship which each of us aspires to resist in our own case, as MacIntyre profusely claims regarding

modernity or modern self and its activities to be like foreclosed articulations.

This kind of autonomy which is the central part of Enlightenment in the philosophy in general and applied ethics in particular involves in rejection of the Aristotelian view of the world in which a teleological perspective takes the central focus where evaluative claims functioned as a particular kind of factual claim. MacIntyre claims that the moral and evaluative conclusion cannot lead to factual premises. However, it is true that the meaning assigned to moral and evaluative expressions changed so much during Enlightenment that what are then commonly considered to be factual premises could not become evaluative and moral conclusion. The differentiation of 'fact' and 'value' and 'is' and 'ought' takes place where value and morality came to be reconsidered and this fact also became reinforced by changing conceptions of Enlightenment.

Thus, the telos that are there in tradition are no longer credible as here MacIntyre raises an important question that, "What kind of identity and what kind of telos were they?" The question could be answered in the following manner, in the pre-modern society it is through his or her membership the agent identifies himself or herself and also identified by others, this unlike being an accidental one is rather an essential definition

that the person is expected to have and carry. The individual inherits a space within the social relationships, lacking which they are considered to be nobody. To realize oneself as a social person is, however, not to occupy a static and fixed position, rather it is to find oneself placed on a journey with set goals. To move through life is to make progress – or to fail to make progress - towards an end which might be given or not given.

A MODERNIST DIAGNOSIS OF BUSINESS ETHICS

This chapter also investigates the problem of the managerial authority from the is-ought prospective. Max Weber, the famous social scientist in relation to it points out that the question of ends are the questions of value and the values are non-rational in nature. I begin the discussion from the foreclosed known social scientists' view of power to authority relation; where I have made a critique of his prioritization of putting power over authority which little severs the present managerial problems and issues. The second theory that I am going to discuss in this chapter in the series is the theory of Emotivism, proposed by Stevenson, remarks that the aspect of authority is subjective in nature and there lies no distinction between manipulative and non-manipulative relations. All of these lead to a kind of purpose, which essentially defeats present social relation. According to MacIntyre, even the famous modernist, the democratized self of modernity seems to lack social content due to the foreclosed reason.

G. E. Moore demarcated 'good' to be having non-natural property and simultaneously to be 'intuitions,' which could be proof or disproof. He also asserts that 'personal affections' and 'aesthetic enjoyment' includes all the greatest goods. The theory of existentialism also espouses same ideas leading to self-gratification which echoes in theory of will-to-power by Nietzsche. Modernity also banks on the aspect of bad-faith in order to explain the alternative negative faith that we used experience in the contemporary form of society.

However, from these foreclosed discussions if we try finding solutions to alternative theories like that of Hume, Kant and Kierkegaard, we seem to be dealing with the same paradoxes. As Hume holds our judgments permeating out of powers which spring us to action unlike reason. Kant excessively relies on reason in action and uses 'will' to carry out action; he also relies excessively on maxims, which provides a lopsided view of life. Kierkegaard, too, being highly critical of Enlightenment says that the modern man suffers from a kind of uncertainty, whether to choose the aesthetics or ethics. However, the choice of ethics and aesthetics is equated with similar choice that we make out of good and evil.

Charles Taylor, who is another prominent thinker of modernity, observes theories from a different perspective. He points out that we have forgotten in due course ourselves that we are part of a 'Great Chain of Being.' In his path-breaking work of *Malaises of Modernity*, he portrayed modern man to be suffering from Relativism, Individualism and Subjectivism. However, accordingly the modern perception has become, self-centered and private. Being infected with individualism people have become atomic and windowless. This very fact leads to 'Disenchantment' as they live in a kind of 'Permissive Society' and 'Narcissism.' Nevertheless, all these lead to a kind of 'Me Generation.' Along with the tool of 'Instrumental Reason' the modern self examines the values and virtues through the eye of extreme 'Scientism' and 'Reason.' So all these leads to 'Loss of Meaning' in life, 'Fading Moral Horizons' and finally leads to 'Eclipse of Ends.' Here not only the meager ends of the common sphere gets eclipsed but also paradigmatic ends like *Kaloskagathos* (Gentlemen in *Republic*) and *Rajarshi* (The Indian concept of Philosopher Sage) simultaneously become defeated.

These problems of modernity pose huge crises and need to be properly diagnosed for cure. However, MacIntyre finds the alternative solution to this crisis in the factor that a good man is supposed to live in society exercising wisdom, temperance, courage and self-restraint. This is the

Athenian mode of *Sophrosune* kind of moral agent 'life' which MacIntyre provides from tradition.

More so over, the virtues of the heroic society, when we look at the Western tradition as such it provide us with the understanding of human being who provided the role and the status inside the social system. The man here is judged according to system of '*arête*' or excellence which being the major demand of the society is supposed to be based on practices. Thus, reward means *Kudos* here, as glory assigned as recognition not only upon the man but also of the community or the household.

Finally, I would like to bring on the theory of Aristotle to solve this 'riddle of modernity.' In *After Virtue* MacIntyre contrasts of man-as-he-happens-to-be and man-what-he-could-be-if-he-realizes-his-essential-nature. MacIntyre guides us to realize the very untutored nature of ours to be tutored through the 'Practical Reason.' Then, we can solve the 'riddle of modernity' through human-nature-what-he-could-be-if-it-realizes-its-telos and thus, achieve our goals.

In conclusion, it could be remarked here that, we find the solution to the problem of modernity through the process of finding solution to the human nature itself. As it lies hidden in organizational spheres, leaderships and

decision making efforts, we can also observe things from better perspective if we observe them in a shared manner through rational ethics.

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dutta, D. M., *The Chief Currents of Contemporary Philosophy*, Calcutta University, India, 1961.

Hare, R. M. *The Language of Morals*, Oxford University Press, 1965.

Hamlyn, D.W., *The Penguin History of Western Philosophy*, Penguin Books, England, 1990.

Horton, John, *Aristotelian Philosophy: Ethics and Politics from Aristotle to MacIntyre*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Horton, John and Mendus, Susan, *After MacIntyre*, Polity Press, U.K., 1994.

H. Titus and S. Smith, *Living Issues in Philosophy*, NY, Cincinnati, 1974.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, London, 1985.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *Whose Justice Which Rationality*, University of Notre Dame Press, December, 1989.

McCarthy, John C, Editor. *Modern Enlightenment and the Rule of Reason*, Journal article by Robert C Miner; The Review of Metaphysics, Vo.57, 2003.

O' Nell, Onora – 'Kant After Virtue' – *Inquiry*, Vol-26, 1996.

Pippin, Robert B., *Modernization as a Philosophical Problem; On the Dissatisfactions of European High Culture*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Stumpf, E. Samuel, *Philosophy, History and Problems*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, USA, 1989.

Taylor, Charles, *Malaises of Modernity*, Anansi Press, 1991.

[Http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modernism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modernism).

CHAPTER – V

A PRIMER TO MODERNITY

This brief chapter discusses a primer to modernity which gauges the depth and at the same time places modernity in the universe of discourse. I have endeavored to impart an overview of enlightenment by providing the significant elements as well as the comments in the form of primer which includes the views of several thinkers, weighing them and providing them with exhaustive overview from multifarious perspectives. At the same time it also provides a brief investigation of modernity which comes in the form of almost a conclusive canvassing of modernity. The chapter discusses the key elements, so also clarifies some of the misconceptions as it puts forward an elaboration of the fundamentals of modernity which in most of the academic discourses is meant as Enlightenment.

Modernity It seems to lie somewhere in between tradition and post-modernism; if we try locating it from the perspective of time. However, it is often identified with a time period, thought process, theory and movement. Modernity is equated with assembly of ideas, theories and

above all a thought and according to many modernists it is also a conglomeration of ideas of several thinkers. Modernists have discussed the very concept of modernity not only from the perspective of time period but also from standpoint of philosophy through religion and other perspectives, however, let us limit the whole of the discourse from ethical perspective.

The chapter discusses different aspects of modernity such as Enlightenment project, religious movements, political cataclysms, realization of oneself, newfound lifestyle and a kind of emancipatory activity, which above and beyond anything, we literally worship, hanker, owe and in the due process, we lose into. It is a kind of losing of one's existence into better or worse, is a matter of controversy; yet it should be properly evaluated.

Modernity as some of the prominent thinkers have analyzed begins from 1312 AD. However, opinions vary about the identity of the root of modernity as it was there embodied in us in tradition through medieval period. Modernity was an outcome of something like a content which amazes, as it echoes among movement makers, political leaders and prophets and cheer leaders. It is and it was there when Pythagoras propounded the theory of numbers and when Thales revealed that what is the primary matter, it was there when Nietzsche propounded about

superman and was showcased when knowledge was declared as power by Bacon.

Modernity has strong and weak properties and representatives as proponents like Spinoza and Descartes who are stronger, where as Shaftsbury and Francis Hutcheson were weaker ones. Similarly, MacIntyre might be a strong modernist yet Rundell and Pippin are weaker as thinkers of modernity from philosophical perspective.

Modernity is too enormous to analyze, as it could also be vast and could be classified which, of course, provides us with a clue to examine issues properly as modernity has got its facelift through modern religious, political, ethical and scientific modes. I will differ, however, with MacIntyre that science or politics or anti-papal movement to be demarcated roots of modernity rather it is something which has a life in tradition, medieval and modernity.

Generally speaking the concepts of modernity, modernism and enlightenment were dealt as one and the same. Enlightenment is said to be a kind of a wealth or fortune in relation to the time period where not only there were movement yet there were constant productions from that time onwards till today. Philosophers like MacIntyre, Taylor, Pippin and Cooper

have tried to identify modernity to be following: for MacIntyre Enlightenment project lies in the confrontation between incompatible and incommensurable moral premises and moral commitment among the Enlightenment thinkers, as the expression of criterionless choice between such premises leads to no rational justification.

Taylor identifies critique of modernity under three malaises. The first malaise is Individualism, which gives freedom to people to make choices about their lives and have conviction. The second malaise consists in primacy of the Instrumental Reason in our lives which leads to weighing issues through rationality in order to achieve maximum efficiency. The third malaise relates to the political sphere, the state, family and the institution. The foreclosed malaise consists of Soft Despotism with immense tutelary power which ends in Paternalistic Society and political liberty in modern governance.

Pippin relates the historical growth of enlightenment to be coming out of dark ages. For him modernity is essentially a bourgeois in nature and experience. Self-understanding here consists in middle class with its private property, market economy and liberal democratic institutions. However, it is a kind of end which is intriguing and extraordinarily ambitious which people pursue.

According to Cooper, Enlightenment critique is the synonym of Ambition as it is a movement. It is a growth from dark ignorance, imagination and reason which stem from natural scientific revolution. It is also a systematic scientific understanding of human nature and moral fruits as Cooper treats liberty, equality and fraternity as produces of enlightenment. However, individualism, self-incurred immaturity, self-understanding, elitism, moral awareness, felicity, calculus of maximizing the balance of pleasure over pain are the essential features of modernity.

DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERNITY

There have been several ways of understanding modernity. A variety of terms are deployed to describe the society, social life, symptomatic mentality or defining aspects of modernity. The defining terms also include bureaucracy, disenchantment of the world, rationalization, secularization, alienation, de-contextualization, individualization, subjectivism, linear progress, objectivism, universalism, reductionism, mass society, industrial society, homogenization, unification, hybridization, diversification, democratization, centralization, hierarchical organization, mechanization, totalitarianism and so on.

MODERNITY AND THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

There is an ongoing debate about the relationship between modernity and present societies. The debate has two dimensions. Firstly, there is an empirical question of whether some present societies can be understood as a developmental continuation of modernity. Secondly, there is an issue of whether modernization has been, and is, desirable for a society. New concepts such as globalization, the end of the cold war, ethnic conflicts and the proliferation of information technologies are taken by some as reasons to adopt a tool to gauge social development. However, modernity came with a structure of self-determination which is observed in contemporary societies. Some of the prominent features of modernity are identified as narrative, permissive society and paternalism.

CRITICISM

Modernity also has its roots in existentialism, nihilism, atheism and cosmopolitanism. It is prevalent also in Literature, Mass popular culture and other areas. It is moreover rampant in the regions which the theorists of modernity have overlooked. The areas that the chapter also would like to refer to are the theories of Nietzsche, Sartre, Dostoevsky, Nihilism, Holderlin, Earnest Hemingway, Pragmatists, to mention a few. In this state of affairs man is in crises, he has multiple selves (Rousseau). He is also at

war with himself, suffers from indecision and seeks pleasure. Modernity is also said to be viscous in nature and consists of people who are privacy seeking, leading to unnecessary evils against necessary evils like world war and cold war, nuclear growth and the colonial revolution. It led to needless growth of groups like war scientists, hacker, mafia, terrorism, feminism and over-estimation of the self among the people.

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hare, R. M., *The Language of Morals*, 1989.

Horton, John, and Susan Mendus (eds.), *After MacIntyre: Critical Perspective on the work of Alasdair MacIntyre*, Cambridge, 1994.

Knight, Kelvin, *Aristotelian Philosophy: Ethics and Politics From Aristotle to MacIntyre*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *After Virtue*, Gerald Duckworth, 1985.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *Whose Justice Which Rationality*, 1995.

McCarthy, John C., *Modern Enlightenment and the Rule of Reason*, Journal article by Robert C. Minor; *The Review of Metaphysics*, Vol.57, 2003.

O' Neil, Onora – “Kant after Virtue”- *Inquiry*, Vol -36, 1995.

Pippin, Robert B., *Modernism as a Philosophical Problem: On the Dissatisfaction of European High Culture*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modernism>.

CONCLUSION

Modernity had the inception from latin ‘modemus’ or ‘modo’ meaning ‘just now.’ Modernity pervades the whole of the academics in contemporary times. Since the inception of *After Virtue* and *Whose Justice and Which Rationality* which led to a wide mushrooming of modernity as concentration began from MacIntyre to be the prominent thinker as well as path-breaker; not only because of his healthy supplementation but also due to his power of theorization. The result of these works which followed theorizing of *After Virtue*, *Three Rival Versions of Morality* and *Dependent Rational Animals* and yet, finally, culminated in *Whose Justice Which Rationality*.

It has been an extraordinary attempt by MacIntyre which not only reverberated but also thronged and thrilled the academic genre of our time due to his theorizations. His works inspired many thinkers and monumental works followed from writings of other thinkers, too. It gave rise to volumes and volumes of work including articles, monographs and made modernity to be one of the theoretical demands of our time. The multi-perspective writings of MacIntyre led to profuse multi-dimensional contributions as it led to tensions and contributions from multi-disciplines, beginning from Religion, Ethics and Philosophy, Protestant Ethics, Sociological History, Politics, Aesthetics as well as Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Mind,

Applied Ethics as MacIntyre, contributed intermittently to these areas, too. So one of the reasons that we got follow up works more on MacIntyre for example, *MacIntyre Reader*. (*MacIntyre Reader* - Kelvin Knight, University of Notre Dame Press, December, 1998).

In this thesis I have limited my discussion within the area of analysis of modernity, its supplementation by tradition which MacIntyre has not carried out completely since this might lead to a compromise. So he went for better theorization as he invented alternative practices from Virtue Ethics and alternatives of modernity from modernity itself which was quite innovative in nature unlike borrowing from tradition. Modernity is also a reaction to prevalent system as many thinkers have agreed on this fact as it is known as *Nuta Akherun* or something 'new' irrespective of theories and time-situated-ness of tradition, pre-modern and modernity. In modernity, I had pointed out that we have weak thinkers and strong proponents as we give more importance to Descartes and less to Bacon, as the former is strong and the latter is weak. Some thinkers are to be taken seriously for their quality of theories and good work and some thinkers must not be taken seriously for their demands and the needs of their theories. This very fact has surfaced in critique of modernity or enlightenment, too.

In the first chapter, I have discussed aspects of Modernity and it consists in not only about the thinkers like MacIntyre but also others. So this is one of the reasons that I have laid bare most of the prominent thinkers and the pertinent issues and weighed them evenly. The second chapter, however, examined the history of modernity, the background of the reasoning, the discourse as well as the important nuances of modernity and the critical issues of situated-ness of the self, definitions, narratives, instrumental rationality, texts and critical evaluations which is one of the necessities and the demands of Enlightenment.

The factor which is prominent in the modernity as most of the time highlighted is nihilism, which is the major problem of third chapter. Here I discuss the very concept with its historical background, progress, theories of Nietzsche contesting Aristotle, MacIntyrean perspective as well as the necessary outcome of Nihilism and its place in modernity including critical remarks of MacIntyre on Nietzsche.

The chapter four deals two applied aspects. The first section examines modernist-existentialist Kierkegaard. He elaborates the pertinent issue of modernity lying deep in the factor of 'choice'. Quite peculiarly, though, he lays bare that the modern man does every day of making choice between ethics (ought) and aesthetics (is). The second section discusses modernity

and business ethics which consists of the major deliberations. However, I have analyzed the 'Characters' which figured in the *After Virtue* as MacIntyre discussed them to be the prominent characters of society pertaining to Applied Ethics. This relates to the demanding and key issues of modernity like Emotivism, Characters which consist of Therapeutic, Manager and Aesthete.

Chapter five is, 'A Primer to Modernity' where I have discussed and analyzed the theories of modernity of Rundell, Pippin, MacIntyre, Cooper and their concepts to be the prime aspects of modernity. Here I have discussed aspects of modernity from these thinkers' perspective and where they essentially lead to and otherwise also. However, I have also discussed the major issues and pertinent aspect of modernity in theory and in essential terminology.

My finding in the thesis has led to overall understanding of modernity as I have discussed most of the aspects of modernity. I have discussed some perspectives and thinkers of modernity including Weberian sources as well as advanced sources, even I have gone further evaluating and contesting the theory of modernity with contemporary theorists. I have situated modernity to a considerable length in the need of particular frame of the time and essentially equating it with prevalent societal crux. My findings have shown

thinkers to be weak and strong which is secondary and as the primary issues discussed are the theories which are path-breaking and inspiring having alternated strength as well as very thought provoking in nature. I have found modernity figuring one and only theory which constantly inspires the generations.

MacIntyre's theory, particularly, and modernity generally, has alleviated us, freed us and emancipated us. One of the major contributions of modernity here is the portrayal of emancipation as it provides us with freedom from times to come. MacIntyre is like a Pandora's Box, which guides us in this path of emancipating theory, carrying necessary theories like Existentialism, Positivism, Logical Positivism, Phenomenology and Philosophy of Analysis. The upheaval which is done due to enlightenment could easily be out-weighed by the emancipating changes of modernity which replenished and healed modernity.

