Srila Sripad Maharaja (Dr. T.D. Singh): Once Bhaktivedanta Swami Maharaja asked us to prove that matter comes from life by using science. I didn’t know how to start. How can we prove that matter comes from life?

Srila Sridhar Maharaja: The definition of evolution given by Darwin is that life comes from the fossil. But we say just the opposite. Evolution from inside of consciousness is the cause of our seeing the different things of this world. The evolution is from within. Evolution is not from the outside, as we might ordinarily think. This is the teaching of Vedanta. Reality does not develop from imperfection to perfection; it is only that a part of the perfection seems to be imperfect. To theorize that the imperfect is producing perfection is ludicrous.

It is far more reasonable and easy to conceive that a part of the perfection has somehow become imperfect. It is perceived by us to be imperfect. That is the natural and more reasonable conclusion. We have to accept something of what Darwin says but where does the fossil come from? And that the fossil can produce the infinite is a foolish idea.

The body is amazing the doctors with so many wonderful phenomena. They cannot fathom so many questions. How is it built? How are consciousness, intelligence, and genius centered in the brain? That wonderful thing which we find in the brain, the thought of the genius, is not produced by a material thing. The starting point must be the wonderful thing. We say that really exists – that wonderful thing, the source of all wonders.

Everything is full of wonder. If we analyze the atom, we will be in wonder. Only we impose limitations. But when we analyze the atomic parts of wood or stone, we will be in wonder. The infinite is everywhere. Perfection is everywhere. The trouble is that with our limited thinking we have produced a world of limits. But we who are captured by the ‘scientific’ way of thinking are not ready to admit that. That is the puzzle. From the biggest to the smallest, from the lowest to the
We shall see some direct implications of the alternative paradigm presented in the last two issues (October and November 2011 issues) once we have considered the fundamental nature of individual living beings. This is outlined in the following Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATTER</th>
<th>LIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The inferior energy (apara-sakti) of the absolute truth.</td>
<td>1. The superior energy (para-sakti) of the absolute truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies the conservation of (material) energy.</td>
<td>2. Satisfies the conservation of (spiritual) energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eternal.</td>
<td>3. Eternal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obey the laws of physics and chemistry to some extent.</td>
<td>4. Non-physical and non-chemical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack consciousness and inherent meaning and purpose.</td>
<td>5. Possesses consciousness and inherent meaning and purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First of all, in the alternative view we are describing, matter and life are understood to be two distinct kinds of energy. Life is not an emergent product of evolution of material particles. The Bhagavad-gita (Bg 7.4-5) refers to this as follows:

\[ \text{bhumir apo 'nalo yayaṁ khaṁ mano buddhir eva ca ahankara itiyam me bhima prakritir ashtadha apareyam itas tva anyam prakritim viddhi me param jiva-bhutam maha-baho sayedam dharyate jagat} \]

Translation: “Earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind, intelligence and false ego—all together these eight constitute My (Lord Krishna’s or God’s) separated material energies. Besides these, O mighty-armed Arjuna, there is another, superior energy of Mine, which comprises the living entities who are exploiting the resources of this material, inferior nature.”

Matter and life are fundamental categories of reality. Matter is the inferior unconscious energy of the Supreme and life is a superior, conscious energy of the Supreme. The source of both is the Supreme. Life is designated as the superior energy because it possesses the fundamental feature of consciousness, whereas matter does not. Both of these energies are eternal, and both are composed of basic elemental units. Both satisfy principles of conservation similar to those in modern physics.

Matter is essentially an insentient substrate from which temporary forms can be constructed by atomic combinations. It derives its properties from the absolute truth, and its transformations are governed by laws emanating from this source. However, it is qualitatively inferior to its source of emanation, since it lacks the inherent property of consciousness.

Life consists of innumerable fundamental units, which may be referred to as spiritrons or living entities. These are described in
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The individual is the universal.
The consciousness of sense-certainty proves itself to be dialectical. It starts out with the certainty that its object is a singular immediate being. But it is just this ‘singular immediate being’ that turns around into its opposite to become a universal – i.e. it is true not only for a single but all individual objects since everything is a ‘singular immediate being’.

‘Every individual is different’ because each has free will and is independent of others. If this is universally true then it dialectically turns around to its opposite and becomes ‘everyone is the same.’ This is called “negative movement” or dialectical because each side of the individual-universal relation negates itself to become the other.

Immediate consciousness is called ego. The consciousness of immediate sense-certainty is not aware that ego is related to the object which it considers as immediately being. The admission of relationship cancels immediacy because a relation is something that mediates between two things that unites them, i.e. changes them from two independent beings into a unity or oneness. This change is negation, thus the many-ness is negated to become one-ness or unity as a relation. Of course the many-ness is not destroyed in a relation, or the relationship itself could not exist as such. This is the nature of negation – it does not annihilate but sublimates; unity implies that two or more things have been united, i.e. the explicit multiplicity is sublimated (becomes implicit) in the concept of unity.

The change in going from one moment to another in this movement or process is called experience (as discussed in the November 2011 issue). [1] Taken together these experiences of consciousness are called its history. It is not a history of the world, or the development of consciousness through historical time. It is simply the experience or change due to the movement of thought explained previously – involving the purely philosophical, logical or conceptual events. The series of these experiences is called its history.

The interaction of life with matter ultimately depends upon higher order principles that cannot be reduced to any mathematical formulation. Essentially, the conscious, superior energy interacts with the inferior energy through the consciousness of the absolute truth. This interaction cannot be completely described in quantitative terms, but it can be understood and investigated. It entails fundamental psychological principles such as free will, purpose, and value. Ultimately, this interaction can be understood as the direction and supervision of the individual atma by the Paramatma (the Supreme Lord): as the individual atma develop various desires and psychological states in the course of their experiences, the Paramatma observes these and adjusts the material situation accordingly.

Thus, the distinction between matter and life is the quality of consciousness. This is the main reason why scientists have had such difficulty in defining life. They either try to avoid consciousness completely, or they try to imagine generating it by molecular combination of inanimate matter. Thus an approach of both scientific and scientistic thinking is called for in order to understand the distinction between matter and life.

The spiriton or atma may be thought of as a fundamental quantized part of the absolute living being possessing the irreducible property of consciousness. The spiriton or atma may thus be compared to the electron, which is regarded as the fundamental quantum of electricity. These quanta of life share the qualities of their absolute source – including consciousness and purposefulness – in minute degree, and are thus regarded as the superior energy of the absolute truth.

Both life and matter operate according to the natural laws, or ultimate causative principles. However, certain laws are more specifically associated with life, and others are more specifically associated with matter. The simple push-pull laws of physics and chemistry undoubtedly have some bearing on the behavior of matter, especially in circumstances where life is not significantly involved (inanimate matter). However, these are at best limiting cases of more general laws that are involved with life.

The figure below. The spiriton or atma may be thought of as a fundamental quantized part of the absolute living being...
Something that and then it object is also true for the object itself since it
really a universal, the very opposite of what it means. That genuine being does not reside in the singular immediate
object, i.e. as the truth for consciousness. It thinks ‘singular immediate being’ yet this is
continually going on. But even after analyzing and making all
absorbs itself in immediate being as its object, i.e. as the truth for
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is in fact a universal, which, as such, is not an object of
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universality of the being of an object is
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A particular assertion states the direct opposite of what it means.

Hegel claims that considering examples may be the best method
for being. It is not that the world is itself an illusion but in mistaking
it to be immediate being, while in truth being lies in something
else — and this is what is implied by the term maya.

Appearance itself implies that there is an essence or ground that
is hidden or implicit. The world as appearance implies that there
is a Truth as the ground of the appearances. The concept of a
Supreme Being, for example, does not mean that there is
something like a tallest or supreme mountain among other
mountains, but rather that God is the true essential being relegating
all other beings to the status of appearance. Thus objects are to
be understood fundamentally as appearances or phenomena in
themselves — not that there is a substantial being or thing-in-
itself behind the object. In spite of the tendency to project or
assume a thing-in-itself as the substance of sense-objects, reason
will have to maintain the upper hand as far as what is accepted as
actual reality. Thus, for example, the rational understanding of
the solar system is that the Sun is fixed, despite the experience
on the Earth of the rising and setting of the Sun.

It is upon rationality that science must be built in confirmation
with the sensuous. The rational conclusion of what true Being is
does accord with the experience of the impermanence we find in
the sensuous world. That being is the permanent is what the
Greeks accepted as a logical conclusion of abstract
understanding, since non-being cannot simultaneously coexist
in being. Similar conclusions are found in books like the
Bhagavad-gita where it is said (Bg. 2.16), “Of true being there is
no cessation, and of untrue being there is no endurance.” However, at the conceptual level there is a dialectical relation
between being and non-being.

Unknown to naive or natural consciousness, this process is
continually going on. But even after analyzing and making all
this explicit, consciousness forgets what it has learned and again
absorbs itself in immediate being as its object, i.e. as the truth for
consciousness. It thinks ‘singular immediate being’ yet this is
really a universal, the very opposite of what it means.

That genuine being does not reside in the singular immediate
object is also true for the object itself since it
really a universal, the very opposite of what it means. That genuine being does not reside in the singular immediate
object is also true for the object itself since it
is only for a time and then it is not. “For us” the object may also be consumed so
that no lasting independent being can be attributed to it. Something that is for a time and then is not is called appearance,
i.e. its real being lies in something else. Hegel comments that we
should rejoice in the fact that our environs are mere appearance lest we should perish of hunger (§ 131 Zu)[2]. We will return to
this distinction of being and appearance based on the criterion
of permanence later.

A particular assertion states the direct opposite of what it means.

Hegel claims that considering examples may be the best method
for reflecting on the contradictory nature of sense-certainty. The
logical conclusion is that the individual being of an object that
is meant, is in fact a universal, which, as such, is not an object of
the senses but an object of perception. Thus the conclusion is
that Being is in truth a universal, i.e. of the
nature of thought. This
recognition of the
universality of the being of an object is
called perception. This
is distinguished from
sense-certainty that
only considers being to
be the individual object of
sense.

BEING AND FORGETFULNESS

Kant tried to resolve the duality between knowing and known
within subjectivity, and rightly distinguished the sensuous
aspects as mere appearance so that what was left over was
supposed to be the pure being of the thing in itself. But rather
than accepting this residue as the pure abstraction or pure
negativity that it is, i.e. pure thought, and in spite of his correct
rational analysis, he still presumed that being was somehow a
concrete thing outside experience (naïve realism). Hegel, on the
other hand, takes the rational part of Kant’s conclusion and
adheres to that as the truth of the object, viz., that the object is
in itself appearance, and being is a pure abstraction rightfully
belonging to thought. Unfortunately, it seems that the perennial
forgetfulness of these deliberations has forced philosophy to
deal with this issue repeatedly for centuries, to the neglect of
other important philosophical problems.

In the November 2011 issue, it was found that what is meant (the
individual being of the object) is other than the actual Truth –
the universal. Illusion also means to take one thing to be another
– e.g. a rope to be a snake. Thus absorption in the object as an
individual being rather than the truth of being as universal (yet
to come is the unity of these two in the detailed determinations
of the self-particularization of the universal) seems equivalent to
the concept of maya or absorption in the world as being. “Ma –
ya” means “not that” where “that” refers to universal truth or
being. It is not that the world is itself an illusion but in mistaking
it to be immediate being, while in truth being lies in something
else — and this is what is implied by the term maya.

Appearance itself implies that there is an essence or ground that
is hidden or implicit. The world as appearance implies that there
is a Truth as the ground of the appearances. The concept of a
Supreme Being, for example, does not mean that there is
something like a tallest or supreme mountain among other
mountains, but rather that God is the true essential being relegating
all other beings to the status of appearance. Thus objects are to
be understood fundamentally as appearances or phenomena in
themselves — not that there is a substantial being or thing-in-
itself behind the object. In spite of the tendency to project or
assume a thing-in-itself as the substance of sense-objects, reason
will have to maintain the upper hand as far as what is accepted as
actual reality. Thus, for example, the rational understanding of
the solar system is that the Sun is fixed, despite the experience
on the Earth of the rising and setting of the Sun.

It is upon rationality that science must be built in confirmation
with the sensuous. The rational conclusion of what true Being is
does accord with the experience of the impermanence we find in
the sensuous world. That being is the permanent is what the
Greeks accepted as a logical conclusion of abstract
understanding, since non-being cannot simultaneously coexist
in being. Similar conclusions are found in books like the
Bhagavad-gita where it is said (Bg. 2.16), “Of true being there is
no cessation, and of untrue being there is no endurance.” Howev
The main difficulty in understanding Hegelian philosophy or Absolute Truth, in general, comes in forgetting the difference between rationally established truth and what appears to be true based on uncritically accepted opinions based on sense experience. Even sense-experience when critically or scientifically analyzed will be in agreement with reason, although for unexamined sense-certainty based on subjective “meaning” and not on objective grounds there may at first seem to be a disagreement. The ability to understand and remember this point is essential in philosophical thought.

Modern science is also based upon the principle of seeking the permanent as the true nature of being. Atoms or elementary particles are supposed to be the genuine unchanging substance upon which the changeable substances of the ordinary sensuous things are based. Here we find the same tendency to look beyond the changeable things, that are considered mere appearances, to the real underlying unchangeable nature that is particular according to atomic theory, or of uncertain and complementary nature according to quantum physics. Of course one may always ask what the nature of the fundamental particles are, and in this way ultimately come to abstract/indeterminate being again.

Plato's *Parmenides* [3] deals with the manner in which universal Being 'participates' in the individual. It is one of the most important books of the ancient world on this topic. The concept of participation is the metaphorical term used by Plato to vaguely indicate the relation between the universal and individual. Aristotle further specified the more detailed explanation of this relationship in terms of the process or production (Gr. *entelechia*) of the determinate or actual from the potential/implicit Idea. Hegel develops the detailed movement of thought in terms of the dialectical relationship between the universal and particular and their subsumption in the individual. The attempt is made here to systematically present the detail of this actualizing movement of thought.
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**Subjective Evolution of Consciousness**

Evolution is generally thought of as something merely objective. But objective evolution is a misperception of reality. Evolution is actually based on consciousness, which is subjective. Subjective evolution, however, seems to be objective evolution to those who are ignorant of this perspective.

Consciousness seems to be the unessential embedded in a concrete substance, but actually it is just the opposite. Consciousness is the substantial and its objective content or world is floating on it connected by a shadowy medium like mind. This view finds surprising support in advanced modern science from which physicists like Paul Davies have concluded that it is necessary to adopt “a new way of thinking that is in closer accord with mysticism than materialism.”

The dynamic supersubjective living reality that produces as much as is produced by its constituent subjective and objective fragmental parts or moments is in and for itself the embodiment of ecstasy, i.e. forever beyond the static reification of materialistic misunderstanding. With an irresistible passion for truth, Srila Bhakti Raksak Sridhar Dev-Goswami Maharaja the author of *Subjective Evolution of Consciousness* book takes us to an incomparable synthesis of thought from Descartes, Berkeley and Hegel in the West to Buddha, Shankara, and Sri Chaitanya in the East to reveal the ultimate conception of reality in all its comprehensive beauty and fulfillment.

To obtain the book “*Subjective Evolution of Consciousness*” please contact us at: editors@scienceandscientist.org