

<https://doi.org/10.37948/ensemble-2020-0201-a011>

WHAT SETS US APART? A PHILOSOPHICAL ACCOUNT

Sreetama Misra ¹✉
Article Ref. No.:

20020870N1WTDA

Article History:

Submitted on 08 Feb 2020

Accepted on 27 Apr 2020

Published online on 02 May 2020

Keywords:
development, creativity,
perfection, imagination,
humanism, moral thinking
Abstract:

Humans' ability to rethink, contemplate, and comprehend the inner essences of a matter of this kind is awe-inspiring. The self-reflective consciousness that drives human instincts is something that substantially contributes to human being's self-monitoring, self-control, and self-reflection. The paper aims at exploring what sets humans apart from the other (especially from the non-humans). It is true that human beings are no different from non-human animals. Yet, they are a different kind of animal, an animal of yet another nature and characteristics, having freewill, an immutable soul, a nonphysical mind, and possessing some intrinsic characteristics from consciousness to language ability, from creativity to literature, from imagination to a drive towards perfectionism etc. A human becomes human by possessing the tendency of 'to be' attainable through moral thinking; human life blossoms in the course of its unique way of living and acting along with appreciating the glories of art, beauty and nature's loveliness. Through analysing how humans go by all these traits in leading a life directed towards infinity, it becomes clear that there is no ultimatum to human life, there is always a continuance, and an emergence towards the better, and towards more than what we are. In a variety of contexts, the human-nonhuman differences have been revitalized throughout. Yet, the paper seeks for potential ideas and possibilities, to rediscover the gems of humane insights in creativity and abstract thinking, and providing opportunities for trans-human potentialities.

"To be human is to be sensitive to the needs, desires, and capabilities of those around you and to treat all as you would like to be treated if in the same or similar situation."

– Theron Michael Cavin

I

Introduction

Standing at the vertex of twenty-first century, it is noticeable that development, especially in a capitalist led economic world, depends on the parameter of accelerated scientific-technological growth. In fact, this sort of

¹ [First Author] ✉ [Corresponding Author] Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Belda College, Belda, West Bengal, INDIA; **Email: sreetamaphil@gmail.com**



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

stubborn analysis of development justifies everything, including human life relating to monetary profit and loss. If we, for a moment, resume thinking about development in terms of GDP that links with monetary gain, some relevant questions ponder us.

- Can we just think beyond this economy-centric concept of development?
- Can we just move beyond and think that the development of human nature is something intrinsically precious to humankind?

In this paper, I shall not directly deal with the above questions. However, my analysis doubtlessly attends a few possible solutions to these problems. Human beings have crossed many centuries since the two major times. First is the Hobbesian period, which declared man's life as essentially "*solitary, nasty, poor, brutish and short*"; secondly, the critical metaphysical and conceptual circles that have trapped human thinking to the systematic explication of universal principles and orders. Over the last few centuries, our world has witnessed innumerable and diverse worldviews, some emphasizing moral justice, while some clinging to socio-political and national justice, some emphasized personal virtue, some holding views on nature and religion. However, conventionally, what makes humans a sentient organism and sets apart from other species is self-consciousness. It begins from discovering that I am a person, I can speak, imagine, invent, and innovate. These are the special aspects of human development, visualized from a slightly different perspective, and it defines the true nature of human reality. The most crucial aspect that human beings possess is moral conscience, which is in no way intrinsic but is the resultant factor of our existence in a socio-linguistic paradigm. In a socio-linguistic structure, the human brain grasps several morals as well as eco-socio-political facets featuring our society and learns to perform responsibilities well described in society through language along with several codes and conducts. Charles Darwin (1871)ⁱⁱwrites,

"Of all the differences between man and the lower animals, the moral sense or conscience is by far the most important... [I]t is summed up in that short but imperious word ought, so full of high significance. It is the most noble of all the attributes of man, leading him without a moment's hesitation to risk his life for that of a fellow-creature: or after due deliberation, impelled simply by the deep feeling of right or duty, to sacrifice it in some great cause."

Of course, human beings are no different from non-human animals. However, they are a different kind of animal, an animal of yet another nature and characteristics, having freewill, an immutable soul, and a nonphysical mind. Human beings have consistently shown their significant pride in the evolution of human intelligence through a series of scientific discoveries and technological inventions. Historical records echoes that the firing events in world history, such as World War II & Hiroshima and Nagasaki bomb blast during the twentieth century, reflect the working together of a hive of minds with a unique intelligence designed especially for humans.ⁱⁱⁱ Humans are distinctively human because of their confounding traits from morality to culture, from science to religion, from engineering to inventions – and in all, although they resemble their closest species,

yet they are distinct and match with no other species on the earth. Human's development over the years constitutes what we are today. I agree with Rabindranath Tagore when he says that what sets us (humans) apart is "*civility*", expressed primarily through human behaviour in its unique way.^{iv} Humans are distinct in the sense that they are involved in researching in non-human studies, cognitive science, mind-brain capacities, genetics, neurosciences, linguistics and so on, with innovative inquisitiveness to know how the non-human animals behave, and how qualitatively humans are different from the rest. I shall restrain my writing to portraying what uniqueness defines the human being as uniquely human. Some of the aspects I discuss below are human beings' uniqueness with respect to language, imagination, and giving with a special emphasis on Bertrand Russell's understanding of human uniqueness in the context of his famous work, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*.

II Ways of Human's Uniqueness

The first-person authority and self-consciousness are some distinctive criteria, which separates humans from non-humans. Animal consciousness is driven by behaviour controlling instinct functions, whereas human consciousness has its own will, realization, judgment, and rationality. However, the several facets of consciousness related to brain states like memory, imagination, action, and perception in humans are very similar to those of animals. The fundamental difference arises in the case of linguistic skill that is absent in animals.

The language system is one of the conventional types defining human uniqueness, resulting primarily due to the human capacity of rational thought. This is one of human's uniqueness until recently, but the growing inquiry whether language is itself innate or genetically acquired or the result of general cognitive learning is itself a big question. Certain acts of animals do wonder humans, but that is not a fact of a surprise because animal acts are primarily because of their instinctive and mechanical action. In contrast, human acts are driven by morality, conscience, and rationality. Again, animal behaviour, since instinctive, is largely predictable, whereas human behaviours are largely under voluntary control. Animals do have their own way of expression (Glen A Mazis^v and Charles Darwin^{vi} have vividly expressed their opinions on this), but their complexity is not like those of humans. On the contrary, human's use of language is creative, which also serves as a tool for expression of thought. Even though human technology is able to discover that animals also do use languages, yet human languages enjoy being richer, more complex, more grammatical, and hence more cross-cultural. Language faculty, being so firmly intertwined into human experiences that it is probably impossible to imagine human life apart from it. When two persons meet together, they start communicating by the exchange of words. Even many humans have the experience of interaction with domesticated cats, dogs, monkeys, etc. In cases, when a human loses his/her language (often due to aphasia/mutism), it brings a tale of sorrows to the concerned human and his/her families. Across the globe,

human beings use different kinds of languages as the basic mode of communication, and as a result, in many communities, the use of dialects has cropped up, which are specific to a particular region or community having differences in pronunciation, grammar, syntax and vocabulary. For instance, in India, Hindi is a distinct language accorded with a discrete title, script, nation and a code of literature. Several dialects of Hindi such as *Braj Bhasa*, *Haryanvi*, *Bundeli*, *Kannauji* etc. have cropped up in different periods among distinctive communities basing on their geographical locations. Therefore, it is a language within languages that makes human language unique. It occurs due to inter-human language blends where language mixes with various levels of world history.

My endeavour is not to look for an evolutionary theory on the origin of human language since it would call for a different paper, but to trace out how it is so unique to the human race. For instance, let us have a look over how linguist Charles Hockett^{vii} produces a list of features specific to human language – that humans possess the ability of duality of patterning, interchangeability, cultural transmission, productivity and so and so on. Hockett’s design features of human language, as distinct from animal communication, mostly talk about verbal language. In this regard, it is even noteworthy to mention the written form of human communication, as unique to human beings. However, Hockett’s design features as specific to human beings, were challenged by Noam Chomsky. According to Chomsky^{viii}, language is biological-based and innately learned, and that human beings share a common universal language that ties all language together. Hockett, however, opposes this Chomskian view. This, however, calls for a separate paper.

Returning to our context, it is noticeable from the various sources of literature that while animals primarily communicate, humans have the capability to distinguish between language and communication. In an e-content developed by Johnson M. Joe on *The Difference Between Animal and Human Communication*^{ix} published in STEM, it is argued that human language is context-free, grammatical, have semantics like noun, verb, present, past etc. in order to express meanings. Even human language is unique when they use signs and written words to express what they understand and mean. Language probably is one of the outstanding inventions in human history, and the millions of signs of progress humans have made today owes severely to our language system. Chinese novelist Gao Xingjian (2007)^x writes,

“Language is the ultimate crystallization of human civilization. It is intricate, incisive and difficult to grasp and yet it is pervasive, penetrates human perceptions and links man, the perceiving subject, to his own understanding of the world. The written word is also magical for it allows communication between separate individuals, even if they are from different races and times.... A writer’s creativity begins precisely with what has already been articulated in his language and addresses what has not been adequately articulated in that language.”

Language, therefore, turns into a social phenomenon, and this feature makes human beings so unique.

Associated with human language faculty is humans' act of imagination, which plays a great role in the world of literature and philosophy, especially since the Platonic days, gently reminding us of the "*third realm*", a bridge creating a discrepancy between what is real and what is imaginary^{xi}. An engineer deciding to build a bridge and consequently making plans for it (without noting down anything on a piece of paper) is said to build the bridge only in his mind, and not in reality. The bridge, when built, we call it to exist. Therefore, the bridge in the engineer's mind is an imaginary bridge, whereas the bridge being built is a real one. The same is for music. In the process of preparing a song, music first remains in the mind of a musician in its raw form before it is given a final form through voiceover, tuning, and instruments. When the tune exists only in the musician's mind, it remains in imaginary form till the time the music becomes audible to others in a presentable form or is noted down for future use. However, in all these, either in the case of a bridge or music or any other creation, imagination takes place prior to its happening in reality. Creativity lies in the making of a plan, whereas imposing the plan is only fabricating. We do not need language for imagination, it might happen with proper/improper meanings, but imagination gives rise to language "as a feature of experience at the conscious level" (Russell, 1984).^{xii}

Hence, a form of scientifically oriented "*philosophical language*" (blossoming of creativity) replaces symbolic languages (the plan/imagination in mind), so that a proper language (creativity in its final form) can be shaped invariably and with precision.

Now we come to an important mark that distinguishes humans from the non-human species, it is the art of "*giving*". Moral thinking drives human's giving, whereas non-human animal's giving is the result of instinct, and they primarily reciprocate. Animals probably give, but humans know the art of giving in a rational and socially significant way. The baseline standard for giving is provided in the Bible as a form of worship. The Holy Bible asks for free giving, cheerful giving, charitable and good giving^{xiii}. Giving becomes possible through human's part in social lives, and humans encounter a variety of options – i.e., giving in terms of rights, charity, freedom, care, value, and the like. Can human giving be elevated to unconditional heights? Let us hold that the most elementary form of giving is sharing food. This form is even shared by animals. This practice evolved during the primitive ages, when men engaged in hunting, while women remained busy in fire and in distributing eatables to their children. In the complex jargon of the human ego, individuals were seen as competing with each other, struggling to get what one can get first. However, a settlement and stability arose when powers began to be vested not in individual hands, but in the hands of authority. It led to the notion of conscious giving, especially for the humans and subsequently, people have started giving away a large portion of their income/investments for the cause of society, and such examples are many. They consciously question, how can we be so wealthy when so many of us are poor? This is, however, a different issue. In the

paragraph below, I shall provide perception of the opinion of Bertrand Russell's distinctive features that separates human beings from the non-humans.

The British Philosopher, Bertrand Russell has listed out six features that mark human's uniqueness and distinguishes human beings from the non-humans. These features^{xiv} are: a) Speech; b) Fire; c)Agriculture; d)Writing; e)Tools and f)Large Scale Co-operation. With the development of civilization in its different facets, social, scientific as well as technological, human beings have shown their excellence through their series of inventions and discoveries such as speech, writing, fire, agriculture, tools etc. However, I would like to stress the final aspect i.e., Large Scale Co-operations. In *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, Russell (1992)^{xv} points out that man out of his impulse and driven by passion as well as intelligence, is interested not in the welfare of a singular man, but in the welfare of all men. As a result, man has witnessed several victories as well as troubles and conflicts among the different human communities and social groups. These conflicts, however, have been resolved with the ethical and moral codes that are formed in society, and which have contributed largely to the benefits of social co-operation and a healthy competition. In the present context, the reflection of large-scale co-operation is visible in fighting against the potentially devastating socio-economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this crisis moment of human civilization, the world is witnessing large-scale, global, comprehensive, and most coordinated cooperation of human beings across territories in the reign of the pandemic with a co-operative hope for better, safer, and elevating man-to-man relationships to a new height.

III

Human Creativity: A Backdrop

Creativity in human becomes possible only through the tool of imagination. Creativity is another human feature that sets us apart from non-human animals. In one of the news published in *ScienceDaily*^{xvi} by the Max Plank Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology on September 10, 2018, it is said that chimpanzees, human's closest relatives, learned how to hunt (in search of meat) and use tools on their own. In an article published on *Plos Biology* by Thomas Breuer (2005)^{xvii}, it is reflected how gorillas use tree branches as walking sticks to measure the water depth, and the list continues. However, in all, even though animal's innovations are largely surprising yet fascinating, it is doubtless that non-human animal acts are largely driven by their instinct, their actions are for a cause and for the sake of something. But human actions may take place either for a cause or for a not-cause. An action is for a cause, when it has a means and an end; and actions for not-cause implies when human actions are the reflections of human's creativity/artistry, undirected towards any means, but has an end. Actions directed towards end aims at the humanistic approach, a step towards self-actualization and unique development. It gives birth to creativity. However, it is noteworthy to remember that technological inventions did not lead creativity to emerge in man; rather creativity led to the emergence of technology. As creativity expert Michael

Michaelko (2011)^{xviii} writes, “*We are all born as spontaneous and creative thinkers*”. Michaelko further adds that every human being is irrepressibly drawn towards certain creative acts and means for appreciation, which in a way transcends us towards our larger self. This aspect of creativity, I think, is a gateway to the humanistic approach. Humanism as a more accommodative approach, stresses on a harmonious interrelation of an individual with the other, its uniqueness lies in human soul, which is neither nature’s product nor an element of God. The understanding of humanism shreds away all prejudicial belief systems and religious taboos upheld by a particular society, and place all individuals under a common platform having shared values and morals. Many a time, humanism prominently emerges as a substitute for religion on the one hand and naturalism on the other. Humanism ornaments itself with some unique traits, which mark its distinctiveness, such as loyalty, inner harmony, wholeness, and peaceful coexistence, without any supernatural intervention. Professor Irvin Babbitt (2017)^{xix}, in his book *Rousseau and Romanticism* sharply puts down his quarrel with religion, especially because religion “*puts the principle of control outside man, while humanism places it within man*”(Radhakrishnan, 1932)^{xx}. Humanists’ core principles are human values. That we are moral beings is the greatest reality and the moral order is held to be the universal law of the world. It is inevitable that, how carefully do we make plans for shaping human society and establish tightly human relationships, the world would at one time or the other make human feel the real suffering and teach that we cannot escape sorrows and sufferings. In this regard, a query crops up how humanism can contribute to making our trivial sorrows and sufferings insignificant. Humanism has the power to do so, especially because of its adherence to the ultimateness of values. Humanism is not any system, but a flowing tendency “*to be*”, it stresses on the essential element of “*reason*” and checks the free-flowing of natural impulses in each man, behind the backdrop of human reality.

In this context, Tagore’s^{xxi} understanding of humanism is extremely noteworthy. Tagore’s thoughts and philosophy have led civilization to a dizzy height, and for him, humanity is over and above anything else. Tagore held that man’s essence lies in looking for divinity in man, to find out the hidden harmony through which man escalates towards more subtle perfection, a state where one realizes the boundless, the infinity, the unfolding potentialities that lie around each man. Man’s speciality lies in seeing the universe of creativity within them, to unfold the creativity and spirit of life. Hence human life blossoms in the spirit of art, creativity, and intuitive living. All individuals possess intuition, but only a few love to exercise this capacity. An intuitive life makes a route to spiritual wisdom and is led by one’s proficiency in art and aesthetic experiences. This belongs to the highest level of mind. All genuine discoveries and creations are a result of not mere reasoning, but of the utilization of man’s highest capacity, the creative capacity in them. Man’s excellence comes into light when more spontaneously artistic qualities grow in them, and man by their own spiritual cum intellectual insight discovers the startling creativities in them. Art is a form of self-expression,

disclosure of the inner fathoms of reality, being more real than the outward. In *Creative Unity*^{xxii}, Tagore beautifully merges the two ideas: Construction and Creation (parallel to the two opposite concepts – conflict and confluence). While the former is material and instrumental, the latter is aesthetic and intrinsic. Constructions, inventions and materializations are for a purpose, for the sake of something or for some wants/desires. In contrast, the expression of human creativity in terms of poetry, music, artistry and so on are mostly for the sake of itself, not always meant to fulfill the need of something else. In this context, Tagore^{xxiii} says,

“Construction is for a purpose, it expresses our wants; but creation is for itself, it expresses our very being... In love, in goodness, man himself is revealed... they show the fullness of his nature which flows out of himself and therefore, they are purely creative.”

Here, we may also bring a distinction between creativity and innovations. Creativity is the use of imagination, and innovation refers to a new method, or a new product that is mostly driven for the sake of larger interest such as for economic growth, educational accessibility, increased wellbeing and sustainability, and environmental sustainability. We have already discussed above that creation expresses our inner fathoms of reality, our very being that unravels our hidden potentialities and discovers the true necessity/existence of our very being. Creation does involve no outside obligations, but it is a realization of our own spirit, which is free and which does not involve any external imposition. In this context, Hospers’s self-realizationist view is very noteworthy. The “*self-realizationist*” view holds that “the only thing worthwhile for its own sake is a person’s development of his best capacities as a human being”(Hospers 1953)^{xxiv}. Tagore explains it in a stunning form using the example of a lamp and light. The poet writes, “If the lamp takes a pervasive pride in displaying its oil, then the light remains unrevealed. The material must know that it has no idea of completeness in itself, that it must not hold out temptations to decoy men under its destination away from their creative activities”(Tagore 1970)^{xxv}. We are to judge our best and best potentialities, but with what parameter are we to judge which potentialities are the best. For Aristotle, one’s best capacities refer to the unique capacities in man, and that unique capacity is the reasoning capacity or rationality that man possesses uniquely. As Ayn Rand (1964)^{xxvi} in his work, *The Virtue of Selfishness* writes,

“The men who attempt to survive, not by means of reason, but by means of force, are attempting to survive by the method of animals. But just as animals would not be able to survive by attempting the method of plants, by rejecting locomotion and waiting for the soil to feed them – so men cannot survive by attempting the method of animals, by rejecting reason and counting on productive men to serve as their prey...”

This is how reason was being nurtured. But gradually, the connotation of man shifted from being merely a “*rational animal*” to an “*aesthetic animal*”. Since the Socratean times, in the western philosophical tradition, man was identified primarily as a rational animal. But with the continued process of evolution of

human mind, man established themselves in terms of creativity, and aestheticism. The aspect of evolutionary aestheticism, however, calls for a different paper. Hospers said, “*Man is the animal with a sense of guilt; Man is the aesthetic animal*”(Hospers 2006)^{xxvii}. Aestheticism is equally identifiable in humans, unlike in non-humans. Animals are mostly guided instinctively by mere necessities; their works are meant for self-preservation and for the preservation of race. But a man becomes a man not by measuring his life in terms of profit/loss or wealth, but by identifying their place in the cosmos as a most uniquely creative being.

This aspect of creativity led to the greatest production of the human species – literature, since literature is derived from human feelings and out of individual emotions. Literature, for Nobel Prize winner Gao Xingjian^{xxviii},

“is inherently man’s affirmation of the value of his own self and that this is validated during the writing – literature is born primarily of the writer’s need for self-fulfilment. Whether it has any impact on society comes after the completion of a work and that impact certainly is not determined by the wishes of the writer.”

Xingjian further explains that literature knows no boundaries, no geographical cross lines, nor any specific customs and transcends all racial consciousness. Literature gives primacy on man’s existence on the existential condition in which individual lives surrounded by eco-socio-economic fluctuations, yet man can distinctively feel their beauty, irony, uniqueness, and emotional expressions attached to it. In Xingjian’s (2007)^{xxix} opinion, the aim of literature is never to subvert.

“its value lies in discovering and revealing what is rarely known, little known, thought to be known but in fact not very well known of the truth of the human world....”

Plato has Socrates’ saying in certain dialogues that poetry is produced not by knowledge or mastery over words, but by being divinely diving into the world of inspiring literary breeze that represents kind of literary madness. Even today, Platonic thinking is considered as a major source with reference to naturalistic, scientific, philosophical, and rational thinking. For Plato, it is only through an examination of true human nature that an individual can attain happiness and stability in society. In the *Republic*^{xxx}, Plato classifies human soul into three parts: appetite, reason and spiritedness; and disharmony and disorder emerges when appetite and spiritedness predominate keeping reason behind. Plato’s views are analogous to Aristotle’s who identifies poetry because of a goal-oriented rational endeavour. Much later, Schopenhauer understands creativity not through man’s skill, but by his endeavour to lose himself in the experience of beauty and the sublime. Schopenhauer (2010)^{xxxi} says,

“Only through the pure contemplation... which becomes absorbed entirely in the object, are the ideas comprehended; and the nature of genius consists precisely in the preeminent ability for such contemplation... This demands a complete forgetting of our own person.”

Schopenhauer rightly points out that genuine creativity/art does not flow from following standard norms/rules, but a genius does not care for rules to make an original piece of creation. Schopenhauer(2010) even says^{xxxii},

“... aesthetic pleasure in the beautiful consists, to a large extent, in the fact that, when we enter the state of pure contemplation, we are raised for the moment above all willing, above all desires and cares; we are, so to speak, rid of ourselves.”

Can we say that it has to do with distinctively making us a unique individual human being? Owen Flanagan has taken a daring and courageous enterprise to enquire what it means to be a human. Traditional philosophy has continually unfolded the humanistic nature of man in discussing how a person ought to be and how to shape one’s good life; And, philosophers focus on certain areas such as righteousness, moral doings, truthfulness, etc. Many literalists do even the task of revitalizing philosophy at different times while dealing with the issues of true wisdom and true science. R. G Collingwood (1938)^{xxxiii} makes it clearer when he writes that a person who creates,

“is acting voluntarily, he is acting responsibly, but he need not be acting in order to achieve any ulterior end, he need not be following a preconceived plan, and he is certainly not transforming anything that can properly be called a raw material. It is in the same sense that Christians asserted, and Neo-Platonists denied that God created the world.”

IV Conclusion

In the first *Humanist Manifesto*^{xxxiv} issued by a conference at the University of Chicago in 1933, John Dewey identified his move towards rediscovering oneself in order to replace the dogmatic culture and excessive scientism, basing purely on the qualities of morality and ethical decision-making. The lines of Humanist Manifesto II run as “*No deity will save us; we must save ourselves*”.^{xxxv} The discussion so far reveals that nature has bestowed its best while creating man and has made man ready for a quest towards perfection. The most fascinating aspect of mortal man’s nature is his search for immortality in beauty, in perfection, and in admiration. Man aspires and hopes to remain always in a peaceful world, and therefore runs after self-perfection and less self-deception, the man leans towards authenticity and more inward experiences of discovering oneself. Unlike man’s physical development, which is involuntary, man’s move towards psychical/spiritual development is voluntary. Perfection is innate to man’s nature and intellect and is a definitive route to man’s self-purification. Here it is essential noting that the concept of perfection also exists in a non-human entity like machines. The goal of a machine that runs efficiently by input-output programming is efficient production and production with perfection. However, in machines, the conception of perfection is pre-gathered information that the machine tries to follow non-intentionally. However, the human concept of perfection is an intentional quest that improves through constant practices and experience. The machine does not

have any experience. Therefore, the perfection that machines induce is a kind of artificial perfection.

Tagore beautifully captivates the mystery of man's two sided relationships: first, a relationship with one's physical being, and secondly, a relationship with the "surplus" in each individual being. The surplus, as Tagore conceptualizes, is the creative urge, where man eventually awakes from his egoistic notion of individuality and steps towards the process of becoming a universal man. It reflects the transcendence from narrower self to the larger self. This "surplus" is what makes a man a creature different from other species. Tagore (2015)^{xxxvi} writes:

"Man lives with two aspects of his life, his animality, and his universality. The animal clings to the present, entirely involved in its immediate needs. That aspect of the human entity, which transcends this animality, lives for ideals. The ideal has nothing to do with physical needs; it is a call from the depth of the soul, it is a deeply embedded imperative."

Although human resembles the non-human in their yearning for physical subsistence, a man yearns for an additional dimension, the "surplus" present in human mind and consciousness, by which man not only transcends beyond the limitations of an individual but also recreates human self and establishes harmony with the universe and all. Man is not only unto himself/herself, a man realizes his/her true self when s/he successfully relates himself/herself to the world freely. Man, in spite of being finite, has a continuous urge to discover the surplus, the extra in him/her. I agree with Tagore when he emphasizes that through one's rationality, man fights against the external forces of nature, while the creative aspect of a man will commend self-comprehension by which man progresses towards a self-willed and self-commanding being. With rationality, man can incessantly move towards attaining and accumulating knowledge, while creative imagination "offers the vision of wholeness... its purpose is to arouse in us the sense of perfection, which is our true sense of immortality" (Tagore 2015)^{xxxvii}. Now an important question haunts in this regard: Can human creativity really lead us to a perfect state? I believe that today the important and civilizing idea of "perfection" is reduced to "performance". The notion of perfection is comprehended in terms of perfect functioning, analogous to the performance of a well-working machine. However, in speaking authentically, perfection presupposes a contradiction. We are all finite beings, and we aspire to achieve the infinite. However, very rarely we get a glimpse of what is perfect, and when it really happens (either in the form of a beautiful piece of art, or words/act of a person that radiates light in the life of ordinary men etc.) we call it miraculous. Hence, we are to adore a philosophy of living, a philosophy of life and to live, and a philosophy of action, which glorifies more the appreciation of art, beauty, and nature's loveliness. There is no ultimatum in anything, but there is always a continuance, an emergence of the better, and a move towards excellence towards a steadfast performance for leading a static moral, happy and well-guided life.

References

- ⁱHobbes, Thomas (2004). *Leviathan*, New York: Barnes & Noble Books, p.xi.
- ⁱⁱDarwin, Charles (1871). *The Descent of Man And Selection in Relation to Sex*, New York: Dr. Appleton & Company, p.67.
- ⁱⁱⁱSelden, Kyoko & Mark. eds. (1989). *The Atomic Bomb: Voices From Hiroshima and Nagasaki*, London & New York: Routledge, pp.173-200.
- ^{iv}Tuteja, K.L & Chakraborty, Kaustav (2017). *Tagore and Nationalism*, New Delhi: Springer, p.92.
- ^vRefer to the instances in Mazis, Glen, A. (2002). *Earthbodies: Rediscovering Our Planetary Senses*, New York: State University of New York Press, pp.189-194.
- ^{vi}Darwin, Charles (2007). *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, 2nd ed. Ed. Francis Darwin, New York: Dover Publications, Ch. IV-V.
- ^{vii}Gair, J. (2003). Charles F. Hockett. *Language*, 79(3), 600-613. Retrieved May 2, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/4489467
- ^{viii}Chomsky, Noam (2006). *Language and Mind*, 3rd edition, New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 82.
- ^{ix}Jose, Johnson M (2015). 'The Difference Between Animal and Human Communication', STEM, <https://owlcation.com/stem/The-difference-between-animal-and-human-communication>.
- ^xXingjian, Gao (2007). 'The Case for Literature', In *Nobel Lectures: 20 Years of the Nobel Prize for Literature Lectures*, Victoria: Icon Books, p.94.
- ^{xi}Plato (2001). *Republic*, trans. by Benjamin Jowett & Revised by Albert A Anderson, Massachussetts: Agora Publications, pp.247-270.
- ^{xii}Russell, Anthony F. (1984). *Logic, Philosophy and History: A Study in the Philosophy of History Based on the Work of R.G. Collingwood*, New York: University Press of America, p.467.
- ^{xiii}Henry, Matthew (1836). *A Commentary Upon the Holy Bible: A Genesis to Deuteronomy*, Vol. I, London: Religious Trad. Society, p.407.
- ^{xiv}Russell, Bertrand (1992). *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, London: Routledge, p.1.
- ^{xv}*Ibid*, p.16.
- ^{xvi}Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (2018, September 10). Active participation in group-hunts earns wild chimpanzees meat access. *ScienceDaily*. Retrieved May 1, 2020 from www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/09/180910093520.htm
- ^{xvii}Breuer, Thomas, Hockemba, Mireille-Ndoundou & Fishlock, Vicki (2005). 'First Observation of Tool Use in Wild Gorillas', *Plos Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0030380>.
- ^{xviii}Michalko, Michael (2011). *Creative Thinking: Putting Your Imagination to Work*, California: New World Library, p. xviii.
- ^{xix}Babbitt, Irvin (2017). *Rousseau and Romanticism*, New Brunswick & London: Transaction Publishers, p.381.
- ^{xx}Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli (1932). *An Idealist View of Life*, London: George Allen & Unwin, p.63.
- ^{xxi}Tagore, Rabindranath (2008). *Sadhana: The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore*, Vol. 2, ed. Sisir Kumar Das, New Delhi: Sahitya Academy.
- ^{xxii}Tagore, Rabindranath (2018). *Creative Unity*, New Delhi: Seltzer Books.
- ^{xxiii}Tagore, Rabindranath (1998). 'Construction versus Creation', *Lectures and Addresses*, Madras: Macmillan Pocket Edition, pp.59-76.
- ^{xxiv}Hospers, John (1953). *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis*, New Delhi: Allied Publishers Ltd, p.593.

-
- xxxv Tagore, Rabindranath (1970). *Lectures and Addresses Tagore*, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, p.60.
- xxxvi Rand, Ayn (1964). *The Virtue of Selfishness*, London: Penguin.
- xxxvii Hospers, John (2006). *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis*, New Delhi: Allied Publishers, p.34.
- xxxviii Xingjian, Gao (2007). *In Nobel Lectures: 20 years of the Nobel Prize for Literature Lectures* by Sutherland, Et a Staff, Icon, p.93.
- xxxix Xingjian, Gao (2007). 'The Case for Literature', In *Nobel Lectures: 20 Years of the Nobel Prize for Literature Lectures*, Victoria: Icon Books, pp.100-101.
- xxx Plato (2001). *Republic*, Trans. By Albert A Anderson, Massachuttets: Agora Publications, p.160.
- xxxi Schopenhauer, Arthur (2010). *The World as Will and Representation*, Vol. 1, New York: Cambridge University Press, p.185.
- xxxii Ibid., p.68.
- xxxiii Collingwood, R. G (1938). *The Principles of Art*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, p.129.
- xxxiv Dewey, John (1973). Humanist Manifesto I. <<https://americanhumanist.org/what-is-humanism/manifesto1/>>
- xxxv Weldon, Stephen Prugh (1997). *The Humanist Enterprise From John Dewey to Carl Sagan: A Study of Science and Religion in American Culture*, Madison: University of Wisconsin, p.248.
- xxxvi Tagore, Rabindranath (2015). 'Manusher Dharma', *Rabindra Rachanabali*, Shantiniketan: Viswa Bharati, p.375.
- xxxvii Ibid, p.15.