

PREFACE (PRASTAVANA)

MAAN LO ki Truth (Sach) ek aurat hai—toh kya? Kya humare paas yeh shak karne ka reason nahi hai ki saare philosophers, jahan tak woh dogmatists (kattarwadi) rahe hain, woh auraton ko samajhne mein fail ho gaye hain? Ki jis terrible seriousness aur clumsy chipku-pan ke saath woh usually Truth ko approach karte the, woh kisi aurat ko jeetne ke liye kitne unskilled aur ajeeb tareeke the? Zahir hai, Truth ne khud ko jeetne nahi diya; aur aaj har tarah ka dogma udaas aur nirash khada hai—AGAR woh khada bhi hai toh! Kyunki aise mazak udane wale log bhi hain jo maante hain ki dogma gir chuka hai, ki saara dogma zameen par pada hai—balki, woh apni aakhri saansein le raha hai.

Lekin agar serious hokar bolein, toh yeh umeed karne ke achhe reasons hain ki philosophy mein jitni bhi dogmatizing hui hai, chahe woh kitni bhi serious, final aur decided kyun na lagi ho, woh shayad sirf ek shandaar bachpana (noble childishness) aur beginner level ki galti thi; aur shayad woh waqt aa gaya hai jab humein baar-baar samajh aayega ki unn bade-bade philosophical buildings ka base (aadhaar) actually kya tha jo inn dogmatists ne ab tak khade kiye the: shayad koi purana popular andhviswas (jaise soul-superstition, jo aaj bhi subject aur ego ke superstition ke roop mein nuksan pahuncha raha hai): shayad words ka koi khel, grammar ki taraf se diya gaya dhoka, ya phir bohot hi restricted, bohot hi personal, bohot hi human—balki "all-too-human" facts ka ek bold generalization.

Umeed hai ki dogmatists ki philosophy sirf hazaron saalon ke liye ek waada thi, jaise pehle ke zamane mein astrology thi, jiski service mein shayad actual science se zyada mehnat, paisa, dimaag aur patience kharch kiya gaya: hum astrology ke aur Asia aur Egypt mein iske "super-terrestrial" (dharti se pare) daawon ke karzdaar hain ki humare paas architecture ka itna grand style hai. Aisa lagta hai ki insaniyat ke dil par hamesha ke liye apna naam likhne ke liye, har badi cheez ko pehle dharti par ek bade aur darawne caricature (mazahiya chitra) ke roop mein ghoomna padta hai: dogmatic philosophy isi tarah ka ek caricature thi—example ke liye, Asia mein Vedanta doctrine, aur Europe mein Platonism.

Humein iske liye ehsan-faramosh (ungrateful) nahi hona chahiye, haanlaaki yeh manna padega ki ab tak ka sabse bura, sabse thakane wala, aur sabse dangerous error ek dogmatist error tha—yani ki, Plato ka "Pure Spirit" aur "Good in Itself" ka invention. Lekin ab jab ispar jeet paa li gayi hai, jab Europe is drowne sapne se chhutkara paakar chain ki saans le sakta hai aur kam se kam ek healthy neend ka maza le sakta hai, toh hum, JISKI DUTY HI JAGTE REHNA HAI, hum uss saari taqat ke waaris hain jo is error ke khilaf ladayi ne paida ki hai.

Spirit aur Good ke baare mein waisa bolna jaisa Plato ne bola, sachayi ko ulta karna aur life ki fundamental condition—PERSPECTIVE (nazariye)—ko mana karne jaisa tha; balki koi ek doctor ki tarah puch sakta hai: "Aisi bimari ne antiquity (purane zamane) ke sabse behtareen product, Plato, ko kaise pakad liya? Kya uss badmash Socrates ne usey waqayi corrupt kar diya

tha? Kya Socrates aakhirkar naujawano ko bigadne wala tha, aur apne zeher (hemlock) ka haqdaar tha?"

[Unlock Full PDF](#)

Lekin Plato ke khilaf ladayi, ya—thoda saaf aur "aam logo" ke liye bolein, toh hazaron saalon ke Christianity ke ecclesiastical oppression ke khilaf ladayi (KYUNKI CHRISTIANITY "AAM LOGO" KE LIYE PLATONISM HI HAI), ne Europe mein aatma (soul) ka ek shandaar tension paida kar diya, jaisa pehle kahin nahi tha; itne kaske khinche hue dhanush (bow) se ab koi sabse door ke goals par nishana laga sakta hai. As a matter of fact, European is tension ko ek distress (pareshani) ki tarah feel karta hai, aur do baar bade style mein is dhanush ko dhila karne ki koshish ki gayi: ek baar Jesuitism ke zariye, aur dusri baar democratic enlightenment ke zariye—jo, press ki azaadi aur newspaper reading ki madad se, shayad aisa kar de ki spirit ko itni aasani se "distress" feel na ho! (Germans ne gunpowder invent kiya—unhe iska credit milna chahiye! lekin unhone phir sab barabar kar diya—unhone printing invent kar di.)

Lekin hum, jo na toh Jesuits hain, na democrats, aur na hi kaafi had tak Germans, hum GOOD EUROPEANS, aur free, VERY free spirits—humare paas abhi bhi woh hai, spirit ka saara distress aur uske dhanush ka saara tension! Aur shayad woh teer (arrow) bhi, woh duty bhi, aur, kaun jaane? NISHANA LAGANE KE LIYE WOH GOAL BHI....

Sils Maria Upper Engadine, JUNE, 1885.

CHAPTER I. PREJUDICES OF PHILOSOPHERS (PHILOSOPHERS KE PAKSHPAAT/PREJUDICES)

[Unlock Full Text](#)

1. Will to Truth (Sach ki Chah), jo humein kai khatarnaak adventures ke liye tempt karti hai, woh famous Sachayi jiski baat aaj tak saare philosophers ne respect ke saath ki hai, is Will to Truth ne humare saamne kaise-kaise sawal rakhe hain! Kitne ajeeb, uljhane wale, questionable sawal! Yeh kahani kaafi lambi ho chuki hai; phir bhi aisa lagta hai jaise abhi shuru hi hui hai. Kya isme koi hairani ki baat hai agar hum aakhirkar shaqi ho jayein, patience kho dein, aur gusse mein muh fer lein? Ki yeh Sphinx humein aakhirkar khud sawal puchna sikha de? KAUN hai jo humse yahan sawal puch raha hai? Humare andar yeh "Will to Truth" aakhir hai KYA?

In fact, hum uss sawal par kaafi der ruke rahe ki is Will ka origin (shuruaat) kahan se hua—jab tak ki hum aakhirkar ek aur fundamental sawal ke saamne aakar poori tarah ruk nahi gaye. Humne is Will ki VALUE ke baare mein pucha. Maan liya ki humein sach chahiye: lekin JHOOTH KYUN NAHI? Aur uncertainty (anishchitta) kyun nahi? Ignorance (agyaanta) kyun nahi? Sach ki value ka problem humare saamne khada ho gaya—ya phir hum problem ke saamne khade ho gaye? Yahan Oedipus kaun hai? Sphinx kaun hai? Aisa lagta hai ki yeh sawalon aur question marks ka koi milan (rendezvous) hai. Aur kya is par yakin kiya ja sakta hai ki aakhirkar humein aisa lagne laga hai ki yeh problem pehle kabhi uthaya hi nahi gaya, ki hum

pehle log hain jisne ise dekha, ispar nazar daali, aur ise UTHANE KA RISK LIYA? Kyunki ise uthane mein risk hai, shayad sabse bada risk.

[Translated By HindiMindBytes](#)

2. "KOI BHI cheez apne opposite se kaise paida ho sakti hai? Example ke liye, sachayi galti se? Ya Will to Truth dhoke ki chah se? Ya dildaar kaam selfishness (swarth) se? Ya samajhdaar aadmi ka pure sun-bright vision laalach se? Aisi genesis (utpatti) impossible hai; jo iske sapne dekhta hai woh bewakoof hai, nahi, bewakoof se bhi bura hai; sabse high value wali cheezon ka origin kuch alag hona chahiye, unka APNA origin—is temporary, laalach bhari, dhokebaaz, mamooli duniya mein, is bhram aur laalach ke shor-sharabe mein, unka source nahi ho sakta. Balki Being ki god mein, jo kabhi khatam nahi hota, chupe hue Bhagwan mein, 'Thing-in-itself' mein—WAHAN unka source hona chahiye, aur kahin nahi!"

Yeh sochne ka tareeka uss typical prejudice (pakshpaat) ko dikhata hai jisse har zamane ke metaphysicians pehchane ja sakte hain, yeh valuation ka tareeka unke saare logical procedure ke peeche hota hai; apne is "belief" ke zariye, woh apne "knowledge" ke liye mehnat karte hain, uss cheez ke liye jise aakhirkar solemnly "The Truth" ka naam diya jata hai. Metaphysicians ka fundamental belief hai VALUES KE OPPOSITES MEIN YAKEEN KARNA (Belief in antitheses of values).

Unmein se sabse hoshiyar walon ko bhi kabhi yeh doubt nahi hua (jahan doubt sabse zyada zaruri tha); halanki unhone kasam khayi thi, "DE OMNIBUS DUBITANDUM" (Har cheez par shak karna chahiye). Kyunki is baat par shak kiya ja sakta hai, pehli baat, ki kya opposites exist bhi karte hain ya nahi; aur dusri baat, ki kya woh popular valuations aur value ke opposites jinpar metaphysicians ne apni mohar lagayi hai, woh shayad sirf superficial estimates (upri andaze) hain, sirf temporary perspectives hain, jo shayad kisi kone se banaye gaye hain, shayad neech se—"frog perspectives" (mendhak ka nazariya), jaisa ki painters bolte hain.

[Visit Our Website](#)

Us saari value ke bawajood jo sach, positive, aur niswarth (unselfish) ko di jaati hai, yeh possible ho sakta hai ki life ke liye ek higher aur zyada fundamental value dhong, dhoke ki chah, selfishness aur laalach ko di jani chahiye. Yeh bhi possible ho sakta hai ki jo cheez unn achhi aur respected cheezon ki value banati hai, woh shayad is baat mein hai ki woh inn buri aur apparently opposite cheezon se chupke se judi hui, bandhi hui aur uljhi hui hain—shayad essentially unke jaisi hi hain. Shayad! Lekin inn khatarnaak "Shayads" (Perhapses) ke saath kaun matha-pachhi karna chahega! Uss investigation ke liye humein naye philosophers ke aane ka intezaar karna padega, jinke tastes aur inclinations ab tak ke philosophers se ulte honge—har sense mein dangerous "Perhaps" ke philosophers. Aur puri seriousness ke saath bolun, toh mujhe aise naye philosophers aate hue dikh rahe hain.

3. Philosophers par teekhi nazar rakhne aur unki lines ke beech mein kaafi lambe waqt tak padhne ke baad, main ab khud se kehta hoon ki conscious thinking (soche-samjhe vichar) ka

zyada tar hissa instinctive functions (fitrati kaam) mein gina jana chahiye, aur yeh philosophical thinking ke case mein bhi sach hai; yahan kisi ko naye sire se seekhna hoga, jaise kisi ne [Click To Unlock Full Text](#)

heredity aur "innateness" ke baare mein naye sire se seekha tha. Jaise paida hone ka act heredity ke pure process mein consideration mein nahi aata, waise hi "conscious hona" kisi decisive sense mein instinctive hone ka OPPOSITE nahi hai; philosopher ki conscious thinking ka zyada tar hissa chupke se uske instincts (fibrat) dwara influence hota hai, aur definite raaston par force kiya jata hai.

Aur saare logic aur uski dikhawe ki azaadi ke peeche, valuations hote hain, ya agar saaf bolein toh, ek definite tarah ki life maintain karne ke liye physiological demands hoti hain. Example ke liye, ki certain (pakka) uncertain (kaccha) se zyada valuable hai, ki illusion (bhram) "truth" se kam valuable hai—aise valuations, humare liye kitne bhi important kyun na ho, phir bhi shayad sirf superficial valuations ho sakte hain, ek khaas tarah ki niaiserie (bewakoofi), jo shayad humare jaise beings ko zinda rakhne ke liye zaruri ho. Agar hum yeh maan lein ki insaan hi "cheezon ka measure" (measure of things) nahi hai.

4. Kisi opinion ka galat hona humare liye uspar koi objection nahi hai: shayad yahi woh point hai jahan humari nayi language sabse ajeeb lagti hai. Sawal yeh hai ki ek opinion life ko kitna aage badhati hai, life ko preserve karti hai, species ko bachati hai, shayad species ko paalti hai, aur hum fundamentally yeh maanne ki taraf jhuke hue hain ki sabse galat opinions (jinmein synthetic judgments a priori aate hain), humare liye sabse indispensable (zaruri) hain, ki logical fictions ko maane bina, reality ko absolute aur immutable (na badalne wali) IMAGINED duniya se compare kiye bina, numbers ke zariye duniya ko constantly nakli banaye bina, insaan zinda nahi reh sakta—ki false opinions ko chhodna life ko chhodne jaisa hoga, life ka negation (inkaar) hoga. UNTRUTH (JHOOTH) KO LIFE KI CONDITION MANNA; yeh zaruur traditional value ideas ko khatarnaak tareeke se challenge karna hai, aur jo philosophy aisa karne ki himmat karti hai, woh sirf is wajah se khud ko good aur evil ke pare (beyond good and evil) rakh leti hai.

5. Jo cheez philosophers ko adhe-shak aur adhe-mazak ki nazar se dekhne par majboor karti hai, woh yeh baar-baar hone wali discovery nahi hai ki woh kitne innocent hain—kitni baar aur kitni aasani se woh galtiyan karte hain aur raasta bhatak jate hain, short mein, woh kitne bachkane aur bacchon jaise hain,—balki yeh ki woh kaafi imandaar nahi hote, jabki woh sab ek bada aur nek shor machate hain jab truthfulness (sachayi) ki problem par halka sa ishara bhi kiya jata hai.

Woh sab aisa dikhawa karte hain jaise unke real opinions ek thandi, pure, divinely indifferent dialectic (tark-vitark) ke self-evolution se discover aur attain kiye gaye hain (unn tarah-tarah ke mystics ke contrast mein, jo zyada honest aur zyada bewakoof hote hain aur "inspiration" ki baat karte hain), jabki fact yeh hai ki, ek prejudiced proposition, idea, ya "suggestion," jo generally unke dil ki khwahish hoti hai jise abstract aur refine kiya gaya hai, usey woh baad

mein dhunde gaye arguments se defend karte hain.

Woh sab advocates (wakeel) hain jo aisa kehlana nahi chahte, generally apne prejudices ke bohot chalaak defenders, jinhe woh "truths" ka naam dete hain,—aur uss conscience se BOHOT door jo ise khud se brave hokar admit kare, uss courage ke good taste se bohot door jo ise samajhne de, chahe dost ya dushman ko warn karne ke liye, ya cheerful confidence aur khud ka mazak udane ke liye.

Purane Kant ki Tartuffery (dhong), jo utni hi stiff aur decent hai, jiske saath woh humein dialectic ki galiyon mein fasata hai jo uske "categorical imperative" ki taraf le jati hain (ya sahi bolein toh bhatkaati hain)—humein nakhre walon ko muskurane par majboor karti hai, hum jo purane moralists aur ethical preachers ki subtle tricks ko pakadne mein maza lete hain. Ya phir, aur bhi zyada, woh mathematical form ka jaadu-tona (hocus-pocus), jiske zariye Spinoza ne apni philosophy ko kawach aur mask pehna diya—in fact, "APNI wisdom ke pyaar" ko, agar is term ko sahi se translate karein—taaki uss hamlawar ke dil mein turant dar paida kiya ja sake jo uss invincible maiden, uss Pallas Athene par nazar daalne ki himmat kare:—ek bimar recluse (akele rehne wale) ka yeh masquerade (bhesh badalna) uski personal dar aur kamzori ko kitna reveal karta hai!

6. Mujhe dhire-dhire clear ho gaya hai ki ab tak ki har badi philosophy kya rahi hai—yani ki, uske originator ka confession, aur ek tarah ki involuntary aur unconscious auto-biography; aur yeh bhi ki har philosophy mein moral (ya immoral) maqsad hi woh asli vital germ (beej) raha hai jisse pura paudha hamesha uga hai.

Indeed, kisi philosopher ke sabse abstract metaphysical daawon tak kaise pahuncha gaya, yeh samajhne ke liye hamesha yeh puchna achha (aur samajhdaari) hota hai: "Yeh kis morality ko aim kar rahe hain (ya woh kis morality ko aim kar raha hai)?" Accordingly, main yeh nahi maanta ki "knowledge ki chah" philosophy ka baap hai; balki kisi aur impulse (bhavna) ne, yahan bhi aur jagah ki tarah, knowledge (aur galat knowledge!) ko sirf ek instrument ki tarah use kiya hai.

Lekin jo koi bhi insaan ke fundamental impulses ko is view se dekhega ki unhone yahan INSPIRING GENII (ya demons aur goblins) ki tarah kaise act kiya hai, woh payega ki un sabne kabhi na kabhi philosophy practice ki hai, aur unmein se har ek ne khud ko existence ka ultimate end aur baaki saare impulses ka legitimate LORD (maalik) manna chaha hoga. Kyunki har impulse imperious (hukum chalane wala) hota hai, aur AISE hi, woh philosophize karne ki koshish karta hai.

Zaruur, scholars ke case mein, really scientific logo ke case mein, yeh alag ho sakta hai—"behtar," agar aap chahein; wahan shayad sach mein koi "knowledge ki chah" ho sakti hai, ek tarah ki choti, independent ghadi ki machine, jo agar achhe se chaabi bhari jaye, toh mehnat se uss end ki taraf kaam karti hai, BINA baaki ke scholarly impulses ke usme koi bada hissa liye. Isliye scholar ke actual "interests" generally kisi aur direction mein hote hain—family mein

shayad, ya paisa kamane mein, ya politics mein; in fact, isse koi fark nahi padta ki research ke kis point par uski choti machine rakhi gayi hai, aur woh ummedwar young worker ek achha [This Pdf is Created By HindiMindBytes](#)

philologist banta hai, mushroom specialist banta hai, ya chemist; woh yeh ya woh banne se CHARACTERISE nahi hota.

Philosopher mein, iske opposite, bilkul kuch bhi impersonal nahi hota; aur sabse upar, uski morality ek decided aur decisive gawahi deti hai ki WOH KAUN HAI,—yani ki, uske nature ke sabse deep impulses ek dusre ke saath kis order mein khade hain.

7. Philosophers kitne malicious (jealous/bure) ho sakte hain! Mujhe Epicurus ke uss joke se zyada chubhne wala kuch nahi pata jo usne Plato aur Platonists par marne ki azadi li; usne unhe Dionysiolakes kaha. Iske original sense mein, aur dekhne mein, is shabd ka matlab hai "Dionysius ke chaploos"—consequently, tyrants ke saathi aur talwe chaatne wale; iske alawa, halanki, yeh kehne jaisa hai, "Woh sab ACTORS hain, unmein kuch bhi genuine nahi hai" (kyunki Dionysiolax actor ke liye ek popular naam tha). Aur yahi woh bura taana hai jo Epicurus ne Plato par mara: woh uss grandiose manner, uss mise en scene style se chidha hua tha jiske Plato aur uske scholars masters the—jiska Epicurus master nahi tha! Woh, Samos ka purana school-teacher, jo Athens mein apne chote se garden mein chupa baita tha, aur teen sau kitabein likhin, shayad Plato ki jalan aur ambitious envy se, kaun jaane! Greece ko sau saal lag gaye yeh pata lagane mein ki garden-god Epicurus asal mein kaun tha. Kya usne kabhi pata lagaya?

8. Har philosophy mein ek point hota hai jahan philosopher ka "conviction" (yakeen) scene par aata hai; ya, ek purani mystery ke shabdon mein bolein toh:

Adventavit asinus, Pulcher et fortissimus.
(Gadha aa gaya, sundar aur sabse taakatwar.)

9. Tum "Nature ke according" JEENA chahte ho? Oh, tum noble Stoics, shabdon ka kya fraud hai! Apne liye Nature jaisa ek being imagine karo, jo hadd se zyada extravagant hai, hadd se zyada indifferent (laparwah) hai, bina maqsad ya consideration ke, bina daya ya insaaf ke, jo ek hi waqt par fruitful aur banjar aur uncertain hai: INDIFFERENCE ko ek power ki tarah imagine karo—tum aisi indifference ke according KAISE jee sakte ho? Jeena—kya yeh uss Nature se alag hone ki koshish karna nahi hai? Kya jeena valuing karna, prefer karna, unjust hona, limited hona, alag hone ki koshish karna nahi hai?

Aur maan liya ki tumhara imperative (niyam), "Nature ke according jeena," ka actually matlab wahi hai jo "life ke according jeena" hai—tum ALAG kaise kar sakte ho? Tum us cheez ka principle kyun banana chahte ho jo tum khud ho, aur jo tumhe hona hi hai? Reality mein, halanki, tumhare saath mamla bilkul alag hai: jab tum dikhawa karte ho ki tum Nature mein apne kanoon ko khushi se padh rahe ho, tum kuch bilkul ulta chahte ho, tum ajeeb

stage-players aur khud ko dhoka dene wale!

[Click To Unlock Full PDF](#)

Apne ghamand mein tum apne morals aur ideals Nature ko dictate karna chahte ho, khud Nature ko, aur unhe usme incorporate karna chahte ho; tum zidd karte ho ki yeh "Stoa ke according" Nature honi chahiye, aur chahte ho ki sab kuch tumhari apni image jaisa ban jaye, Stoicism ka ek bada, eternal glorification aur generalization! Sachayi ke liye tumhare saare pyaar ke bawajood, tumne khud ko itne lambe waqt tak, itni zidd se, aur aisi hypnotic rigidity se Nature ko GALAT dekhne ke liye force kiya hai, yani ki Stoically dekhne ke liye, ki ab tum usey kisi aur tarah se dekhne ke kabil nahi rahe—aur sabse upar, kuch gehra ghamand tumhe yeh Pagalon wali (Bedlamite) umeed deta hai ki KYUNKI tum khud par tyranny (zulm) kar sakte ho—Stoicism self-tyranny hai—Nature bhi khud par tyranny hone degi: kya Stoic Nature ka ek PART nahi hai?...

Lekin yeh ek purani aur hamesha rehne wali kahani hai: jo purane waqt mein Stoics ke saath hua woh aaj bhi hota hai, jaise hi koi philosophy khud mein yakeen karne lagti hai. Woh hamesha duniya ko apni image mein create karti hai; woh kuch aur nahi kar sakti; philosophy yeh tyrannical impulse khud hai, sabse spiritual Will to Power, "duniya ke creation" ki will, causa prima (first cause) ki will.

10. Woh utsukta aur bariki, main toh chalaki bhi kahunga, jiske saath "real aur apparent world" ka problem aaj pure Europe mein deal kiya ja raha hai, sochne aur dhyan dene ke liye food provide karta hai; aur jo background mein sirf "Will to Truth" sunta hai, aur kuch nahi, woh certainly sabse tez kaano ka daawa nahi kar sakta. Rare aur isolated cases mein, shayad sach mein aisa hua ho ki aisi Will to Truth—ek certain extravagant aur adventurous himmat, forlorn hope wale metaphysician ka ambition—isme shamil ho: jo aakhir mein hamesha "certainty" ki ek mutthi bhar ko khubsurat possibilities ki puri gaadi se zyada prefer karta hai; shayad aise puritanical conscience ke fanatics bhi hon, jo apne aakhri trust ko ek pakke "kuch nahi" (sure nothing) mein rakhna pasand karte hain, bajaye ek uncertain "kuch" ke.

Lekin yeh Nihilism hai, aur ek nirash, maut ki hadd tak thaki hui aatma ka sign hai, chahe aisi virtue kitni bhi courageous kyun na dikhe. Halanki, stronger aur zyada zinda thinkers ke saath mamla alag lagta hai jo abhi bhi life ke liye eager hain. Isme ki woh appearance ke KHILAF side lete hain, aur "perspective" ke baare mein ghamand se bolte hain, isme ki woh apni bodies ki credibility ko utna hi low rank karte hain jitna "dharti ruki hui hai" ke aankhon dekhe saboot (ocular evidence) ko, aur iss tarah, apparently, apne sabse secure possession ko khushi se haath se nikalne dete hain (kyunki aaj kal koi apni body se zyada kis par yakeen karta hai?),—kaun jaane agar woh sach mein kuch wapas jeetne ki koshish kar rahe hain jo pehle ek aur bhi secure possession tha, purane waqt ke faith ke domain ka kuch, shayad "immortal soul," shayad "old God," short mein, aise ideas jinke zariye woh behtar jee sakein, yani ki, "modern ideas" se zyada zor-shor se aur zyada khushi se?

[Become Member To Unlock PDF](#)

Cheezon ko dekhne ke is tareeke mein inn modern ideas par DISTRUST (avishwas) hai, us sab mein disbelief jo kal aur aaj construct kiya gaya hai; shayad thoda sa satiety (tripti) aur scorn (nafrat) ka mixture hai, jo ab ideas ke uss BRIC-A-BRAC (kabad) ko bardasht nahi kar sakta jo alag-alag origin ke hain, jaisa ki so-called Positivism aaj market mein fek raha hai; ek refined taste ki nafrat inn sab reality-philosophasters ki gaon ke mele jaisi rang-birangi aur thigade lagi (patchy) cheezon par, jinmein is rang-birangepan ke alawa kuch bhi naya ya sach nahi hai. Isme mujhe lagta hai ki humein aaj ke skeptical anti-realists aur knowledge-microscopists ke saath agree karna chahiye; unka instinct, jo unhe MODERN reality se repel karta hai, woh galat saabit nahi hua hai... unke peeche hatne wale raaston se humara kya lena-dena! Unke baare mein main cheez yeh NAHI hai ki woh "peeche" jana chahte hain, balki yeh ki woh wahan se DOOR jana chahte hain. Thodi ZYADA taqat, swing, courage, aur artistic power, aur woh WAHAN SE NIKAL jayenge—aur wapas nahi!

11. Mujhe lagta hai ki aaj har jagah dhyān hatane ki koshish ho rahi hai us actual influence se jo Kant ne German philosophy par dala, aur especially uss value ko samajhdari se ignore karne ki jo usne khud par set ki thi. Kant sabse pehle apni Table of Categories par proud tha; ise apne haath mein lekar usne kaha: "Yeh metaphysics ke behalf par kiya gaya ab tak ka sabse mushkil kaam hai." Zara is "kiya gaya" ko samjho! Woh is baat par PROUD tha ki usne insaan mein ek nayi faculty (shamta) DISCOVER ki hai, synthetic judgment a priori ki faculty. Maan liya ki usne is mamle mein khud ko dhoka diya; lekin German philosophy ka development aur rapid flourishing uske pride par depend karta tha, aur younger generation ki eager rivalry par ki agar possible ho toh kuch discover kiya jaye—kam se kam "nayi faculties"—jispar aur bhi zyada proud ho sakein!—

Lekin chalo ek pal ke liye reflect karte hain—aisa karne ka high time hai. "Synthetic judgments a priori POSSIBLE kaise hain?" Kant khud se puchta hai—aur uska answer really kya hai? "EK MEANS (faculty) KE MEANS (zariye) SE"—lekin unfortunately paanch shabdon mein nahi, balki itne ghumawdar tareeke se, imposing, aur German profundity aur shabdon ki sajawat ke display ke saath, ki insaan puri tarah se uss comical niaiserie allemande (German bewakoofi) ko dekhna bhool jata hai jo aise answer mein involved hai. Log is nayi faculty par khushi se pagal ho gaye the, aur jashn apne climax par pahunch gaya jab Kant ne insaan mein ek moral faculty bhi discover kar li—kyunki us waqt Germans abhi bhi moral the, abhi "Politics of hard fact" mein haath nahi daal rahe the.

Phir German philosophy ka honeymoon aaya. Tubingen institution ke saare young theologians turant bagicho mein chale gaye—sab "faculties" dhundne lage. Aur unhe kya nahi mila—German spirit ke uss innocent, ameer, aur abhi bhi jawan period mein, jise Romanticism, uss malicious pari ne, dhun bajayi aur gaana gaya, jab koi abhi "dhundne" aur "invent karne" ke beech fark nahi kar sakta tha! Sabse upar "transcendental" ke liye ek faculty; Schelling ne ise intellectual intuition ka naam diya, aur isse naturally pious (dharmik) Germans ki sabse earnest khwahishon ko pura kiya. Koi is puri exuberant aur eccentric movement (jo really jawani thi,

bawajood iske ki usne khud ko itni himmat se bhes badla, buddhe aur senile concepts mein) ke saath isse bada galat nahi kar sakta ki ise serious le, ya moral gusse ke saath treat kare.

[Produced By HindiMindBytes](#)

Kaafi hai, halanki—duniya buddhi ho gayi, aur sapna gayab ho gaya. Ek waqt aaya jab logon ne apne maathe ragde, aur woh aaj bhi ragad rahe hain. Log sapne dekh rahe the, aur sabse pehle—buddha Kant. "Ek means (faculty) ke means se"—usne kaha tha, ya kam se kam kehna chaha tha. Lekin, kya yeh—ek answer hai? Ek explanation hai? Ya kya yeh sirf sawal ka repetition nahi hai? Opium neend kaise lata hai? "Ek means (faculty) ke means se," namely virtus dormitiva (sone ki taqat), Moliere mein doctor jawab deta hai,

Quia est in eo virtus dormitiva,

Cujus est natura sensus assoupire.

(Kyunki isme sleep-inducing power hai, jiska nature hai senses ko sula dena.)

Lekin aise jawab comedy ke realm mein aate hain, aur yeh high time hai ki Kantian question, "Synthetic judgments a PRIORI possible kaise hain?" ko dusre sawal se replace kiya jaye, "Aise judgments mein belief (yakeen) zaruri kyun hai?"—effect mein, yeh high time hai ki humein samajhna chahiye ki aise judgments ko sach manna zaruri hai, humare jaise creatures ke preservation (bachaw) ke liye; halanki woh naturally abhi bhi false judgments ho sakte hain! Ya, zyada saaf bolein, aur mota-mota—synthetic judgments a priori bilkul bhi "possible" nahi hone chahiye; humara unpar koi haq nahi hai; humare muh mein woh sirf false judgments hain. Sirf, of course, unki sachayi mein belief zaruri hai, plausible belief aur ocular evidence ki tarah jo life ke perspective view se belong karta hai.

Aur finally, uss enormous influence ko yaad karne ke liye jo "German philosophy"—I hope aap iske inverted commas (goosefeet) ka haq samajhte hain?—ne pure Europe mein exercise kiya hai, isme koi doubt nahi hai ki ek certain VIRTUS DORMITIVA (neend ki goli) ka isme hissa tha; German philosophy ka thanks, noble aalsiyon, virtuous logon, mystics, artists, three-fourths Christians, aur sabhi nations ke political obscurantists ke liye yeh ek khushi ki baat thi, ki unhe uss overwhelming sensualism ka antidote (ilaaj) mil gaya jo pichli century se is century mein overflow kar raha tha, short mein—"sensus assoupire" (senses ko sula dena)....

12. Jahan tak materialistic atomism ka sawal hai, yeh unn theories mein se ek hai jo sabse achhe se refute (galat saabit) ki gayi hain, aur Europe mein ab shayad learned world mein koi itna unscholarly nahi hai ki ise serious signification de, sivaye convenient everyday use ke (expression ke means ke abbreviation ki tarah)—chiefly Pole Boscovich ka thanks: woh aur Pole Copernicus ab tak ocular evidence (aankhon dekhe saboot) ke sabse bade aur successful opponents rahe hain. Kyunki jabki Copernicus ne humein yakeen dilaya, saare senses ke khilaf, ki dharti ruki hui NAHI hai, Boscovich ne humein sikhaya ki dharti ki uss aakhri cheez mein belief chhod dein jo "ruki hui" thi—"substance" mein belief, "matter" mein, earth-residuum mein, aur particle-atom mein: yeh senses par ab tak ki sabse badi jeet hai jo dharti par haasil ki gayi hai.

Lekin kisi ko abhi aur aage jana hai, aur jung ka elaan karna hai, relentlessly aakhri dum tak jung, "atomistic requirements" ke khilaf jo abhi bhi wahan ek dangerous after-life jee rahi hain jahan koi unhe suspect nahi karta, zyada celebrated "metaphysical requirements" ki tarah: kisi ko sabse upar uss dusri aur zyada khatarnaak atomism ko khatam karna hoga jo Christianity ne sabse achhe se aur sabse lambe waqt tak sikhaya hai, SOUL-ATOMISM (Aatma-Atomism). Ijazat dijiye is expression se uss belief ko designate karne ki jo soul ko kuch indestructible, eternal, indivisible, ek monad, ek atomon manta hai: is belief ko science se nikal fekna chahiye!

Humare beech, "soul" se chhutkara paana bilkul zaruri nahi hai, aur iss tarah sabse purani aur venerated hypotheses mein se ek ko chhodna—jaisa frequently naturalists ke clumsiness ke saath hota hai, jo soul ko bina khoye usse touch bhi nahi kar sakte. Lekin raasta naye acceptations aur refinements ke liye khula hai soul-hypothesis ke liye; aur aise concepts jaise "mortal soul," aur "soul of subjective multiplicity," aur "soul as social structure of the instincts and passions," ab science mein legitimate rights chahte hain. Isme ki NAYA psychologist unn superstitions ko khatam karne wala hai jo ab tak soul ke idea ke aas-paas almost tropical luxuriance ke saath flourish hue hain, woh really, mano, khud ko ek nayi desert (registan) aur ek naye distrust mein dhakel raha hai—yeh possible hai ki purane psychologists ka time zyada mazedaar aur comfortable tha; eventually, halanki, woh pata hai ki precisely is wajah se woh INVENT karne ke liye condemned hai—aur, kaun jaane? shayad naya DISCOVER karne ke liye.

[Unlock PDF](#)