

It is all interesting to see that none of the two of these hundreds of philosophers have ever agreed in answering these questions. They have always differed. Why? Because they have been speculations. They have been speculating, theorizing. They do not know the truth. Well, coming to the scientist, with due respect to his science, in my opinion - and not in my opinion but in the opinion of many philosophers like me - science never attempts to answer these questions. But science is investigating the different departments of nature - which is all to be given. It is like this - when a carpenter begins making a chair, before he can do anything else he must have a piece of wood. And when he has a piece of wood then he starts chopping it into pieces and according to the plan, he makes it. Exactly that's what science does. Science takes for granted the existence of nature and once it has taken for granted the existence of nature, it goes on to investigate it and then goes on to describe it - what is this picture of this, what is this picture of that and how it acts and how it re-acts, and so on and so forth. XXXX

But if he were to ask the first question - where did this come from - they have got no answer. That whole field of investigation is limited by the boundaries of his nature. They cannot go beyond that. They will have to be confined within this boundary. And therefore they cannot account for the origination of the universe. They can account for how this universe is constituted - the beautiful design and the working of these different cells and so on and so forth. And that's what I have always wondered - over the titles which Charles Darwin gave to his monumental works. The first book he called THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES. But if he were trying to answer this first basic question in order to entitle it as THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES he would have called it THE ORIGIN OF LIFE. But he didn't do it and he didn't do it rightly because he could not, he was not dealing with the origin of life but the origin of the species, having first taken for granted that life exists and then he goes on to describe how and why and so on.

The second book that he entitled was THE DESCENT OF MAN. Man has descended - I know not from what in his opinion. But if he were dealing with the origin of man, he would have called his book THE ORIGIN OF MAN, not THE DESCENT OF MAN. So we should be careful of course. These things we ordinarily don't take into consideration, especially we who are in high schools and colleges. I was a kid like you and I used to take in everything the teacher said but I think we must think over these things - why it is so and what does it explain and what good does it do to me? In what way does it help me? And so we find that in philosophy we have gotten