Chapter-IV

Work plan or Chapterization of the Study.
Introduction:-
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PART -A

Indian Philosophy

With aspects of Education

Introduction:-

Indian Philosophy mostly depends on the Vedas.

The Vedas

The existence of Vedas prescribed by the mind of Aryan the particular of Indian philosophy has mentioned in the Vedas. All the systems of Indian philosophy has developed without any disturbance though our philosophical knowledge in not completed to this time .Towards absence of chronological data, the complete indifference of the ancient Indians towards personal histories, the archaic character of Vedic Sanskrit, the break in tradition, and the biased orthodox coloring of interpretation, which instead of help often proves a hindrance, are some of the main reasons due to which our knowledge about this period remains mostly shrouded in mystery and vagueness. The Vedas means knowledge, it depends on too mantras and Brahmans mantras. Its mean is the song of good and godless. A collection of mantras are Semites or Vedas. Semites – Rigayauh, Sam, and Atharva.

1. Particulars of Indian Philosophy

Indian Philosophy:-

(1) Ancient Philosophy  (2) Modern Philosophy

(i) Vedic Philosophy (Sath Darsan)
(ii) Non- Vedic Philosophy (Charvaka Darsan)

A-I Ancient Philosophy

Vedic Philosophy (Based on Vedas)
There are six systems of Vedic Philosophy:

Shankhya: (Kapila)

Brief Acknowledgement With Aspects of education

Kapila was the founder of Shankhya Darsan.

Introduction

Shankhya is certainly foundation of Indian philosophy. We find references to the Shankhya Yoga doctrine in some of the Upanishads, e.g. In the Chhandogya, the Prashna, the Katha and particularly in the Shvetashvara; in the Mahabharata; In the Gita; and the Smriti and the Puranas, the author of the Vedanta-sutra, repeatedly refers to the view whether the Shankhya can be regarded as teaching of Upanishads and rejects it, besides undertaking of the Shankhya in the Tarkapanda on rational grounds. Shankracharya regards it as ‘main opponent’ (Pradhanamalla) of Vedanta and says that though Shankhya and Yoga are generally accepted by the wise as conducive to the Highest good, yet these systems advocated dualism and cannot be supported by the Shruti. These words are used in the Shruti in the sense of knowledge and action respectively and words like Mahatav, Avyakta etc. are used in the sense of names and forms.

The Evolutes

(Ahankara)

Ahankara is said to be of three kinds:

Vailkarika or Sattvika when sativa predominates. Viewed as cosmic, it produces manes and five sensory organs and five motor organs. Viewed as psychological, it produces good deeds.

Bhutadi or tames, when tames predominates. Viewed as cosmic, it produces the five subtle elements (ten-mantras). Viewed as psychological, it leads to indifferent acts or to idleness and sloth.

Taigas or rajas a, when rajas A predominates. Viewed as cosmic it supplies the energy by which the Sattviks and the Tamara produces their respective evolutes. Viewed as psychological, it produces evil deeds.

Bondage and liberation

A ethic ally system of life reflected in there types of pain. As-
Adhyatmika, towards it the eternal and psychological reasons with mentally and bodily worries suffers in the life.

Adhyatmika, in this the natural reasons are effected in the life of men beasts, birds etc.

Adhyatmika, its effected by the supernatural reason as –planets ghosts angels etc in the life of a man as where are guns there in pains. Although pleasantness comes after soreness. So heavens living depends on various guns. So at the last stage or end of the man has been depending on three types of pain. So this stage calls-bondage.

Now the means of liberation is a complete goodness and the best and highest endness of life. All of this depends on Purusartha. Because Purusa is free from is conscience to do his work in legal stage.

Therefore we can say that a man has suffered in his daily life with bondage and liberation.

**God And Prakriti**

The original Shankhya had believed in supernatural power Shankhya had been interesting to materialism with Jainism and Buddhism. It believed in the Vedas. So it calls orthodox. It does not believe in god, opts idea in that the prakrti and purusa are sufficient to prove the universal power but not too more god. Though some thinking have prove the power of god. In while the Shankhya as Vijnanabhiksa has been supporting to god the god. Which they have explained towards the god as –

God is resifts by self motion so it will not adjusted to the word with misery and pain.

Therefore god’s motives are not durable because it is not powerful.

It deals with the rules of karma.

A god has complete knowledge with pure beings the word material is supreme.

**Yoga (Patanjali)**

Brief Acknowledgement

**With aspects of education:**

Patanjali is the traditional fonder of yoga system. The meaning of yoga is unity of the spirit with particularity existence of soul. The Vedanta explains it the Gita clears that a situation of yoga is not the source of to reaching the god. But by yoga a man is free of pain. By the views of Patanjali, yoga does not do control soul’s action-motion but it controlled body with mindly
senses, which effected by purse and Prakarti which is reflected in the particularly yoga by Shankhya.

The Gita calls them one. Means of yoga is soul’s activity, but Shankhya calls it knowledge. And it by exercise for proper aim-it falls that yoga deals by their tickly and practically systems. Therefore yoga accepts the metaphysical system, which deals by Shankhya.

**Chitta and Its Vrttis**

Patanjali Yoga is also known as Raja Yoga is the source of centralization of the Chitta. The site of this is through Meditation or concentration which is also called Yoga (yoga Samadhi). Chitta means the three internal organs of Shankhya Buddha or intellect, Ahankara or ego and mans or mind. Chitta is the same as Antahkarana. It is mahatma or Buddha which includes Ahankara and Mamas. Chitta is the first evolutes of Prakriti and has the predominance of Sativa. It is in itself unconscious. But being finest and nearest to Purusa this power has been reflected in purusa with his conscience which had connected to the objects. The objects depends on its form, so form’s its verities.

A virtue of consciousness which comes from the Purusa and illuminates this form is called Janna purus depends on its conscience so it is not bounded to limit by prakrti. If it does not verity the Chitta’s motions with understanding of its modification.

**The existence of god**

According to yoga god’s existence is universal. Patanjali feels that god is in practically. But some of them have feel too theoretically. So them have proved that its existence reflects in philosophical issues. Patanjali says that god’s existence reflects in that purusa who is not effective by pains action, impression of course, all of depends on laws of karma. All of the karmas connected to the human being it is the Purest Knowledge. He is perfection incarnate. He is purest knowledge. He is the teacher of the RSIS (Sa- Purvesamapi Guruh) and the education of Vedas explains that a existence of god have being in universal site. The proofs advanced for his existence are: the Veda tells us that exist; the law of continuity tells us that there must be the highest limit of knowledge and perfection which is God;

God is responsible for the association and dissociation of Purusa and Prakrti; devotion to God is the surest way of obtaining concentration and thereby liberation.
Iii Vaishesika (Kanada)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education -

The Vaishesika theory in the next step of Shankhya in real situation is great than the Nyaya. So it is on before stage in reality not after that of both and jain dharmas this word dharma is related with Vishaesa, which mean-secrecy of the soul the philosophy of Vaisaesika declares that the existence of soul is universal truth the site of Vishesa deals the importance of things as well its recognition. Kanada is the founder of the Vaishesika philosophy with also Kanabhuk, Uluka, and Kashyara, So there is also called after him as Kanada or Auluka philosophy the name Kanada published reason maharishi used to live alive to take keen interest in eating some of the Kanada or food grain picks up from the fields. So the word Kanada eatables in philosophical meaning is vishes.

Karma

According to the category of karma and his conception, it belongs to the existence and substance in properly but not separately. So the permanent feature of substance there is an action is equal dynamic and transient feature for its situation for the reason of confection and disco faction, the steps of action are five-

Super quality work.
Below quality work.
Good quality work.
Middle quality work.
Normal quality work

God and Karma

The Vaishesika proves the Veda’s existence with karma and its law. So Kanada does not believe in clearly to the existence of god so the importance of the Vedas reflects in its existence has been interpreted to the thinkers in this actuality that the Vedas are equal to god. But the ideas of Tadvachana the Vedas are the worlds of the sager and seers. All of the thinkers for Vaishesika and the Nyaya system, including Prashastapada, Shidehara and udayana are clearly supports with various arguments to the existence of god. We cannot, therefore, treat the founder of the
Vaishesika as an atheist. More ever, Kanada believes in spiritualism and makes the physical universe subservient to the moral order.

The Veda is authoritative, but it is neither nor authorless. It is the Word of God and this makes it authoritative God is omniscient, eternal and perfect it has been proved the systems of karma and law which have demerits affected by karma’s qualities.

**Bound age And Liberations**

The Vaishesika declares that the bound age and liberation on equal to knowledge. The ignorance action motion wear its demerits is depends on the activity of the soul they are due to attachment or aversion and aim at obtaining pleasure or avoiding pain. If actions are in conformity with Veda’s injections, they lead to merit; if they are prohibited by the Veda, they lead to demerit. The qualities and disqualifies of the personal spirit reflects in the Adrsta moral power. Form the karma and his law with actions and his performance whether they are good or bad according to the karmas one performed by the bound age. This Adrsta controlled by the existence of spirit it lexis and spreads the issues of plea absentness or sorrowness for the particular soul. So the spirit performed by the liberation. Therefore bondage of the soul represent in motionless and liberation reflects in knowledge when actions stop, new merits and demerits do not get accumulated and old merits and demerits also are gradually worn out.

**Iv Nyaya (Gautama Maharishi)**

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education -

Maharishi Gautama was the supper most founder of the Nyaya and its institution. His recognition is as-maharishi Gautama and Aksapada. The nyaya means the argument and suggestion have dealing with logical and intellectual systems which can say- Tarkashadira or reasoning of the science with logically system as Hetuvidya a science of causes Vadavidya a technique of logic Anviksiki is a technique of characteristically method.

The Nyaya-sutra was commented upon by Vatsyana in his Nyaya-Bhasya. The Uddyotakara mentioned Vartika its particulars mentioned in Vachaspati and Tatparya-Tika? Udayana’s Nyaya-Kusumanjali and Jay anta’s and Jay anta’s Nyaya-Manjari are the other important works of this School the Nyaya of the modern School of Indian logic beings with the epoch-making Sattva- Chintamanis Of Gangesha
**Verbal Testimony**

The fourth kind of valid knowledge is Shabda or Agama or authoritative verbal testimony. Its means is also called Shabda. Which have speak out by authentic men Aptavakya whenever declares that importa the speaking words have been remaining its importance. An importance of words comes before all. Towards the god the Nyaya in present and past had declared position by the words because all the speaking words speak out by verbal-testimony.

So testimony is two types Vaidika and secular. The Vaidika testimony has completed which declares by the being or god. The secular testimony has completed which declares by the authentic or regard able persons. Therefore the words which have spoken by trust worthy person. That the words indicated to the significance and rationality situations are to be valid for time being and too forever.

**Causation**

According to Nyaya describes about to causation that a cause has not its condition it is affected by the situation of Condit ironless a particular cause produced by the effect and effect produced by the particular causes which include in many site as-

It is necessary that the fastness is depending with effeteness which can say Puravartti.

It is necessary that the events are reflected in the effects, as –Nivataprva-Vartti.

It is necessary that the third is it unconditionally or necessity; it must unconditionally precede the effect (Ananayathasiddha). Unconditional events are being suddenly expressed which controlled by the cause.

So we can say that the theory of Indian philosophy about causation the Nyaya says, too same as the western philosophy says- the philosopher Hume says that a cause is conditional but j.s. mill defines it as unconditional and unformed Hence the theory of causation describes by the Nyaya.

**Soul**

According to the soul’s description by the Nyaya the soul controlled by the god. God’s decision depends on law of karma. The Nyaya believes in the action of material cause for the universal being reoffered by eternal atoms as- air, fire, water, earth, controlled by the soul, soul and atoms are related to creation. Now the means of creation a combination of atoms the Nyaya declares that means destructive situation a negative sense and negative sense means the combination depends on actions so all of the action motions.
The super natural power does not creel any t hang and does not destruction superpower is not creator with this that the material system is not complete Therefore called the ruler of the Universe being regarded as the efficient cause, the real efficiency belong to the Unseen Power.

**God**

Nayaya explains that the system of Vaishesika metaphysics reflects in matter spirit and super natural’s motion. We have discussed the metaphysics if the Vaishesika School and so we need not repeat it here. The principles of Asarkayavada, belongs to the power which accepted by Nyaya as- the ecreaty with unreal, the atoms of creativity, with spirit, liberal ideas, the exits of the Vedas naturalist to the god to Nyaya.

The criticisms which we leveled against the Vaishesika also apply against the Nyaya position in so far as both are identical. While Kanada does not clear the god after Vaisheka. So Nyaya declare the existence of god and the grace as the existence of god is essential steps to gain the knowledge which leads to liberal thinking. At last we can say that god is the controller of the world.

V

**Mimamsa (Jaimini)**

(Purva- Mimamsa)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

The word Mimamsa means the high ideals, to know about the Vedic ideas which the source of highest knowledge. So the critical sensitive meanings by giving us ideas that the Vedas have controlled all of the views of human beings Just as Sankhya and Yoga, Vaishesika and Nyaya are regarded as allied systems, similarly Miasma and Vedanta are also affected by Vedas. From the past time the Vedas depends on the process of mantra and Brahman circle, which called Karmakanda, after some time the Upanishads is called Jnana Kanda, so all of the action-motion rituals and the sacrifices, while the latter deals with the knowledge of reality.

**Validity Of Knowledge**

Let us first consider the nature of valid knowledge according to Mimamsa Prabhakara gives the ideas of knowledge to the anubhuti which reflected at presently parse. A cognition which apprehends an object cannot be intrinsically invalid. Memory arises from the impression of a prior cognition and therefore cannot be treated as valid knowledge. Kumarila tells us that the
knowledge depends on that object which is affected by causation it is free from permanently
knowledge. Parthasarathi defines it as apprehension of an object which has not been already
Apprehended, which truly represents the objective circle affected by various steps us with its
contradiction. A valid cognition therefore must fulfill these conditions.
Firstly, it must not arise from defective cause (Karanadosarahito).
Secondly, it must be free from contradiction.
It must be self-consistent and should not be set aside by subsequent knowledge
(Badhakajnanarahita).
Thirdly, it must apprehend an object which has not already been apprehended.

**Verbal Test**

Shabda-Pramana has got the greatest importance in Miasma. Testimony is verbal authority. It
is the knowledge of supra-sensible objects which is produced by the comprehension of the
meanings of works. Kumarila divides testimony into personal (Pauruseya) and impersonal
(Apauruseya). The former is the testimony of the trustworthy person (Aptavakyya). The latter is
the testimony of the Veda (Vedavakya). It is valid in itself. It has intrinsic validity. But the
former is not valid in itself. Its validity is inferred from the trustworthy character of the person. It
may be vitiated by doubt and error and may be contradicted afterwards. The Veda is eternal and
authorless. It is not the work of any person, human or divine. The sages are only the ‘seers’ not
the authors of the Veda.
The Veda is not composed or spoken even by God. The Veda deals with Dharma and the objects
denoted by it cannot be known by perception, inference, comparison or any other means of valid
knowledge

**Nature of knowledge**

We have discussed the Mimamsa theory of the intrinsic importance of the validity and its
knowledge. Before we come to the problem of error, we may add a few words to explain the
nature of knowledge according to Prabhakara and Kumarlia. Prabhakara’s theory of knowledge
as self-luminous (Svaprakasha). It manifests itself and needs nothing else for its manifestation.
Though self-luminous, it is not eternal. It arises and vanishes. Knowledge reveals itself and as it
does so, it also simultaneously reveals its subjects and its object In every knowledge- situation we
have this triple revelation.
The subject and the object both are manifested by knowledge itself simultaneously with its own manifestation. Cognition is known as cognition. The self is known as the knower and it can never be recognized as an objective system is interchangeable. It is the point of junta, jenny and Janna is simultaneously revealed in every act of cognition.

**Dharma**

According to the Dharma we know about it that it is point of enquiry. Jaimini declares in Mimamsa that dharma controlled the people’s activities there is the most ideas of the ought is effected Bayreuth and karma its deal with moral sense because Dharma and moksa of are represents the action and site of spirit which dialed by the Vedas. So Dharma is supreme and its commanded by the Vedas because one acts and other acts are too depends on the Vedas. All of the consciousness with particular conscience supported by the Vedas, Dharma deal the situations of pleasantness sorrowness which have suffered by human being. All of the activities held by Apurua presents by spirit which a man consider to do his work that work controlled by Dharma.

**The Vedanta or upnishad darsanas**

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

According to Badrayana the cream of the Vedas are Vedanta or Upanishads.

(a) The Vedanta or Upanishad Its sense is – Rahasya or Guhya Vidya actually the means of his word is secretly teaching of we may call it Rahasya or Guhya Vidya.

The Vedanta or Upanishads means Analysis as

- Up - Near by
- Ni - Devotedly
- Sad - (I) a student sits to gain knowledge from teacher.

(ii) A student wants to clear acknowledge.

(iii) A student wants to develop of rasping power.

Therefore the complete word of Upanishads means-

The pupil site down.

With his guru.
For learning behavior.
With to get some ideas by the teacher and a teacher do clear all doubts of the pupil.

(b) Kinds of Upanishads -

With Aspects of Education

The Vedanta Darsans or Upanishads part

According to Ramanuj Acharya and Madhvacharya, there are various types of Upanishads In all of the Upanishads, the Muktikopanised is the supreme. According to the Muktikopanised, there are 108. (One hundred eight) Upanishads although ten or eleven Upanishad as valied.

Shankracharya-

All of the eleven upnishads ten or contain its qualities with description.
As the eleven Upnishads are-

Ishz Kena
Katha
Prashna
Mundaka
Mandakya
Taottiriya
Aitreya
Chhandogya
Brhadanyaka
Shretashvatara

The Upanishads

Education aspec

We know come to the Upanishads which can we say that all of the upnshads theory mentioned from the Vedas. So foe called- Vedanta or Upanishads as it means-

In it a child sits near his guru.
In it a child solved his problem by the guru.
In it a child tries to gain knowledge from guru.

It means- nearby sitting with guru no- it means- A child learns manners from his guru.
Sad it means a child know about high ideals.
Generally we know about Rahasya or guru vidya from the Upanishads.
Muktikopanishad tells us that the member of the Upanishad are 108 in these 10 or 11 are authentic.

By the declaration of Shankaracharya These Are: Isha Kena, Katha, Prashna, Mundaka, Taittiriya, Aitareya, Chhandogya, Brhadaranyaka, Shretashvatara.

**Atman**

As the word ‘Atman’ originally meant life-breath and then gradually acquired the meanings of feeling, mind, soul and spirit. Shankaracharya quotes an old verse giving the different connotations of the word ‘Atman’. The verse says that the Atma deals all of the actions and motion in the body of human being. Atman is being always as the same forever.

The true self has been the main topic of investigation in the Upanishads. Socrates of ancient Greece has also persistently advocated the supreme necessity of ‘Know Thyself’. We may select three Upanishads – the Chhandogya, the Mandukya and the Katha, for our present purpose. In a dialogue between Prajapati and Indra, narrated in the Chhandogya, we find a development of the concept of the self from the waking or the bodily self through the dreaming or the empirical situation mostly depends on as dreamless site also presented by the Atman therefore Atman is supreme controller of the human being.

**BRAHMAN**

According to Brahman we know that it is the objective system of ultra native site of reality. So the word Brahman means gowns blitheness reflected in the God, Brahman with creates the nature and human beings. In the beginning it meat sacrifice, then prayer and then it acquired its present meaning of ultimate reality which evolves itself as this world all of the nature and souls of men is universal exists. Chandogya declares it as in Tijjalan, For the Brahman is the founder of words nature in this words all of the being have been taking birth. After birth its living and death controlled by the god Brahman. All of this depends on elements is given in this order Brahman created the word from the elements as either to air to five to water to earth it is evolution. So the evolution is given in the doctrine of the five sheaths (kasha’s) in the Taittiriya. The lowest level is that of matter (Annamaya). Matter is unconscious and dead and cannot account for life. It is purely on the physical plane.

C- Mahabharata – Gita Darshans

**Bhagavadgita**

Brief Acknowledgement
With aspects of education

Bhagavad-Gita is a song of lord krishme. Inthese songs lord krishan persuades to arjuna to fight against kauraves. The gita is the most popular and sacred book of the Hindus and is mentioned in the Mahabharata’s bhisma parva. It is the greatest Sanskrit epic. There are various Persons the praises showered on this work both by Indian and European scholars. Lokamanya Tilak calls it’ a most luminous and priceless gen which gives peace to afflicted souls and makes us masters of spiritual wisdom’.

“Mahamana Malavilaviyaji “sees a unique synthesis of the best ideas with good faith and human thinking.

According to mahatma Gandhi gita is the real mother whoever calls it helps always and it is not affective by dishonor it is ready to do help in human’s pleasantness.

Mahabhrta Saar Bhism Parva– Shri Mad Bhagavad Gita
Importance of figures – 18 or eighteen numbers
Chapters – 18
Parvas– 18
Nature’s elements – 8
Gyanendriyan– 5 18 Elements
Karmendriyan – 5
It means- Jive – Srishti– Created by Elements – 18
Purans – 18
Up Purans– 18
Mala Make – 108
Figures – 1 and 8
18x6 = 108
Mahabharata - war – Days – 18
Both Sides (Kauravas- Pandavas) Army – Akshohini– 18
Stanzas Or Shrilocks – 700
AS –
Dharitrashtra-1
Sanjai– 40
Arjuna– 84
Lord Krishna – 575
But Southern Indian Publish edition - 745 Stanzas

AS -
Dharitashtra- 1
Sanjai – 40
Arjuna – 84
Lord Krishna – 620
But according to Shankracharya ‘S Bhashya, 700 Stanzas or Shrilocks are authentic

**Gita’s Aspects Of Education**

A site of being
The teaching of metaphysical system gita is where is no being and unreality where is nonbeing and reality. So the soul is Avinashi, Nitya, Ajar, Avyaya, Sarvagata, Achaca, Savatana, Avyakta and Achintya with Avikarya. After this thinking we can understand that only the human body or a man is mortal and soul is immortal. When the body of a man after his death burn in five then the soul left the body and come out for enters into others that are new. The infinite underlies and animals but finite being and its existence is universe, so it is not effected by birth and death even though our body be “dust retuning unto dust” it is sure and truly that the existence of soul remains forever.

**Jnana**

This Yoga is essentially and predominantly the way comes to know this that the yoga is the fait source of understanding about self realization. Even the devotees are granted knowledge by the lord so that may realize the goal. Yoga, bereft of knowledge, is impossibility. We may weaken the power of the sense by fasting and abstaining from necessities, but unless we rise above the relish and the desire, the psychological attachment to the sense objects, we are not true Yogis. And this relish can go away only with the rise of true knowledge .How high the GITA place knowledge can be seen from the following: Even the most sinful man can cross over the ocean of Samara towards the boating of knowledge it a man does not know about the secret of gita. He is unknown about the knowledge of the so
The culmination of action is in knowledge. Having obtained knowledge, one soon embraces peace. There is nothing purer than knowledge’. The knower is identified by the Lord with His own self.

**Karma**

Karma yoga is not opposed to Jnanayoga. In fact, the former is possible only when the latter is attained. There is no importance of bad work. A constituent Guans of Parkriti sativa, Rajas and Tames, necessarily give rise to actions. As Wordsworth says:

‘The eye cannot choose but see,
We cannot bid the ear be still,
Our bodies feel where’ere they are
‘Against or with our will’

The universe itself depends on actions. Inertia is not liberty, but death. Work keeps up the cycle of the universe and it is the duty of every individual to help it. He who does not do so and finds pleasure in the sense is sinful and lives in vain. The ideal of the GITA is not negativism, asceticism or escapism. It is not negation of actions, but performance of actions in a detached spirit. It is not Naiskarmya, but Niskama Karma.

**BHAKTI**

Bhatia or devotion is defined as in unknown situation of god’s service it may be call karma, disinterested action, as we have seen, is not possible without knowledge.

Hence Bhatia too, like Niskama Karma, can be performed only by a true jinni. Only he can completely resign himself to the Lord. The devotee is confident of the guarantee given by the Lord –‘Never does my devotee perish’ and ‘The doer of good never comes to grief. The Lord says: ‘Even if a very ill- conducted him till he will not be good and very well. When he will because soon in well sit heartbeatily blessing for you, so lord Krishna says oh arjuna. That person has blessed by me.

Next a man who believe in my work depends and serves to me with any hate to any one oh, Arjuna that person has blessed too by me .The object of devotion is the personal God, the Purusottama on whose mercy the devotee has to throw himself utterly.

**A-Ii Non-Vedic Philosophy**

(Charvaka Darsans,)
Brief Acknowledgement
With aspects of education

Theory And Materialism
The crude Arjuna a situation of critical system of Indian philosophy in which maintain the
valuation of materialism, all of the influences and validity from the standpoint of empirical
system is not reusable but the point is discussable on all doctrines, proofs and thoughts. So
Arjuna view that perception is valid and inference is invalid is itself a result of presence. The
Arjuna know other activities by inference and too same for himself through inference. Therefore
all of the thoughts ideas not material objects cannot be perceived, they depend on the nature.
So Arjuna’s site called consciousness. So it is not philosophical ideas. Hence the Arjuna’s
valuation is depended up on suspense as the earth round less system.

Importance Of Metaphysic
According to Arjuna as four elements of the existence are earth five water and air there is no
existence of fifth element, ether because body had not affected by ether it has affected by the
four elements so soul and god are not effects the body All of the things with soul and mind’s
exists is due to a combination of these four elements these elements are universe which are
produced of material system.
This process certainly combined for the production of the body. In this procedure all of the
body’s system as color shape with constructing and its qualities are suffering from the elements
so the soul and body do its activities after the decision of its consciousness because the
consciousness too compensated with elements.

Types of ethics
According to Dharna, Arthe, Kama,
Moksa and these theory charvaka all of the pleasantness for human body reflects in the activities
of a man in the world. So its theory is cat drink and be merry.
By the side of ethics charavaka tells us that-
The importance of the soul is none. Death is sure.
Religion is not affected for all times and ideas of the mind.
A man suffers in good criteria in his life which affected, by human values-as dharma, artha, kama, and moksa as following particulars.

Dharma- by this a man do his work in good site.
Artha- by this a man realizes the importance of wealth.
Kama- by this a man suffers in the way of ending.
Moksa- by this a man has rejected of all activities.

Therefore all of the activities in human life have controlled by ethical systems.

A-Iii - Jainism Philosophy
(Mahavira Swami)

Jainism

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

The means of the word Jainism prescribed by jaina. In it a man has finished his desires. After this situation, a man regards the importance of his soul .There are the twenty four Tirthankaras of Jainism. All of the Jainism believed in the faith. Rsabhadeva is the first Mahavira, is the last hero his name was Vardhamana. But we cannot say that Mahavira is the founder of Jainism because Jainism thoughts are have been developing before him .Although Mahavira gave a new ideas about faith and believe in the aims to teaching principles of modern Jainism philosophy. It was the time of 6th century B.C. and too time of the budha .His predecessor, the 23rd Tirthsnkaras; Parshvanatha it was the time of 8th or 9th century B.C.

Importance of knowledge

According to Jainism knowledge devides in to following particular as-

Mediate –PAROKSA.

Jmmcdita-APAROKSA.

Except this knowledge further divided as-

Awadhi, MANAHPARYAYA kavalla, so mediate knowledge too divides as-

Mate.

Scrota.

In mediate knowledge- perceptual knowledge in actuality.
So mediate and immediate knowledge is under mate, only fact perception is not only knowledge but conception and perception both combination is knowledge, because perceptual knowledge as mediate since it presupposing action of thought therefore all of depends on mate and scrota as-

Mate- in its perceptual and interential combination is over.
Scrota- in its knowledge and authority combination is over.

Hence mate and scrota are two kinds of mediate knowledge with jmediate knowledge .So the three proofs for knowledge by Jainism as-

- Perception.
- Interence.
- Authority.

**Pramana And Nyaya**

The Jainism declares the Pramana and Nyaya are as- a knowledge of thing- as the it is Pramana, and naya- a thing in its relation. By the naya we can understand the site of a thing because all of truth depend on our thoughts all thoughts affected by aspects of that thing and decision based on particular knowledge. So the Nyaya are in Seven numbers in which first four are Artha Naya, because they connected with meaning. After that the last there are Shabda-Naya because they connected with words.

Towards the Nayabhasa- we can say that- the Nigama Naya-shows a outlook of particular and universal site is equal. It’s are not differencable.

So the universal and particular stages show as real and unreal which did By Nyaya-Vaishesika. The ‘Sangraha-Naya’ shows us that a particular thing depends on its reasonable situations.

**Anekantavada**

The system of metaphysical construction by the Jainism in a reality and unreality calls Anekabtvada. The realities of matter and soul are bye-depended. So there are some atoms and particular spirit which are separate and free real so each atom and each sprit belongs its own aspect as the thing is finites’ situation. In the site of its positive and negative conditions we can say that a general person may know some qualities of things because we do not know about qualities of things so much

Hence a man who knows all the qualities of a thing, an all qualities of all things that person suffers in the procedure of Anekantvada. So the Jainism views are that the human knowledge is
essential which much or less it is depended on the necessary relations and limitation but all of the point depends of a man judgment

**Syadvada**

Syadvada which is also called Sapata-Bhangi- judgments. All of these judgments depends on the seven steps and all of seven steps to give decisions by its knowledge the Sapata Bhangi theory depends on the words, perhaps, probability or the doctrine of the may be. But it is not in the literal sense of probability that the word stay is used here. Probability suggests skepticism and Jainism is not skepticism. Sometimes the word ‘stay’ is translated as ‘somehow’. But this too smacks of agnosticism and Jainism, again, is not agnosticism.

The word ‘stay’ is used here is the sense of the relative and the correct translations of the word Syadvada. It is the theory of real knowledge for the situation of various aspects reality in the same and related. So all of the judgments are essential related conditional limit for ‘Stay’ or ‘Relatively speaking’ or Views form a particular view-point which is necessarily related to other view-point’ must precede all our judgments.

---

**A-Iv- Buddhism Philosophy**

(Mahatma Gautama Buddha)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

For the time being of 6th century B.C. on the world level feeler that the light of knowledge bright in Asia with its virtues as courage, love and sacrifice whose heart feeled with emotion purse and that the whole human life was suffered with misery pain and sorrow. At the time belongs to super feeling to the men’s pleasantness with sorrow in oldness sickness before death because it is the law of nature. In that presence Mahatma Gautma Budha affected by nature’s happened events, so he left all of the kingdom facilities on the age of twenty nine with lovely nature were renowned far and wide, and still more delved newborn child who connected the link of love to his parents; who left the ornaments wife and fame. After their universal facts for man; and after six years, rigorous religious austerities, at last Siddhartha lay and sits under free near Gaya and
had suuless to gat knowledge and left the ignorance with affects of Maya. Now the Gautama covered to the truthfulness site in universal facts with the existence of universe. So Mahatma Gautama Budha taught there is not any the rich and the poor not the minor and the major, not the intelligent and the dull etc. It spread like fire far and wide from the lofty Himalayas to Cape Clamoring and ranged behold the frontiers of its homeland to Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Malaya, Java, Sumatra and then again then to Nepal, Tibet, Mongolia, Korea, China and Japan. It become a word-religion and a great cultural force at least in Asia, because the prince sidharthe has changed to budha. The budha told the four noble truths and eight told paths are being for us even today and with too forever. Enlightenment which dawned upon the mortal Siddhartha and transformed him into the immortal Buddha serves us even today. The Dharma-chakra, the world of the law, first turned by the Buddha at the deer park in Senath still revolves.

**The Four Noble Truths:-**

According budha- there are four noble truths. As there are Duhkhas. A man’s life is full of misery and pains where is pleasantness there is surely soreness, so both are communed. A human being has been suffering from various Duhkhas as poverty line illness oldness selfishness greediness angriness haleness quarrelers deathless etc.

These are causes of Duhkha-Samudaya; there at are noiuing else without any cause. All of the events which have suffered from many causes, everything depended on its causes in the world. The world’s activities suffered by various conditions limitations facts and all of the situations affected by the causes.

There are many situations and cessation of Duhkha Nirodha everything depends on some situations and conditions. All conditions are too depends on the affective position of the existence. because all of the things have their being and the being is conditional and its relation is necessary and momentary must born and death with production to destruction.

There are various ways to remove the Duhkhas which called Duhkha Nirodha- Gamini Pratipat. As- by the side of ethical and spiritual ways are yama, niyama, dharma, dhyan, Samadhi etc.

The noble Eight fold Paths of Education:-

According to eight fold paths of education we can say that these are following-as-

1. Right faith (Samyag, Drasti),
2. Right resolve (Sankalpa),
3. Right speech (Vak),
(4) Right action (Karmanta),
(5) Right living (Ajiva),
(6) Right effort (Vyayama),
(7) Right thought (Smtri) and
(8) Right concentration (Samadhi). This is open to this clergy and the laity alike.

From ancient literature are have know three paths as- good behavior, good luck and good education. They roughly correspond to Darshna, janna and charta of right conduct and right concentration refer to right knowledge is the direct reason of liberation. From the ethical bide of budha’s middle path is equal to Aristotle’s golden mean; hence the noble eight fold paths of education are essential for a good human being.

**Nirvana**

The ideal saint of both the schools of Hinayana is the Arhat who has simply ‘blown’ himself out of existence by annihilating all desires and passions. The ideal is said to be negative, individual and selfish. Nibhana is said to be a negative cessation of all earthly miseries. Next number in third noble truth is bearing It is often compared with the extinction of the flame of a lamp. Just as lamp when it becomes neither extinguished nor thither, neither to the earth nor to the sky, neither to this direction nor that, it has been utterly blown out on account of the oil being consumed; similarly a sage obtains Nirvana when the desires and the passions have been consumed; he goes neither this way nor that, but obtains utter peace.

The very word ‘Nirvana means ‘blowing out. It is the dissolution of the five Skandhas. It is the cessation of all activities (Chittavrttirodha) and of all becoming (Bhavanirodha). But there are many verses and passages in the Pali Canon which emphatically reject this negative conception of Nirvana.

**A-V- Indian Modern**

**OR**

**Contemporary Philosophy**

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education: -
According to literature of Indian modern or contemporary philosophy, we can say that the philosophy combined with ancient philosophy, with this fact that present Indian contemporary philosophy is too equal academic philosophy. Actually the contemporary Indian philosophers belong to their tradition. So they have not been cover to highlight such action aspects of their thoughts which reflects in original thoughts. So their traditional thoughts are mentioned in the contemporary Indian philosophy with modern thoughts, because the traditional thoughts have been tied with tradition and dogmatic tradition for the source of dogmatic tradition in philosophical thinking. It is true that a complete and radical breaching away from tradition. So the tradition is not possible therefore some of these who want to do because homeless they start look-after the sources for inspiration.

A philosophy declares the views with morality the moral philosophy bright as a moon light. So the thoughts of the contemporary Indian thinkers are natural and original thinking. Now the work of philosophy is the purpose for giving a complete knowledge about human being’s spirit and the nature with critical comments have been clarifying the concepts for the point of faithful exposition and its clearance is compulsory with the system of appreciate thinking and identification. All of the identification of the philosophers and their thoughts are not only depended on sympathetic circle but depended on their educational ideas.

Therefore there are two current philosophical activities as-
In its both the intellectuals and the general people have been taking interest.
In its all activities are clearly academic and professional.
In this literature some of the philosophers as like K.C. Bhattacharya and Radha Krishnan gives their ideas.
In which they have wanted to increasing ideas in the Indian universities for the philosophical teachers and students. Because they have teed that is this major work will do help for philosophical understanding.
All of these thoughts are supported to the academicals and systematical manners to soloed the philosophical problems in critical topics.
So some of the philosophers of the twentieth century as swami vivakananda, Dr. Radhakrishnan have soloed the many philosophical problems throughout in the world for the teachers and students.
Therefore the philosophical knowledge had increased from ancient time by the philosophers and of the modern time too many philosophers have given the knowledge to this time.

Some of the Indian Philosophers

With Philosophical aspects Of Education

**Rabindranath Tagore**

(1861-1941)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

A student of philosophy is invariably faced with a difficulty when he is trying to apprehend a thinker who is also a poet. The procedure that is followed in philosophy is that of gathering evidences first and then of making deduction from those evidences. Poet-philosophers are interested in arguments and logic, he is a visionary, and therefore, communicates the truths that are revealed to him directly through his poetic images. But then, it is the business of student of philosophy to go beyond the poetic images deep into the poet’s realization in order to pick up the truths and to gather the evidences. There is danger of error, but, “if you shut your door to all errors, truth will be shut out’’. With care an insight has to be cultivated an insight into the poet’s mind, feelings and realizations. The outward life of Rabindranath was not very eventful. Excepting the award of the Nobel Prize and the founding of the ‘Shanti Niketan’, the external events of his life were, more or less, normal.

**Reality and God**

It is safe to say at the very outset that by the terms ‘Reality’ and ‘God’ Tagore does not mean two different entities. Here, both these expressions are being used only as a precautionary measure against a possible misunderstanding that may wrongly be created. In metaphysical context, a distinction between ‘God’ and ‘Reality’ is maintained. For Tagore such a distinction is unnecessary. Although, at times, one gets the impression that Tagore also is using the two expressions differently, but on a closer only because the poet cannot be philosophically precise in his writings.

There are descriptions in Tagore that create the impression that Tagore’s Absolute has been conceived almost in Shankara’S manner. He asserts that everything is a manifestation of the absolute .In Gitanjali he says, “Though art the sky and thou art the nest as well”.

Again, there
are passages in Tagore’s writings that clearly indicate that his position is fundamentally different from that of Shankara.

**Doctrine or Concept of Maya**

Tagore has introduced the concept of Maya also in his philosophy of God and the world. Although the concept of maya mentioned in the Vedanta but it concept reflects in the conception of Tagore’s creation of the nature. So it is more or less, in the Vedanta fashion, its principle is declares by its appearance. About it Tagore tells that maya is a universal but it is not undistuction. It is the mist and not the sun’. In its Tagore says that the truth universal stands but Maya has not. Tagore explains the nature of Maya with the help of analysis that it has been getting from pre knowledge. So its knowledge is not self depended .One, who knows, one which concerned to the same that is, considers them not in their separateness, perceives a value in them. Likewise , if the views of a creator with its values which clears by his creation level.

**Nature of Man**

Tagore conceives man in his behaviorism affected by the good governance by the god. The z god don’t the best qualities to the man’s nature. So Tagore declares that some Philosophers give the facts for a man become a man has been given a very key status. Metaphysically speaking, he is in many respects God-like, and yet he is very much a creature of his world. Tagore traces the history of evolution of life and shows that with the advent of man evolution himself strikes a different note. Before man appeared on earth, evolution proceeded, less, in a mechanical manner.

The physical forces, the mechanical laws of aggregation, co-ordination and heredity controled completely the course of evolution. Almost mechanically the species went on entering into the realm of competition and were selected or rejected according as they succeeded in adjusting themselves to the demands of the environment.

**Relation of the soul and Body**

According to soul and body we can say that –

A body reflects the filite side of the existence of a man.
A soul reflects the infinite side of the nature of a man.

In this Tagore trusts in reality and its aspects. So he believes in soul and body because soul and body are real. Tagore does not believe that body id a false aspect to the life of a man. A body is
the temple of the god. But in this view Tagore believes the site of its temple and the god. So we do not understand about the mistake and importance of the temple for god. Because the temple belongs to importance of reality with the realization of god reflects in its temple. Hence the Tagore declares that body has been show in its reality. We must not forgive the existence of an aspect the nature of a man, because the nature depends of the existence of the soul.

**Nature of Religion**

Rabindranath initially was a Brahmo-Samaji. Later on he developed religion which combined some elements of Brahmo-Samaji with some elements of orthodox Hinduism. Finally, he came to believe in, what be called, ‘the Religion of Man’. Whatever be the influences or the determinants that shaped Tagore’s views on religion, the fact remains that Tagore explicitly believes that religion cannot be confined to any group or sector tribe or nation. Man picks up that particular form of religion that suits him, but in the final analysis religion transcends all such particular forms. Ordinary religions, according to Tagore, are just aimless wanderings.

The aim of true religion is the realization of one’s kinship with everything. Religion, according to him, is a sort of homesickness. So as the site homesick its importance rise up day and night with the religious man is also on his sacred voyage to his eternal home.

**Swami Vivekananda**

(1863-1902)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

Swami Vivekananda was born on January 12/1863 in a high family of Calcutta. His childhood life was peaceful. Its education in a sense, was all-round, because he took to physical culture almost as zealously as to learn and intelligence. He has been learn, Literay, music, riding, swimming with too wrestling. So he had a good knowledge of Indian and western views. His initial mental frame-work was that of a rationalist and septic combined in one. He had mate to swami ramkrishan in 1881. At that time too proved to change in his life circle. So he has been taking interest in his teaching, but after some time he feel of doubt and resistance, he surrendered and accepted Swami Ramakrishna as his friend, philosopher and guardian.

**Reality and God**
It is somewhat philosophically unusual to treat reality and God under the same head with the site of Vivekananda philosophy that it is concept less situation. So the reality treated in metaphysical concept by traditional philosophy with too that God is in religious concept. So Vivekananda also combines, in his thought, towards the importance of God, he regards all of the complete existence of god. Therefore we find two currents flowing almost side by side in the philosophy of Vivekananda as –

He regards the Advanta Vedanta.

He regards one of the theism of the bhakti-culture.

Vivekananda is almost convinced that these two currents are not really two currents, that they are just two ways of looking at the Reality. But then, an attempt can be made to determine the features of both these aspects of his thought.

**The Doctrine of Maya**

An account of Vivekananda doctrine of creation has to refer to the doctrine of Maya. Vivekananda, in a sense, is a neo Vadnais, and as such, the Maya-doctrine naturally makes its appearance in his philosophy. It is true that Vivekananda has borrowed this doctrine from Advaita Vedanta, but his conception of Mayas is not exactly similar to that of Shankara like Shankara, Vivekananda also believes that Maya is a power of the Creator; he also thinks that Maya is the principle of change, a Shakti that makes creation possible. But in Advaita Vedanta, Maya is the power that creates illusion; it is that Divine Shakti which has the capacity of deluding man into believing that the world is real. Vivekananda does not accept this position. According to him, Maya does not necessarily mean being illusory or unreal. In Vivekananda philosophy Maya, is conceived just as a fact about the nature of the world, it seeks to express the essential characters of the world as it exists.

**Nature of Man**

Some anthropologists have claimed that the origin of religious thought lies in some form of animism. The primitive man found himself unable to explain the phenomena of dream, unconsciousness and death. He was forced to believe that the real man was not the man that was apparently seen moving and living. This crude idea about the mysterious being started taking shape as man’s capacity to think and speculate grew. That is why Vivekananda says that this was
the main object of inquiry for the situation of Upanishads and with the inquiry of Katha Upanishads. As a example- some of the man says, a man has gone forever after his death. But some says, a man’s soul is too alive forever after his death. He himself tries to answer the question by saying to this point thus there are two ideas as-
A man is mortal.
A soul is immortal.

**Destiny of the soul: Realization of Immortality**

Now, it is apparent that according to Vivekananda, freedom represents the essence of the soul, and as such, soul is not really in bondage. The impression that it is in bondage is only apparent. Now, this presents a difficulty, such a description of the soul is difficult to understand, because our awareness of the usual state of the soul creates the impression that soul is the suffering individual, limited in his capacities and action. In fact, such awareness makes us thoughtful and forces us to think about the ultimate destiny of the soul. Vivekananda is aware that every thoughtful person is confronted with a question like this. But he is convinced that there is no contradiction between these two impressions between our impression on the soul’s limited capacities and the conviction that the soul is, in reality, never in bondage.

These points are clarified in Vivekananda deliberations on the nature of the soul’s immortality- the realization of which, in his opinion, is the ultimate human destiny.

**The Way of Action (Karma Marga)**

Towards Karma yoga Vivekananda says that Karma yoga is influenced by good work which affected by ethical and religious system. Karm yogi does not believe in any doctrine. He believes in hard work and yoga but not in metaphysical system he realizes the importance of special aim but not selfishness. He has worked in such position and description to doing work.

For firstly the importance and valuation of karma and for secondly the unselfishness karma.

Again as-

The first stage- in this stage, karma yoga does not recommend to flying away from the worldly Karma, because he reminds the events of his life as good evil, pain, suffering etc are dependent up on his work.

The second stage- in this stage Karma- yoga has worked out for unselfishness, it means that his work has to be none attached.
Mahatma Gandhi
(1869-1948)

Brief Acknowledgement
With aspects of education

The birth of mahatma Gandhi was Porbandar. His date of birth 2nd of October 1869. Gandhiji’s caste and profession was Vaishya yet gandhiji ’s father the grandfather and uncle have served the served the served. For some time is father was the prime minister in the court of Rajkot and also in vankaner though his parents have their education, Mohandas karam chan ghndhi also grew in mixed and balanced himself. Gandhi was believes in to moral and religious traditions. Yet he recommended to the changes with needs to the childhood un eventful but one his friends who was nonwage he persuaded to him for meat – eating, smoking, stealing with two other evils. So all of these experiences mostly effected to gandhiji with moral sense therefore gandhiji went to England for higher education in 1888.

Gandhi theism

Gandhi’s theism

According to the God truth with the theism of gandhiji we can say that a philosophical student finds some difficult in the philosophy of gandhiji as the importance god. To the academicals side for philosophy gandhiji did not have any training though gandhiji mostly beliefs in Vaisnavas type for the Vaisnavas circle he has influenced from the atmosphere of his family because all of the family members of mahatma Gandhi have their ideas that the god Vaisnavas existence power is supreme in Indian with all of these ideas they have regarded the authority of the Vedas and the Upanishads.

There the general thinking is that they have become the thoughts to belief that all of these ideas must be develop in education institutions in India.

Truth Is God

Towards the truth is god mahatma Gandhi calls to the truth that it is equal to the god. He says that where is truth there is god therefore god and truth are connected says that when was young I have been hoarding that there many hundred names of Hindu god and goddesses, but most of these names of god were by no means in the existence. Though the mean of god depended on the truth. All the creatures are depends on the god. So we can say that there is no any name of
god, because the god has reflected in many forms. It considers that it is speechless. So it is not impossible for the human tongue for complete description. So gandhiji says that about all of the arguments god is truth and truth is god.

**Karma and Rebirth**

Gandhi believes in rebirth also. This belief is obviously a product of his extreme respec for Hindu beliefs and tradition. But, there is a significant sense in which Gandhi’s faith in the possibility of rebirth carries the distinctive mark of his own personality and genius. In Hinduism rebirth is, more or less, a metaphysical doctrine, a belief postulated for explaining mysteries of life prior to birth and after death. While Gandhi is not going to deny this, he does not feel the need of entering into the details and subtleties that the concept of rebirth involves. On the other hand, he gives a moral interpretation to this doctrine by emphasizing the pragmatic and ethical value of this belief. He feels that by believing in the possibility of rebirth one is able to make adjustments with life. This belief enables man to be loving, kind, moral and benevolent even in the midst of his bitter experiences of jealousy, hatred and strife. It is true that life is not a bed of roses.

**Non-Violence (Ahimsa)**

According to the theory of truth gandhiji has belief and consideration to nature of non-violence. He himself that truth and non-violence are so old as so hills and mountains. All of the proofs declare that truth and non-violence both are connected and affected to one another by many experiments have declare that various problems of life may be soul by the truth and non violence so gandhiji tells that in fact the power of truth and non-violence have fact in his life style. So for explaining more clearly the transition from the notion of Truth to that of Non-violence he says, non-violence and truth are so connected that it us not disconnected from one another in particularly. As we can say that they are two sides of action. Which coin shows the deferent shape of meats but the evaluation is the same one so non voiles and truth remains connected.

**Religion and Morality**

In a philosophical account of the thoughts and beliefs of a particular thinker ‘religion’ and ‘morality’ ought to be dealt with separately because, philosophically speaking, the two concepts are basically different. Moral values are essentially this – worldly, they are concerned with life
as it is lived. Religious values have a reference to the ‘beyond’. It is quite possible for the two to coexist, but conceptually they are different.

In Gandhi’s thought, however, they almost overlap. Gandhi believes that religion and morality are connected to each other.

Gandhiji says that without religious stage morality is useless. He would be prepared to accept even in valid religious statement is equal to mortal statement. Gandhiji says that as we have lost the morality thoughts too lost religious thoughts because both are impressive in the life of a man so a man can not to replacement to the god without combination of religion and morality.

**Sri Aurobindo**

(1872-1950)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education

Aurobindo Ghos was born on the fifteenth of August, 1872 at Konanagar, west Bengal. He got his early education in Loreto Convent school of Darjeeling, and was taken to England at an early age eight. In the early part of his stay in England he was put under the care of an able teacher, named Dewitt. In 1885 he was sent to stent. Paul’s School in London. In school he developed a special fascination for some classical Languages like Greek and Latin and also for some European languages. He learnt them all, and even tried to compose verses in Latin and Greek. After completion his studies he appeared for the I.C.S. examination, was successful in the written test, but could not qualify in the riding test. In 1893 he come back to India and joined the Baroda State Service.

There he found enough leisure to read ancient Indian philosophy. Somehow he was not satisfied with the type of life he was leading at Baroda, and was drawn into political career

**The Super mind**

We have seen that the realm of reality has been divided into two hemispheres, the higher and the lower. The retune principle of Sachidananda (the pure Existent, Consciousness-force and Bliss) represents the higher sphere and Matter, Life, psyche and Mind belong to the lower hemisphere.

We have also seen that evolution has reached the level of mind and is preparing for its next leap into the realm of the spiritual-the higher hemisphere. Now a question arises how can this leap be brought about? How can an evolutes belonging to the lower sphere transform itself in such a
way that it is able to enter the higher or the spiritual sphere. Sir Aurobindo feels that this can be possible only if a principle mediates between the two.

That principle must serve as the link between the two spheres. It must, on the one hand be similar in nature to Sachidananda and, on the other, it must not be the opposite of the mental. Such a link is the Super mind. It belongs to the higher hemisphere and yet it is end and the ideal of mind- that which mind is going to be high ideas.

**Ignorance, its Origin and Nature**

An analysis of sir Aurobindo’s conception of Man, creation and evolution would clearly show that the concept of Ignorance has been given an important place in Sri Aurobindo’s metaphysics. Creation has been described as the plunge of the spirit into ignorance. The entire world is conceived as being in the realm of ignorance and evolution is conceived as gradual progression form ignorance to knowledge. Therefore, it is essential to try to determine the nature of ignorance. Indian Philosophers have thought on the problem and have been able to develop various conceptions about the nature of ignorance.

Some of them have called it Ajanna or Avidya; some of these thinkers have attributed this to the principle of Maya, Which, according to them, is the power of the reality to produce cosmic illusion?

**Nature of Creation: The World –Process**

So far we have been trying to determine the nature of the reality- of Saccidanda. But, the fact of creation demands an explanation especially in view of the fact that the Absolute is conceived as absolute and infinite, as the Supreme that lacks nothing. Naturally, the question regarding the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ of creation would be raised. In fact, Sri Aurobindo conceives creation as a double-process, it is firstly a descent of the spirit into the worldly forms and then it also implies an ascent of the worldly forms to its original higher status. Sri Aurobindo is aware that all talks about spiritual regeneration and growth would presuppose two things

(a) Firstly it would presuppose that the ideal can be reached, and that there can be no better guarantee to this than the fact that the ideal really is part of our nature, although somehow we have forgotten about our own selves.

(b) Secondly it would imply that there has been a descent of the spirit into the world because ascent presupposes descent.
Yoga And Its Aim

The from the side of yoga, of means- unity which control to the man’s body so the main aim of yoga for a man to realization of the power of divine and unity. Some of the philosophers regards mostly greatest evil is the separation of the finite form the infinite, and therefore, the importance of the legal unity too combined with its aim so Aurbindo feels that somehow or other, believes in some such concepts of Yoga, but he makes it consistent with the general nature of his philosophy. Even a causal look at the main aspect of his thought will make it clear that there are certain basic ends that his Yoga seeks to serve. We have seen that evolution has reached a particular stage both at the individual level and at the cosmic level. We also have noticed that evolution is preparing for a leap into the spiritual or the super mental level. ‘Yoga’ is needed to facilitate and expedite this leap.

Krishna Chandra Bhattacharya
(1875-1949)

Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education: -

K.C Bhattacharya was born at Serampur on the 12th of May 1875. He was born in a Brahmmin family of Sanskrit scholars /naturally, in his childhood itself he was initiated into an appreciation of ancient Indian wisdom. Krishna Chandra had his initial school education at the local school .However, after passing his matriculation examination in 1891, he was sent to the Presidency College. He was a brilliant student throughout, and so succeeded in getting P.R.S. award of the Calcutta University in 1901. He joined the Bengal educational service, and served as Lecturer in Philosophy in various colleges of “Bengal. He retired from the educational service in 1930, when he was officiating as the Principle of Hooghly College

. After retirement he was invited to work as the Director of the Indian Institute of Philosophy at Amanner He worked there till 1935, when he was offered the post of the professor in moral and mental department of philosophy in the University of Calcutta so he posted and engaged till 1937.

Real and Unreal

Usually it is believed that philosophy is an attempt to construct a world-view. In India philosophy is made to serve a practical –more accurately. The path leading to third state of
complete freedom from suffering consists in a kind of knowledge. This knowledge is conceived as the knowledge of the distinction between the ‘real’ and the ‘unreal’ that means philosophy has to give a world-view, it has to analyses the nature of the world in order to discover the real and unreal aspects of the world. But, Krishna Chandra does not agree with this fully. In this respect his position is similar to that of Kant, or even to that of the Logical Positivists. Like them K.C. Bhattacharya also believes that it is not an essential function of philosophy to construct a synthetic view of the world.

He feels that judgments of philosophy are not factual; they are not related to facts in so far as they do not claim fact city like the empirical judgments.

**Philosophy of the Spirit**

We shall be in a position to appreciate fully the nature of the philosophy of the Spirit when we come to discuss Krishna Chandra’s notion of subjectivity. But it would be fruitful to have some idea of it in relation to the grade of theoretic consciousness which has the self-subsistent as its content. Metaphysics, as we have seen, elaborates the concept or the form of the object in relation to the subject. That shows that no metaphysical concept is intelligible without reference to the subject or the spirit. In fact, within the realm of the philosophy of the Object, logic deals with pure forms which are the forms of pure object and these pure objects form the subject matter of metaphysics.

That is to say, logical activates are symbolic its forms symbolizing the metaphysical content. Now, what do metaphysical objects signify? Metaphysical concepts cannot be the symbols of facts, because they are self-subsistent. Thus, they can be symbols only of contents that are enjoying believed.

**Philosophy of Truth**

Religious consciousness, as we have seen, is the highest kind of spiritual activity, but this does not involve a theoretical denial of the subject as ‘I’ on the other hand, in this consciousness, along with the awareness of the over-personal self, there is an enjoying consciousness of I am not. K.C. Bhattacharya speaks of the possibility of the consciousness is Truth, because this consciousness is above the subject distinction. This is the consciousness of the absolute, that is of the Truth. The Absolute is not the same as the over personal reality that is enjoyed in purely
subjective attitude. The over-personal reality constitutes the content of religious consciousness, and religious consciousness is a process of inward sing. That is, it is a process in which ‘I’ is not negated but enjoyed as the whole process becomes completely inner and subjective.

Theory of Knowledge

Krishna Chandra describes knowledge thus, “it is in introspection into knowledge That we realize that we believed before we knew and that there was then no awareness of the distinction of the object believed from the belief. Knowledge as distinct from mere belief involves the awareness of distinction.” It is apparent that knowledge, Here, has been described in terms of belief. It is true that nothing can be known unless it is believed and also that there is a difference between ‘belief ’ and ‘the object believed’

The awareness of this distinction is also an essential aspect of knowledge. That shows that fundamentally knowledge is always a kind of an awareness. Awareness can be of two types: awareness in the objective attitude and awareness in the subjective attitude. In the former a distinction is made between the object of awareness and the subject of awareness; in the latter, it is difficult to make such a distinction.

Concept of the Absolute

We have just described the absolute as completely indefinite. Even earlier be described neither as objective nor as subjective. In fact, it is not safe to ascribe any epithets to it strictly speaking, it is not even thinkable. At best, an attempt can be made to have an idea about it in terms of certain symbols. K.C Bhattacharya feels that the western philosophers have committed the error of trying to describe the characters of the absolute Kant, for the first time, realized the futility of such attempts, but even he made the mistake of calling it unknown and unknowable.

He did not realize that to call the reality unknown and unknowable was also to give a description of the reality. On account of some such reasons K.C. Bhattacharya feels that the absolute cannot be described even as reality It is pure Indefinite that is why it transcends the subjective and the objective.

Sir Mohamad Iqbal

(1877-1938)

Brief Acknowledgement
With aspects of education:-

Sri Mohammad label occupies a unique position in Contemporary Indian Thought. He is only thinker of the recent times who tries to apply academic philosophical standards to Islamic thought. Most of the other Indian thinker philosophies in the background of ancient Hindu tradition Irbil, although having the same philosophical spirit and temperament, carry the Islamic tradition with him. And yet, philosophically speaking appears to be close to other Contemporary Indian thinkers in many respects.

Mohammad Irbil was born in 1876 at Sialkot. He got his early education at Sialkot and Lahore. He had a uniformly good career and obtained his M.A. degree in philosophy, after which he become a lecturer in the Oriental College. By that time his fame as a poet has begun to spread. In 1905 he went to Cambridge from where he obtained his Tripods, having carried out his Studies under Mc Taggart. For same time he did research on Persian Metaphysics at Munich in Germany.

**Nature of the Self**

In outlining his conception of the self Iqual follows a particular procedure. He first states the organic view of man, and then refers to some of the interpretation of this view by the different sects and schools of Islam. In particular he makes a mention of the views of Devotional Sufism, specially, to the famous expression of Halla‘Anal Haq’ or ‘I am the creative truth’. He tries to organic the salient features of all these ideas and then arrives at his own conception of the self. ‘Anal HAQ’ particularly seems to have provided to IQBAL the rudiments of his own notion of the self. Before giving an account of this, it would be worthwhile to determine the geneal meaning of the word ‘self’. What is it that the word stands for or denotes?

We shall see that IQBAL’S meaning of the word is not very different from this. Although he lays emphasis and some such elements that are not ordinarily emphasized very much.

**Nature of the World**

Contemporary Indian thinkers are aware that the present-day intellectual deliberations cannot afford to go against the assertions of the sciences. IQBAL also is aware of the sciences has succeeded in determining the nature of the material world. Therefore, like other contemporary Indian thinkers, he also comes to assert the reality of the world. He has his justification for making this assertion, but his confidence in real and unreal to the world is unqualified. He is very
much a realist in maintain that the external world exists and is real. Iqbal says that an intuitive insight will reveal the reality of the world. One kind of intuition makes us conscious of ourselves and makes us aware of a principle of unity that organizes our experiences. Another intuition tells us that we are pitted forces other than the ago obstruct us.

Thus this intuition forces us to accept the reality of the obstruction and of the environment. Iqbal feels that without accepting the reality of the world we shall not be able to explain our experiences and behavior.

**The world as an Ego**

If such is the nature of space and time, we shall not be logically justified in believing that the world consisted of fixed substances or things located in objective space and time. What then is the nature of the material world? Iqbal says that it is not possible to have an idea of the material world through ordinary sense-impression or intellectual apprehension. Both these faculties work on one basic presupposition, namely, that the world before our view is there-rigid, fixed and static. When senses or intellectual deliberations apprehend the object, they work under the belief that the object continues to be in the same state in which it had been when contacted initially.

Thus they views at the object in the traditional mould of space and time without realizing that every object is essentially a dynamic process of growth and development.

**God as the Supreme Ego**

According to Iqbal the universe is of the nature of a free creative force. He also says that the world-process is not blind but purposive. The teleological character of the world shows that the world-process is being rationally directed. He says further that rational egos have the capacity to regulate and direct their own creative life. Therefore we are constrained to think that there is a Being cannot be outside the universe, because in that case the end and the goal of the world would become external. The supreme Ego is conceived as guiding the creative progress of the world. In fact, Iqbal believes that individuality is a matter of degrees.

There is a rising note of ego hood throughout the inverse; it has not reached perfection even in human beings. Therefore, Iqbal comes to conceive God as the Supreme Ego – as the ideal of ego hood.

**Importance of the Prayer**
Iqbal's analysis of ‘Prayer’ becomes significant in relation to another question, ‘how can the ego develop his ego-capacities’? Iqbal believes that the world provides a field for – activity, an opportunity for the ego to express its potentialities. In fact, all activities performed in the world are ego-sustaining or ego-developing activities. Even the pleasure giving or pain giving acts unfold and enrich the ego–capacities. Man has accepted at very great risk the trust of personality and freedom. How can he justify this trust? How can he use his freedom in the right way? He must have a respect for the ego and a faith in its capacities. This requires patience-patience in all kinds of situation, even in the midst of hardship and suffering. Patience hardens the self against every kind of ills, and enables him to cultivate the capacity of applying concentrated energy to every situation that confronts him. The purest example of concentration of patience is prayer. Prayer or the act of worship intensifies life.

**Dr. S. Radhakrishnan**  
(1888-1975)  
Brief Acknowledgement

With aspects of education-
Radhakrishnan was born on September 5, 1888, at a small place, Tiruttani, forty miles to the north–west of Madras. He was the second child of his parents. His early life was spent in Tiruttani and Tirupati, both famous as place of pilgrimage. Perhaps on account of that early influence he was naturally attracted towards religion. He admits himself that since then he developed a firm faith in the reality of the unseen world, a faith which was never forsaken. He had his school and college education in Christian missionary institutions. During this period he came to be acquainted with the main teachings of Christianity and also with the critical remarks of the Christian missionaries on the Hindu way of life. That led him to undertake a study of Hindu scriptures. He unconsciously developed a respect for such powerful religious preachers as Swami Vivekananda. His early religious orientation was a result of all these influences and impressions.
The Absolute or the Brahman

This non-physical principle is designated by Radhakrishnan both in the Indian way and in the western manner. He at times calls it the Brahman, and at other times, the Absolute. His Absolute contains in it the elements of both –the Advaita Vedanta and of the Hegelian tradition. It is the only reality, but it is not arrived at the last and minimum stage of it. This will be evident if we examine the strictly monistic character of the Absolute as it has been conceived by Radhakrishnan. He believes that the ultimate explanation of the universe has to be monistic. The Absolute in itself is essentially one. Like the Advaita Vedanta’s calls it the differentiations that appear to be there are so only the situation of its position, so the true that everything, in a sense, is an expression of the absolute, but these expressions do not in any way affect the monistic character of the Absolute.

The Absolute and God

Over and above the principal on the God, we come across a similar account also in the Advaita Vedanta of Shankara, But there the two principles are conceived as basically one, as different ways of apprehending the same reality. Advaita makes a distinction between Paramarthika Drsti and Vyavaharika Drsti and the difference between the two principles of Absolute and God is ultimately reduced to these two points of view. Radhakrishnan also distinguishes between the Absolute and God although he does not reduce their distinction to the empirical and the transcendental points of view as it has been done in the Vedanta. He feels that in order to explain the universe it is necessary to think of a principle that would account for the order and purpose of the universe. Like Whitehead Radhakrishnan also believes that one cannot account for the dynamic and creative character of the universe if the primary Being is also not conceived as creative.

True Natural Of The Soul

From the side of real nature and the soul, we can understand that it is difficult to give an exact or precise meaning of the word ‘spiritual,’ But Radhakrishnan feels that at least at least in the context of man, an understanding of this word is not as difficult as it initially appears to be. The import of this expression can be made clear with the help of examples taken from man’s life-examples of such activities that can be called spiritual.

The Doctrine of Rebirth
The doctrine of the plurality of selves along with the consciousness of the fact of death leads Radhakrishnan to develop a doctrine of Rebirth also. If souls have to retain their individuality till the end of the cosmic process, they must continue to exist in some form or the other even after death. Rebirth therefore means survival; it is continuing to exist by assuming different bodies after death. Radhakrishnan is aware that it is difficult to understand the mechanism of rebirth fully but awareness to the unfulfilled urges and tendencies in the purposive set-up of the universe compels us to think about some possible forms of life after death just only to provide yet another opportunity for the realization of the unrealized urges.

We cannot, in one life, exhaust all the potentialities of life. The most general ground for the rejection of a belief in rebirth is the first that there is no evidence of anybody giving any memory of the past life. But Radhakrishnan says that lack of memory about the past life is not an adequate ground for rejecting the belief in rebirth.

**The doctrine of rebirth and Moksa**

Towards the doctrine of birth and rebirth we can understand that Man is a finite – infinite being. Even in his finite embodied existence his spirituality asserts itself from birth to Rebirth. He, even in the midst of his finite surroundings, has yearnings of a higher kind. That shows that the ‘being’ of man is a continuous march towards the realization of that higher spiritual state. The soul has to pass through various stages of embodied life, but all these stages are only resting places for him, not his goal.

His various births merely provide him with opportunities for directing his energy towards the realization of the goal of existence – which is the ultimate human destiny. Ancient Indian Philosophy describes this ultimate goal of existence as the state of complete salvation or Moksa. It is conceived as a state free from suffering - a site where is to understandable to the nature and its realization.

**A-Vi N.K Davaraja**

Philosophy, Religion And Culture

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

The main concern of Philosophy, as conceived by the present writer, is the analysis, interpretation an assessment or evaluation of those symbol bound activities or experiences of
man that constitute, or affect, his qualitative growth and progress. It is characteristic of man, as a being endowed with self-conscious reason and as one seeking critical self-awareness, to engage himself in various kinds of activities productive of different types of value, and also to reflect on those activities.

This reflective activity is called philosophy. Man is by nature inclined to pursue different kinds of value; he is constantly seeking to transcend the present by first imagining and then striving to realize a better state of affairs or superior forms of experience and awareness. Philosophy is the instrument that enables man to make his pursuit of values a consciously directed activity. The most important function of philosophy consists in the framing or proposing of definitions.

**Language And Reality**

A discussion of the relationship between language and reality seems logically to presuppose an acquaintance with the nature both of reality and of language. It happens, however, that our knowledge of reality, particularly the knowledge that can be shared and communicated, necessarily depends on language. In our experience of linguistic expressions of that knowledge, the latter is found to be continually being modified or improved upon. Any formulation of the relationship between language and reality, therefore, should proceed not on the basis of a fixed conception of reality, but on that of the changing or developing character of those conceptions.

In other words, the relation between language and reality can be comprehended, if at all, only through reflection on the nature of the attempt or attempts made by man to delineate and describe the real. By linguistic or other kinds of symbols, we should be being, in other words, with a discussion of the nature not of reality but of language.

We conclude, then, that language is essentially, and necessarily, social. Its main purpose is not so much the description of the real as it, as the communication of what it appears to the speaker in terms having a common import for both the speaker and the listener. This last reservation of colours and forms, odours and tastes—are unshareable, they cannot constitute the denotative meaning of the words used to indicate them. What, then, does a word like ‘red’ indicate or denote? Here, two observations are in order. First, the word ‘red’ does not exclusively indicate a particular shade of redness; it stands, rather, for a family of colour as perceived by different persons are not wholly alike. This leads to my second observation. In order that the word ‘red’ may be considered to have been correctly used in discourse, it is enough that there be agreement among the persons concerned regarding the propriety of using that word ‘red’ with a family of
shades of redness under instructions from his elders; on all subsequent occasions, he understands that word to indicate any shade falling within that family. The fact that two or more persons use the same word to indicate is the fact that the percepts of the persons concerned are similar enough to evoke the reaction consisting in the use of the word ‘red’ communicates in a discourse is not so much the fact of the presence of a particular colour as the fact of the family likeness of the sensations in the speakers, who have severally learnt to associate that word with a given class or family of sensed phenomena. An important conclusion in regard to the capability of language to describe reality follows from these considerations: language can describe reality-particularly the reality of colors and forms-only to the extent to which that reality assumes for men a common meaning expressible in terms of common verbal reactions.

We may now pass on to indicate another limitation under which language has to operate in its attempted delineation of reality. The use of language is strictly limited by the interests and cognitive powers that human beings have in common. This statement has a twofold implication. Man can describe reality only in terms of what he is fitted to see of that reality. Roughly speaking man has five types of sense organs which reveal to him several orders of qualities in the physical world; he also has an intellect or understanding endowed with a certain constitution. He cognize the external world, and accordance with his inherent powers, needs or interests. Maybe these powers, needs and interests are organically related to the word in which they operate; but even that does not guarantee that these powers, etc., are suited a priori to put us in contact with all the properties world. The modern man’s self-complacent attitude in this regard has tended to be shaken by the discovery of paranormal phenomena by psychical research during recent times.

**Logic And Reality**

One of the main functions of formal logic is the study of those relations among propositions upon which valid inference depends. These relations are known as implication. As Cohen and Nagel observe; ‘We infer one proposition from another validly only if there is an objective relation of implication the first proposition and the second’. Here an important question arises: what is the source of the relation called implication between two or more propositions? In the final analysis, propositions are nothing but certain kinds of assertions or statements. What makes one statement or assertion imply another? Different systems of logic seem to hold different views on this crucial point.
According to the Nyaya system inferential necessity, i.e. the connection between the minor term (Paksha) and the major (Sadhya), is grounded in Vyapti which is a necessary relation between two objective entities. The Aristotelian syllogism admits of a similar interpretation.

**Value And Reality**

What relation, if any, does value bear to reality? Those who ask this question ultimate value and ultimate reality. Our initial question, them, may be split up into the following sub-questions: What is to be understood by the terms ‘ultimate value’ and ‘ultimate reality’? And how is the relation between the two to be conceived? Other questions concern the method of investigation and or the method of proof. What is involved in framing the definitions of the aforesaid terms? And how is a hypothesis concerning their interrelation to be tested or justified?

These last questions, obviously, touch on the fundamental problem of the nature and method of philosophy. It is not possible here to enter into a detailed discussion of this problem.

**Morality and Religion**

A fruitful discussion of the relationship between morality and religion presupposes clear conceptions of the phenomena denoted by the two terms. Unfortunately, it is far from easy to give precise descriptions of the concepts of morality and religion particularly the latter. As is well known, Plato wrote a whole treatise called the Republic in order to define the concept of justice or moral propriety, and there is no end of books on the origin and nature of religion. Etymologically the Sanskrit word dharma, which is our synonym for morality, stands for the principle that upholds society, or holds together the people composing society. Dharma is what maintains social harmony. Taken in this sense, it is very close to the term as used in the Republic.

This description of dharma or morality may be taken to be tolerably correct and acceptable. But it is difficult to give an account of religion which would be as acceptable.

**Modernity And Reality**

It seems to be widely supposed that the attitude of modernity is in some way hostile to religion. The typically modern man, it appears, tends to be either indifferent to religion or irreligious. For one thing the modern man is pre-occupied with many matters relating to business, society and Government; many of these were simply not there to bother men and women during ancient and mediaeval times. The numerous means of communication invented by man, including the
automobile and the airplane, the press and the radio, have interlinked individuals, societies and nations in a thousand ways; each of these ways demands time and attention and, occasionally, a measure of affective and or volitional involvement.

Both as a citizen concerned with the daily march of events affecting national interests and international peace, and as an intelligent and active individual more or less determined to secure amenities of an industrial civilization, the modern man has but little left by way of time and energy to think about and pursue religious matters.

**Conclusion:**

Therefore, we can conclude that the ancient and the modern Indian contemporary philosophers have giving their philosophical thoughts to the consider for philosophical study to the further readers and students. They have cleared that a man has depends on existential conditions with his speaking stage and to care in his life for gaining philosophical knowledge. So all of the ancient and modern Indian thinkers too recommended to speak about the ultimately more or less conditions in philosophical circle. Now we can say that from the vedic time all Indian philosophers have been regarded to the vedic knowledge. At that time various rishies and munies published of philosophy. As maharishi Gautama, patanjali, kapila, jaimini etc. they have taught philosophical knowledge with moral and religious knowledge. All of the thinkers solved the educational problem in philosophy with conceptions as- karma, rebirth, immortality, salvation, dharma, soul, god etc.

Towards the jainism there are various thinkers to sh mahaveera have solved the philosophical problems in educational circle. Towards budhism- mahatma gautam budha have too solve the problems of philosophical education. thus the Indian modern philosophers as- mahatma Gandhi Dr. radhakrishnan, swami Vivekananda K.C. bhattacharya etc. Have too solved the philosophical education problems. Therefore at last we can say that the Indian ancient and modern philosophers have been mentioned education problem and their solutions in philosophical educational circle on various aspects of education.

**Part – B**

**Western Philosophy**

With
Philosophical aspects of education

Introduction:

**Nature** :- The nature of Philosophy: The word ‘philosophy’ consists of two Greek works, namely, ‘Philosophy’ and ‘Sophia’ Janice the etymological meaning of the term is ‘the friendship or love of wisdom’. As such, philosophers may be called a ‘wise man’ However, this title is too pretentious, and Socrates defined philosophers as ‘as seeker after wisdom’. Even when defined the term ‘philosophy’ does not become any more precise. The important thing is to note that philosophy seeks wisdom, and not knowledge, wisdom and not the empirical knowledge. Indian philosophers aimed at immortality and not a world of sentient happiness:

Even if the world be full of wealth, how does this lead to immortality? Again: - This search after wisdom is comprehensive undertaking and is direction to the solution of such problems:

**Scope and Periods:** -

Towards the scope and periods of this philosophy we can say that there are various sources in thus scope. A western philosophical education In the scope of philosophical system, has description and mentioned the philosophy of a man and people with in the history of people real system of philosophical thought. Though the history of oriental peoples as – the Hindus Chinese Egyptians have their main ethical principles conducted by complete system of their complete thoughts. They describes in their poetry and faith. Therefore we can do study of the western philosophy for it the study must be start from the ancient Greeks and its civilization now we can do some classification of scope and the historical periods of western philosophy as-

Towards the western ancient Philosophy and the characteristics of Modern Philosophy: For our convenience we have divided the continuous river of thought into four periods.

Ancient Philosophy.

Greek Philosophy from Thales to Aristotle.
Greco Roman Philosophy.
Neo-Platonism of the Alexandrian school.
Mediaeval Philosophy or Scholasticism from the fifth to the fifteenth century.
Modern Philosophy.
The renaissance from the 15th to the 17th century;
The Period of enlightenment from Locke to Kant;
Historical aspect

Histories of Greek Philosophy Few of the western ancient thinkers have their progressive stage throughout western culture with western philosophy including civilization of Greeks. So we have begin our account of knowledge with them thinkers but it is not only depend upon their thoughts because the foundations are too depends on western ideas. Their ideas and problems have been solved by too European civilization from two thousand years. Therefore their philosophical ideas are that any people has furnished of the thought of human being have spread out from the philosophical thinking out of its beginning systems. The systems depend on the existence power of the spirit. So this power reflects in the truth. So all of the thinkers in the western regard to love of truth.

Environmental Aspect

Towards the environmental situation of the western philosophy we can say that all situation peninsula which has situated in Greece. With all of these are many harbors. That harbors encouraging and connecting to the islands so the islands remains Greek colonies because all Greek colonies were established in a regular chain this chain is from the mainland to Asia-minor. Which chained to Egypt Sicily Southern Italy with the Pillars of Hercules which is untouched the mother country, so all of these colonies are developed in unity except they have too different tradition customs institutions. Though there are too much progress in many circles as- in commerce in industry in trade cities rising wealth sources increasing level of labor
development of intellectuality progress in social, political level therefore all the progressive stage of Greek world depends on his religious has been prepared to open way to other civilization.

**Political aspect**

The background of the political circle for Hellenic city in Athence was supported by the leaders and founders in systematic colonies. We find that their citizens have controlled by philosophical thinkers in religious monarchy with aristocracy and democracy. The level of society has described by Homeric epics with the form of government. The situation of that wealth and culture have described by the forms of aristocratic systems of that government.

The leadership of privileged category has referenced by that social conditions on dispute and citizen class arise too this site. To transition from aristocracy to democracy in sixth and seventh centuries B.C. is accomplished by the high ambitions people because the people have powered by god. Thus we can say towards the political level of the he Hellonic words all of the people have ruled by that government which deals to democracy.

**Literature aspect**

Towards the literary means we can say that the changing in social and political situations have reflected in the Greek consciousness the literary movement has depended in the causes and symptoms of Greek civilization which dialed by the traditions of Athence. All of the literacy has left than old traditions and demand for new reforms. The sixth century B.C. the history of Greek literature was developed for the existence of spirit gradually so for the Homeric literature was in cheerfulness. Its was in objectivity sites. It has been reflecting in his childhood, but so gradually disappeared because the literature was more critical and subjective.

As in the homer even we find reason and occasional moral reflections from the manners and behavior of the people. As the for lushness of mortals misery in life wickedness of injustice and so ever.

**Religious Aspect**

According to religious Origins of Greek Philosophy- The religious of the Greeks is of peculiar importance for a study of the history of their philosophy; but the relations between religion and philosophy in the Greek world are as complicated as they are intimate. The interplay between Greek religion and philosophy is complicated by the fact That Greek religion ahs two major aspects:
In its first aspect, it is the importance of religion and the value of Olympus God to making followers through the epics of homely in the god’s existence remains in forever. So it has been reflected always in the action motion of human being.

(2) In the next aspect of Greek religion, which becomes prominent in the religious revival of the sixth century, B.C. is associated with the so-called mystery cults. Greek religion in its anthropomorphic aspect undergoes a long and refining development from the earliest times until the culmination of Greek civilization in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., and this development is intricately related to that of philosophy.

**Thales**

(624-554)

Brief acknowledgement

With Aspect of Education

**Substance. Thales**-

Thales’ importance lies in his having put the philosophical question squarely and with response that there is not being without any references. Thales was boring Miletus, a colony of Greece, he was born about 624 B.C. he had died between 554 and 548 B.C. Thales was the first philosopher of Greek yet he was a statesmen mathematician and astronomer too. Once a time 28th May, 585 was held a conference in Greece. Ten this conference all of the writers have submitted the list of seven wise persons his name was too mentioned in it.

Though Thales did not write anything to reading but his knowledge was much for teaching to the students, as Thales declared that the water in the essential and original substance fact that nourishment, heat, seed, which are essential to life, contain moisture. In selecting water as his primary substance, Thales may have been influenced by the myth of oceans and Tethys.

**Anaximander**

Brief acknowledgement

With aspect of Education

Principle of things

**Anaximander**-
Anaximander reasoned thus: The essence or principle of things is not water, as Thales supposes—for water itself must be explained but the Boundless or Infinite, conceived as autonomous impressive issues which all things have made and to which all things return. By this the thinker like a boundless system, full up to the space mains the animate and natural issues have to describes because he regards the qualities of things which are related and Among a number of conflicting interpretations of Anaximander’s Boundless:. As follows-

That the Boundless is a combination of things which reflects in separate interpretation.

That the Boundless is not definite determinate with too qualities of differential system.

(3) That the Boundless is something intermediate between the observable elements, for example, between air and water or air and fire. The second interpretation despite its vagueness—perhaps even because of it has considerable plausibility; perhaps as Burnett suggests, a reconciliation of these views is possible. The Boundless is infinite, or rather indefinite in extent he naively infers, otherwise it would be consumed in the creation of things. From this great mass of undifferentiated matter different substances are separated in consequence of its eternal motion; first the hot and then the cold tge hit surrounding the cold as a sphere of flame. The heat of the flame turns the cold into moisture and then into air, which expands and breaks up the sphere of fire into wheel-shaped rings. The rings have openings like the holes of a flute, through which the fire streams, and these are the heavenly bodies, which the air, surrounding them forces to move around the earth. The sun it the most remote body in the heavens, next comes the moon, and then the fixed stars and the planets. The earth, which is in the center of the system, is a cylindrical body. This conception of the earth as a cylinder, unsupported by anything but held in equilibrium by other bodies, conveys perhaps a dim recognition that there is no absolute up and down in the word. Indeed, Anaximander’s cosmology despite its many fanciful details foreshadows some features of the universe of modern astronomy. The first living beings arose out of the moist element in the course of time some these creatures came out of the water upon the drier parts of the land, and adapted themselves to their new surroundings. Man, like every other animal. Was in the beginning a fish. Anaximander’s speculations on the origin of living creatures like his cosmological speculations have an astonishingly modern flavor. Everything must return again to the primal mass whence it sprang. Only to be produced anew as infinitum. This is the doctrine of the alternation of worlds prevalent in early thought. According to Anaximander’s doctrine of cyclical recurrence innumerable worlds presumably succeed one another in time but are not
coexistent.. The creation of things is injustice in the sense that by becoming what they are, they rob the infinite and justice demands their return to the infinite. There is thus an eternal cyclical recurrence of the processes of separation from and return to the primordial substance. Anaximander’s thinking represents an advance over that of Thales first in its attempt to explain a derivative the element which Thales sets up as a principle and secondly in its attempt to describe the stages of the process of becoming. Anaximander likewise seems to have had some notion of the indestructibility of matter. His refusal to ascribe quality to the Boundless shows a tendency towards a more abstract mode of thought than we find in his predecessor’s concrete, sense perceived substance.

**Anaximenes**

(588-524)

Brief acknowledgement

With Aspect of Education

**Understanding substance**

**Anaximenes**-

He was born at Miletus in 588 B.C. and lived till 524 B.C. he was the disciple of Anaximander he had wrote some prose because he left that some of the literature has essential to write.

He describes that the situation of things and its substance is equal in all positions. But these have alive in unindetermination as per the air has its existence in all times. Perhaps one of the reasons for selecting air as the first principle is that it is dry and cold and thus intermediate between fire, the warm and dry element, and water, the cold and moist element. Moreover, air is the principle of life in our bodies: deprived of breath, the organism dies. So the air and breath is essential for living a man, so is it the principle of the universe forever. The world is represented by Anaximenes as breathing. As man’s soul, which is air, holds him together, so breath or air surrounds and sustains and sustains the whole world.

Thus the word is represented by Anoxic in its as breathing the spirit of a man is depends on breathing system and the air is essential element for living to the man The air holds together of the man so the breath or air has been surrounding to the man throughout the world. It has been pounding through the space forever.

**Pythagoras**
Brief acknowledgement

With aspect of Education

Pythagoras was born in Greece 570 B.C. and he had died 495 B.C.

He Form Of Things

Towards the philosophy of Pythagoras, the situation of teaching stage in the institution of Pythagoras has provided for philosophical consideration. The philosopher has considered to the problem the existence of things. All of the things suffered in the whole world. He regarded to the substance as determination to the other with air remain in the world. Therefore we considered that the form of things have been sorrauneled in the world Things and its relations

The Pythagoreans,

Who were considered the philosophical problems about the relations and situations of things for the theory of relations of things, we can do consider too subjective systems- as in the mathematics, all of the mathematician were interested to consider that all of the things have quantization relations which have depends on broad circle. All the thinkers have clerical the problems of the relations and regularity of things, being of things in the world. Numbers are for the pythagoreans, the principles of things not as being the stuff or substance of things in the Milesian sense but rather as constituting their formal or relational structure. Things are the copies or imitations of numbers. The later distinction between matter and from which is central to the platonic and Aristotelian systems of metaphysics, was fore shadowed by the Pythagorean distinction between numbers and things. The Pythagoreans made entities of numbers just as many persons today make entities of the laws of nature speaking of them as though they were the causes of whatever happens. In their delight over the discovery that there is a numerical relation for example, between the length of the string and the pitch of the tone, they called number which is only a symbol or expression of the relation the cause of the relation and placed number behind phenomena as their basal principle and ground. Now if number is the essence of things then whatever is true of number will be true of things. The Pythagoreans, therefore devoted themselves to the study of the countless peculiarities discoverable in numbers, and ascribed these to the universe at large. Numbers are distinguished as odd and even the odd cannot be divided by
two the even can to this extent, the former are limited, the latter unlimited. The odd and the even the finite and the infinite the limited and the unlimited constitute the essence of number and of reality. Nature itself is a union of opposites, of the odd and the even, the limited and unlimited. A table of ten such opposites is offered: limited and unlimited; odd and even; one and crooked; light and darkness; good and bad; square and rectangle. The Pythagorean doctrine of the dualism of the limited and the unlimited and their harmony is no doubt traceable back to Anaximander and Anaximenes. The doctrine of the conflict of opposites was foreshadowed by Anaximander; and the concept of the unlimited was shared by Anaximander and Anaximenes. The Pythagoreans regarded the unlimited as prior to the limited: individual things arise through the limitation of the unlimited space by the imposition of forms on space. The corporeal world is also numerical being based on the unit. The point in one the line two the figure three the solid four again earth is a cube; fire a tetrahedron; air an octahedron; water an icosahedrons, and so on. That is to say the lines and surfaces of bodies were conceived as entities having an independent existence; for there can be no bodies without lines and surfaces, whereas lines and surfaces can be thought without bodies.

**Empedocles**

(495-435 B.C)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspect of Education

**Roots Of Things**

**Empedocles**-

For Empedocles, there is neither origin nor decay in the strict sense of the word, but only mingling with separate. So this position has created that what is the situation what is possible and impossible forwards the roots of things in the world. So for the site of roots of things there is their existence. The elements are as Earth, Fire, water as per bodies are connecting with all elements. If the roots of things have missed the existence of body have too missed. Now Empedocles was born in Agrigento, southern side of Sicily 495 B.C. he belongs to the wealthy and pubic famous family. Empedocles was the leader of democracy in his city so this he declared the kingship of the city. He died in 435 B.C. He provided the roots of things as – earth air fire water in the life a man forever in the world. What cause the elements to unite and divide? Empedocles explains change by assuming two mythical forces, Love and Strife, or Hate in
addition to the four elements and controlling their union and division. Empedocles did not deny that the two motive forces—which we might call attraction and repulsion may exist together, the former causing bodies to be formed and the latter causing them to be destroyed. Originally all the elements were mingled together in the form of a sphere in which love reigned supreme and from which Hate was excluded. But gradually strife, gaining the upper hand entered and scattered the elements. At this intermediate stage, when the elements are partially separated, things exist; but with the ultimate triumph of Hate the elements are completely separated from one another and there are longer individual bodies of any kind. At this point the process is reversed and love again enters and gradually re-establishes the original homogeneous mixture; and then the process of disintegration will begin anew, and on in periodic change. In the two extreme states of complete union and complete separation there are no individual bodies; the stage of individual bodies as exemplified by the present state of the world, is an intermediate state of partial mixture and partial separation. In the process of formation of the present state of the cosmos, air or ether first separated, forming the arch of the heavens; fire came next forming the sphere of stars beneath; water was pressed from the earth by rotating motion, and seas were formed; and the evaporation of the water by the fire of heaven produced the lower atmosphere. Organic life arose from the earth first plants, then different parts of animals arms eyes and heads. These parts were combined, haphazard producing all kinds of shapeless lumps and monsters creatures with double faces, offspring of oxen with human faces, children of men with oxen’s heads which separated again until after many trials such forms were produced as were fit to live; and these are perpetuated by generation. Man is composed of the four elements, which accounts for his ability to know each of them: like is known by like; it is by earth that we see earth; and by water and by air glorious air and so on. Sense perception is explained by the action of bodies on the sense organs. For example in vision particles of fire and water pass from the object seen to the eye, where they are met by similar particles through the pores of the eye, under the influence of the attraction of the particles from without. By the contact of these bodies near the surface of the eye, images are produced. Only such particles, however affect the eye as fit into its pores. In hearing air rushes into the ear and there produces sound; in taste and smell, particles enter the nose and mouth. The heart is the seat of intelligence.

Anaxagorases

Brief acknowledgement
Anaxagoras.

The criterion of Anaxagoras was to change the declaration of Empedocles. He has thought that the absolute never be change, the quality too never change. So the reality is permanent it does not comes into being or passes away.” He did not, however, any the fact of changing, the changement is correlated. It passes through existence with all elements. They had think that the elements are more than four now proposed by Empedocles; for the world is full of qualities. He declared that the four elements air fire water earth not at all these are related to other existence. So Anaxagoras declared that the existence of other qualities have been remaining too separation the number of things as- the parts of body are- flesh blood hair bone gold and so on. So the numbers of elements are more important for the human body. In the original state of the universe, before the formation of words, infinitely small particles of matter which our philosopher called germs or seeds and which Aristotle, in his account of Anaxagoras, designated homogeneous parts in homoiomere were all mingled together in a confused mass, filling the entire universe, and not separated from one another by empty spaces. The original mass is a mixture of an infinite number of infinitely small seeds. The world, as it exists now is the result of the mingling and separation of the particles composing this mass. But how were the seeds separated from the chaos in which they lay scattered and united into a cosmos or world-order By mechanical means, or motion by change of place. The seeds however are neither endowed with life as the hylozoists hold nor are they moved by love and hate. What then caused them to move? Anaxagoras finds the clue to his answer in the rotation of the heavenly bodies by us. A rapid and forcible whirling motion produced at a certain point in the mass, separated the germs this motion extended farther and farther bringing like particles together and will continue to spread until the original chaotic mixture is completely disentangled. The first rotation caused the separation of the dense from the rare the warm from the cold the bright from the dark the dry from the moist. “The dense, the moist the cold, the dark collected where the earth now is the rare, the warm, the dry, the bright departed toward the father part of the ether. The process of separation continued and led to the formation of the heavenly bodies which are solid masses hurled from the earth by the force of the rotation and to the formation of different bodies on the earth. The heat of the sun gradually dried up the moist earth; and from the seeds filling the air which were deposited in the
earth slime by the falling rain, organic bodies arose. To these organic bodies Anaxagoras ascribed souls in order to explain their movements.

**Theology and Ethic**

Gods also exist and are composed of atoms; the gods are mortal like men—though longer-lived. The gods are more powerful than men and possess reason of a high order. They are knowable by men in dreams and perhaps in other ways, but they do not interfere in affairs of men and hence they need not be feared or propitiated. Like all other things, the subject to the impersonal law of the motion of the atoms. The superiority of reason to sense which we have noted in Democritus’ epistemology is extended to the sphere of ethics: The end of all conduct is well-being, by which he means not the pleasures of sense alone but rather the satisfaction which accompanies the exercise of the rational faculties. In the ethical fragments attributed to Democritus, we may declare the idea of morality with materialism and hedonism, and hedonism, encountered here for the first time, no doubt reflects a natural affinity between these two doctrines. Pleasure has a quantitative and palpable character which harmonizes well the materialistic and naturalistic philosophy.

**Protagoras**

(490 B.C.)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspect of Education

**Ethic**

Ethics—The subjectivism and relativism which characterize the sophistic theory of knowledge appear in their ethical views also. From theoretical skepticism the step is not far too ethical skepticism, to the view that man is a law unto himself in matters of conduct. If knowledge is impossible, then knowledge of right and wrong is impossible, there is no universal right and wrong and conscience is a mere subjective affair. The ethical arguments of sophistry parallel the epistemological ones: Just as the conflicting cosmological speculations of the nature philosophers led the sophists to question the possibility of theoretical knows the diversity of customs possibility of theoretical knowledge, so the diversity of customs, morals and traditions of various nations lead them to question the validity of any absolute, objective standards of conduct and social action.
These extreme ethical implications were not drawn by the older Sophists, such as Protagoras (b.ca. 490 B.C.) and Georgia’s.

**Socrates**

(469-399 B.C)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspect of Education

(Super most philosophers

Socrates was the super most philosopher in the western its we have described the philosophical and ethical situation, as it began to shape itself before the end of fifth century B.C.

A philosopher wanted to take interest in intellectual and moral thinking. He wanted to clear in truthfulness against falschool. His thought was that the things must see in their right relations, because all of the things recated to the universal actuality. So all of the same thoughts are depends on moral and intellectual thinking. So crates was the famous philosopher in Greece and greek philosophy. he was the greatest figure of western philosophy and the intellectual father of western philosophers and as same till this day. He is a unique figure in the history of philosophy. He wrote nothing, yet he was a genuine thinker who, through his disciple Plato, has exerted an incalculable influence on the entire development of Western philosophy.

**Undermining Knowledge**

With this aspect Socrates’ chief concern has to comparison sophistry, which, in undermining knowledge, spread out from the base of moral thinking. So a crate has been looking after in philosophical thinking in practical life. For its aim he has suffered from the moral and intellectual thinking in his life. At that time he saw that the primary level of moral thinking was so poor in the value of truthfulness in their life. With this the more people do not know about the underling knowledge. He had felled the main problem of knowledge. So had considered to faith in knowledge of human being.

So his aim was to solve the problems of human truth and faith truth and virtue in life of human being. So has purpose was to solution about some difficulties of men’s life in under mining knowledge. In order to reach truth, so his thought ran, we must not trust every chance opinion that enters our heads. Confused, vague, and empty thoughts fill our mind; we have a lot of undigested opinions which we have never examined, a lot of prejudices which we have accepted
on faith, and of which we do not understand the meaning; we make a lot of arbitrary assertions for which we have warrant. In fact, we have no genuine knowledge at all, no real convictions; we have built out intellectual hour on sand, and the whole edifice will collapse unless we reconstruct its foundations. Our most urgent task is to make our ideas clear, to understand the real, meaning of terms, to define correctly the notions we employ, to know exactly what we are talking about, Then too, we should have reasons for our views, prove our assertions, think, not guess, put our theories to the test of verification by the facts, and modify and correct them according. The Sophists say there in no truth and that knowledge is unattainable; men differ from one another, opinion is set against opinion and one opinion is as another. This says Socrates, is a dangerous mistake. It is true that there is no truth and that knowledge is unattainable; men differ from one another, opinion is set against opinion, and one opinion is as good as another. This says Socrates, is a dangerous mistake. It is true that there is a diversity of thought; but it is our duty to discover whether beneath the clash of opinions there may not be a fundamental agreement, some common ground on which all can stand, some principle to which all can subscribe. To evolve such universal judgments was the purpose of the Socratic method, which Socrates method, which Socrates employed in his discussions, and which is an ingenious from of cross-examination. He pretended not to know any more about the subject under discussion than the other participants; indeed, he often professed to know less than they. Yet they soon felt that he was master of the situation that he was making them contradict themselves and all the while deftly guiding their thought into his own channels. “You are accustomed to ask most of your question when you know very well how they stand,” complained one of his listeners. Before one’s very eyes, the confused and amorphous notions of the disputants gradually take shape, growing progressively clear distinct, and finally standing out like beautiful statues. Socrates had not learned the art of sculpture for nothing.

**Products Of Justice -Skill Development**

In this expect Socrates has described in the process of products of justice and the development of skill in general way by opinion of his contemporary philosophers. He has been testing the skill level of every person. He asked the question per question for getting the correct answers. When till that person did not get the final answer. So crates was do help for beaching the correct decision and to get final opinion. So for getting correct answer the essential features of the Socratic method is comes before other methods. For example once a time Socrates had mate a
young man his name was euthydemus. Socrates asked the question to know his ambition to become the greatest in any circle. After to know his ambition Socrates has suggested to do complete his ambition with do this hope that he will become the just man himself then the young man has thinks that he is already for it.

Therefore So crate tells that there must be certainly activities are necessary for proper products of justice and for skill development. Knowledge then is possible after all, but only if we pursue the proper method; we must define our terms correctly, with the general and typical, not with the particular and accidental. This the Sophists fauled to understand and Socrates sets them right. In one important respect, however, he agreed with the Sophists: He shared with them the belief in the futility of cosmological and metaphysical speculations. “Indeed, in contrast to others, he set his face against all discussions of such high matters as the nature of the universe; how the ‘cosmos’ as the savants phrase it, came into being; or by what forces the celestial phenomena arise. To trouble one’s brain about such matters was he argued, to play the fool.” His interests were ethical and practical, and he did not see what was to come of such speculations. The student of human learning he said, expects to make something of his studies for the benefit of himself or others, as he likes. Do these explorers into the divine operation hope that when they have discovered by what forces the various phenomena occur, they will create winds and waters will and fruitful seasons? Will they manipulate these and the like to suit their needs? He himself never wearied of discussing human topic. What the noble what the base? What is meant by just and unjust? What is a statesman? What is a ruler over men? What is ruiling character? And other like problems, the knowledge of which as he put it, conferred a patent of nobility on the possessor, whereas those who lacked the knowledge might deservedly be stigmatized as slaves.

In emphasizing the importance of the Socratic method, we must remember that Socrates was no methodologist; he did not himself explicitly describe his method of philosophical inquiry Aristotle was the first to set himself this methodological task. Socrates did, however, put a method into practice, and his own thinking so well exemplifies a pattern of philosophical procedure that it is difficult to believe that he was entirely unaware of its character and its principal steps. The method which Socrates employed in his philosophical analyses has five readily distinguishable characteristics.

**Ethics**
In ethics Socrates cleared the real mean of ethics by the attitude of sol rates is morality goodness. So the question what is good and life now justify such a life to reason? How should a rational being act, what ought to be his controlling principle? Having raised the problem, Socrates gave his answer; though soerates was not info our of only philosophical life but laid the foundations for such a system of moral philosophy. He solved the problems in ethical circle. From the side of word view in ethics, he has cleared that the question of humanity and ethically has been regarded by the natural laws in the life of human being which depends on the theory of knowledge. A ethical knowledge has been controlling by the morality systems. This has dialed by universal spirit.

Therefore Socrates was also philosopher who believed in morality ethics. Knowledge is the highest good, so Socrates answers. The central thesis of the Socratic ethics is contained in the formula: knowledge is virtue. Right thinking is essential to right action. In order to steer a ship or rule a state, a man must have knowledge of the construction and function of the ship, or of the nature and purpose of the state. Similarly, unless a man knows what virtue is, unless he knows the meaning of self-control and courage and justice and piety and their opposites, he cannot be virtuous; but knowing what virtue is, he will be virtuous. Knowledge is both the necessary and the sufficient condition of virtuous action. No man is voluntarily bad or involuntarily good. No man voluntarily pursues evil or that which he thinks to be evil. To prefer evil to good is not in human nature; and when a man is compelled to choose between two evils no one will choose the greater when he may have the less. The objection is raised that we see better and approve of it and pursue the evil. Socrates would have denied that we can truly know the good and yet refuse to choose it. With him knowledge edge of right and wrong was not a mere theoretical opinion, but a firm practical conviction, a matter not only of the intellect, but of the will.

Socrates deduces a number of other implication from his identification of knowledge and virtue. Since virtue is knowledge it follows also that virtue is one knowledge is a unity an organized system of truth and hence the several virtues are merely so many different forms of virtue as such. Furthermore, virtue is not only good in itself it is to a man’s interest. The tendency of all honorable and useful actions is to make life painless and pleasant; hence the honorable is also the useful and good. Virtue and true happiness are identical; no one can be happy who is not temperate and brave and wise and just. I do nothing, says Socrates in the Apology, but go about first and chiefly to care about the greatest improvement of the soul. I tell you that virtue is not
given by money but that from virtue comes money and every other good of man, public as well as private. And the last words which he speaks at his trial are these: Still I have a favor to ask of them. When my sons are grown up, I would ask you oh my friends to punish them; and I would have you trouble them as I have troubled you if they seem to care about riches or about anything, more than virtue; or if they pretend to be something when they are really nothing then reprove them, as I have reproved you for not caring about that for which they ought to care and thinking that they are something when they are really nothing. And if you do this both I and my sons will have received justice at your hands.

**Faith In Knowledge**

Socrates’ believed in knowledge his thinking was much strong for faith in knowledge. His views was that all the problems of human mind have been solved by complete knowledge which depends on the moral conduct of a man. So all the thinkers have remained the ethical ideas. These ideas have covered with faith and knowledge. Some of the thinkers have given the self evident in faith and knowledge. So crates describes the meaning of morality. He explains the situation of right and wrong. Good and bad in the life of a man, because the curious question have arise in the life of a man – as –

How can I do complete my knowledge?
What is life and how can alive it.
What is right for me?
What is good for me etc?

Therefore all the questions have been solved by faith in knowledge for human being.

**Knowledge and Conduct**

As we knowledge in the Socratic school and the systems of knowledge and conduct he did not after and construct any theory of knowledge and conduct. But all the pupils of Socrates have developed their knowledge by questionnaires and with his conduct. As for logical problems suggested by his method the subject of their study; others turned their attention to the question implicit in his ethical techniques and attempted to work out theories of ethics. The Migraine school, founded by Excludes (450-374 B.C.), combined the Socratic teaching that virtue is knowledge with the Eleatic doctrine of the unity of being: the notion of the constitutes the eternal essence of things; nothing else-neither matter, motion, nor the changing word sense real
being. Hence, there can be but one virtue, and hence, also, external goods can have no value. The successors of Excludes exaggerated the dialectical phase of his teaching, and, in the tradition of Zeno, the Enneadic, and the Sophists, delighted in all kinds of subtleties and hair splitting. The Socratic ethics was many sided, and its different aspects were often in conflict with one another. Each of those conflicting aspects was exaggerated by his followers. The two principal ethical schools, each basing itself on certain phases of ‘Socrates’ teachings, were the Cyrenaic, founded by Aristippus at Cyrene and the Cynic established by Antisthenes at the gymnasium of Cynosarges in Athens. The Cyrenaics seized upon Socrates enthusiastic portrayal of the joy and satisfaction to be derived from intellectual pursuits. The summum bonum or highest good, became for them the attainment of the greatest amount of pleasure and the avoidance of pain the Cyrenaic doctrine was a pure quantitative hedonism: it did not distinguish higher pleasures from lower but advocated the pursuit of those pleasures which are most intense whether of the body or the soul. Crude hedonism contains within itself the germ of pessimism: the attainment of a preponderance of pleasure over pain seems impossible and the exclusive pursuit of pleasures leads to boredom and frustration. Hegesius, the pessimist of the school observed that the man is fortunate who attains even a painless state; that for most men. Like is preponderance of pain over pleasure. Under these circumstances, suicide appears to be the only way out and thus became the urger to suicide. The Cynics exaggerated the Socratic thesis that virtue, which is identical with knowledge is something worth while for its own sake apart from any rewards in the from of pleasure. It is accordingly man’s duty to be virtuous and seek independence of all wants. The emphasis on independence and freedom from want is an exaltation of traits exemplified by Socrates his personal independence and indifference to the opinions of others. The ethics of virtue and duty led its exponents to extremes of discipline, restraint, self renunciation and complete independence of possessions in other words to asceticism. It also led to rejection of the artificialities of civilization and to the advocacy of a return to a state of nature,. Diogenes of sinope was the practicing exponent of this radical aspect of Cynicism. The two Socratic school of ethics despite their opposition had one important element in common. They both sought the salvation of the individual the one in pleasure as the highest Good was adopted and modified by the epicureans, while the Cynic teaching which rejected the pleasure theory and advocated the doctrine of virtue for virtue’s sake, was developed by the stoics.

Plato
Plato’s philosophy is rationalistic in the sense that it holds a rational knowledge of the universe to be possible, as well as the sense that the source of knowledge lies in reason and not in sense perception. Experience, plays an indispensable role in knowledge; our priori ideas are aroused and suggested by experience. His philosophy is realistic in that it affirms the existence of extra-mental realities—the forms or ideas; idealistic, in that this word of forms is conceived as ideal realm transcending the particular things in space and time; Phenomenalistic, in that the sense world is reduced to the status of phenomena or appearances of the world.

In its refusal to equate reality with the physical world, Plato’s philosophy is radically anti-materialistic. It is pantheistic in the sense that all phenomena are looked upon as manifestations of an intelligible world-order, and also in that it introduces an all-pervading world-Soul. It is theistic in its acceptance of a Demiurge, a creative principle which imposes the forms on plastic receptacle.

**Virtue Is The Highest Good**

According to Virtue is the highest good, we can say that Sense experience is not totally disregard. It serves an occasion for the exercise of intellect. Sense experience illustrates a universal truth given by our intellect. Thus sense experience can clarify but does not constitute knowledge. Unlike empiricism, according to which mind is passive with regard to simple ideas, rationalism supposes mind to be active, both in obtaining self evident innate ideas and in constituting knowledge. The theory of innate ideas was transformed into that of a priori truths by Kant. Now rationalism does explain universality and necessity involved in knowledge. Plato’s theory of knowledge is summarized in the famous figure of the divided line at the end of Book VI of the Republic. A vertical straight line is divided into four segments, each of which represents a level of knowledge; each of the four types of knowledge has its peculiar object and appropriate method of inquiry. The lowest segment represents conjecture, a kind of sensuous knowledge conversant with images, shadows, reflections, dreams, etc. A mirage seen on a desert would no doubt be an example of what Plato calls conjecture. Conjectural knowledge is mere guesswork and is at best probable, but even this low grade of cognition affords some clue to the character of the physical object which it distortedly reflects. The second segment of the divided
line represents belief, the knowledge of sensible objects, whether material objects such as trees, mountains, rivers, etc. of human artifacts such as houses, tables, works of handicraft, etc. The source of belief is sense perception and, although it is more reliable than conjecture, it likewise is only probable knowledge with perception a doctrine which he attributes to the Sophist Protagoras. Conjecture and belief are grouped together by Plato under the heading “opinion,” which embraces all sense-derived knowledge. The third segment of the line represents discursive intellect, or the understanding which occupies itself not with sensuous particulars but either mathematical entities such as numbers, lines, planes, triangles and other arithmetical and geometrical objects. This form of knowledge is hypothetical in that it proceeds deductively from definitions and unproved assumption. Plato clearly anticipated the modern postulational interpretation of mathematics when he suggested that mathematics rests on assumptions or suppositions rather than on self-evident principles, or axioms. Mathematical knowledge is also characterized by its use of sensuous imagery, such as the diagrams used in geometrical proof, or the symbolization of numbers by means of collections of objects or dots. The sensuous imagery employed in this type of knowledge functions only symbolically to assist the intellect in its thought processes; the figures in a geometrical diagram are symbols of the ideal circles and triangles with which the proof is concerned. The highest segment of the line represents rational insight, the objects of which are the forms or ideas; the method by which such knowledge is achieved is dialectic. Dialectic considers the forms, not as isolated essences, but as constituting a systematic unity – as related to the form of the good. Dialectical knowledge rests on categorical first principles. Not on hypotheses and is able to dispense entirely with sensible figures. Each level of knowledge symbolized in the figure of the divided line. Has not only the characteristic method but its characteristic objects.

**Theory of The Universe**

Plato was the famous disciple of Socrates. His thoughts are not infavour of some theories, as the theory of knowledge, theory of conduct theory of state only but he was inmfavour of all universal theories- all the systems of Plato towards the theory of universe have supported by the point of view and Sense appearances, and agrees with Socrates that genuine knowledge is always by concepts. He accepts Heraclitus’ doctrine that the world is in constant change, but restricts its application to the world of sensuous appearances. With the Elea tics the agree Ment that the real world is unchangeable, but substitutes for Parmenides’ unchanging being his world of eternal
ideas. With the atomists, he agrees that reality is manifold, but replaces a plurality of atoms by a plurality of forms or ideas. With Anaxagoras, he assumes that mind is a dynamic factor in the world, and finally he agrees with nearly all Greek philosophers that reality is basically rational. Plato’s hierarchy of the sciences, presented in Republic book VII in connection with his theory of higher education, conveys a clear picture of the nature, objects and special significance of each of the abstract sciences, beginning with arithmetic and concluding with dialectic. Arithmetic describes as the abstract science of number and of numerical relations; its theoretical value consists in the fact that it liberates the intellect from sense and thereby promotes abstract thought. Arithmetic by its exact, quantitative methods also resolves apparent contradictions in sense perception. Although Plato is primarily concerned with arithmetic as a pure or abstract mathematical science, he calls attention to its applicability, to its employment in computation in the practical arts. After arithmetic he mentions plane and solid geometry, the science of figures in two and three dimensions. Again though his primary concern is theoretical, with the ability of abstract geometry to draw the mind toward the eternal forms, he does not ignore the application of geometry to warfare, architecture, land measurement, etc. Astronomy by which he means the science of solid bodies in motion, is the next science in the hierarchy. Plato makes it clear that for him astronomy is not the describes governing such motion to use modern terms, he has in mind celestial mechanics or astrophysics, and not descriptive astronomy. The chief value of such knowledge is that it directs the mind to the law and harmony of celestial motion and thus paves the way for the dialectical study of the harmony of the eternal forms; but Plato does not entirely ignore its practical application in the art of navigation. Hermonics is the study of the motions of bodies which produce harmonious sound. Like astronomy, it directs the mind to ideal harmony. Harmonics. In Plato’s scheme, is the science of the principles of harmony, which are, to be sure, exemplified in music-music is applied harmonics—but the two are by no means the same. Dialectic is the coping stone of the sciences, the systematic unity of the earlier sciences of the earlier sciences of the hierarchy; it is the concerned with the forms in their organic unity. In its theoretic aspect, dialectic is the completion and fulfillment of scientific inquiry; on its practical side it serves as a guide in morals and statecraft, and in the other humanistic pursuits. Plato’s theory of knowledge contains throughout a reference to the objects of the several sciences and levels of knowledge. Clearly, for him epistemology or theory of knowledge cannot be divorced from metaphysics or theory of reality. Plato found it necessary to
metaphysics, to his world-view, in order to validate knowledge. Sense knowledge the kind in which the Sophists believed presents to us the passing, changing, particular, and accidental. Sense knowledge cannot therefore be genuine knowledge; for it does not reveal the truth or get at the heart of reality. Conceptual knowledge is conversant with the universal, changeless, and essential elements in things and is, consequently, the only true knowledge. Philosophy has for its aim knowledge of the universal, unchangeable, and eternal behind the particular and transitory appearances of sense.

**Theory of the knowledge**

Towards the theory of knowledge, Plato had described a divided line at the end of Book IV of the Republic. A vertical straight line is divided into four segments, each of which represents a level of knowledge; each of the four types of knowledge has its peculiar and appropriate method of inquiry.

The lowest segment represents conjecture, a kind of sensuous knowledge conversant with images, shadows, reflections, dreams, etc., a mirage seen on desert would no doubt be an example of what Plato calls conjecture.

Conjectural knowledge is mere guesswork and is at best probable, but even this low grade of cognition affords some clue to the character of the physical object which it distortedly reflects.

The second segment of the divided line represents belief, the knowledge of sensible objects whether material objects such as Trees, mountains rivers etc., or human artifacts such as houses, tables, work of handicraft, etc.

The source of belief is sense perception and, although it is more reliable than conjecture, it likewise is only probable knowledge.

**Doctrine of Ideas**

Doctrine of Ideas- The idea, or concept, as we have seen, comprehends or holds together the essential qualities common to many particulars; the essence of thing consists in their universal forms. The doctrine of universal essences is difficult to grasp; we are more apt to consider such generic ideas as mental processes only. If particulars alone exist, there is nothing corresponding to the idea or type outside the mind. ‘‘I see a horse, but ‘horses’ I do not see,’’ as Antisthenes is reported to have said. Plato did not share this view; that the ideas and thoughts have been rising
in the mind of god and men but indeed the divine thought is itself directed toward them. He refers ideas to the mind which has existing power.

So all the existing power have their forms with substances as- actual not actual, original not original, So all the subjects are changeable. All the particular objects too changeable in their patterns, because they are not in permanent existence but the ideas are permanent to remain forever. The ideas or archetypes, though numberless, are not disorganized and chaotic; they constitute a well-ordered world, or rational cosmos. The ideal order forms an interrelated, connected organic unity; the ideas are arranged in logical order, and subsumed under the highest idea, the idea of the Good, which is the source of all the rest. This idea is supreme; beyond it there in no other. The truly real and the truly good are identical; the idea of the Good is the logos, the cosmic purpose. Unity, therefore includes plurality; in the intelligible or ideal world there in no unity without plurality, and no plurality without unity. Plato’s emphasis on unity in the diversity and multiplicity shows the influence of Parmenides. The universe in conceived by Plato as a logical system of ideas, an organic unity, governed by a universal purpose, the idea of the Good, and it is, therefore, a rational, significant whole. The meaning of the Good cannot be grasped by the senses, for they perceive only the imperfect and fleeting reflections of the Good, but can never rise to a vision of it as a perfect and abiding whole. It is the function of philosophy, by the universe, and to conceive its essence by logical thought.

Plato’s theory of ideas is his most original philosophical achievement. Although the way was prepared for the ideal-theory by the Pythagorean number-mysticism, the eternal being of Parmenides, the Heraclitean logos doctrine, the qualitative atomism of Anaxagoras, and most of all by the Socratic doctrine of concepts, the theory of universals as a fully articulated metaphysical position must be credited entirely to Plato. The essentials of the theory are so clearly delineated in the Platonic dialogues that we may without risk of over-simplification summarize it in a few definite statements: Forms or ideas, defined as the object corresponding to abstract concepts are real entities; the platonic form is simply the reification or entification of the Socratic concept- endowed with the properties of the Eleatic being. There is a great variety of forms including the forms of classes of things-house, dog man, etc.; of values goodness, beauty, etc. The forms belong to a realm of abstract entities, a “heaven of ideas,” separable from concrete particulars in space and time. The separation of the forms and their exemplification is commonly referred to as the Platonic dualism. The forms are superior to particulars in degree of
reality and value; the forms are the realities of which particulars are mere appearances. The form is a model or archetype of which the particular is a copy. The forms are non-mental and subsist independently of any knowing mind; they are not “ideas” residing in the minds of men nor even in God’s mind. The suggestion that a form is merely “a thought in our minds,” a name for a group of particulars having a common predicate, is seriously entertained but presumably rejected by Plato, on the ground that a name is insignificant unless there is “a common nature” to which it refers. Their mode of being is unique; they are neither mental nor physical, but are none the less real. Since they are non-temporal, as well as non-spatial, they are eternal and immutable. The forms are logically interrelated and constitute a hierarchy, in which the higher forms “communicate” with lower or subordinate forms. The supreme form in the hierarchy is the form of the Good. The forms are apprehended by reason, not by sense-though sense may provide the occasion and the stimulus for the apprehension of the form which it embodies. Finally, the relation between a particular and the form which it exemplifies is called “participation”; all particulars with a common predicate participate in the corresponding form. A particular may participate simultaneously in a plurality of forms, and when it undergoes change it participates successively in different forms. The doctrine for participation presents serious difficulties for the theory of forms difficulties of which Plato was fully cognizant. The philosophical position summed up in the above statements, commonly referred to as platonic realism, has had its exponents from the time of Plato to the present. Its period for greatest influence, however, was during the middle Ages.

**Doctrine of immortality**

Plato describes immortality to the soul and in several of his dialogues offers arguments for immortality. The most characteristic of these is the argument from the soul’s knowledge of forms: he declares that the soul or spirit has owns pure existence. It does not mortal, so it has pure idea to immortality. He also makes use of the permanent existential power of the soul because the existence of the spirit is universal. The has left the body after the death of a man. This argument infers the per-existence of the soul from its possession of interpretative principles and axiomatic truths which have not been acquired in this life.

Since these principles are part of the native endowment of the soul, they must be recollections of eternal verities apprehended in an earlier state and recalled on the occasion of sense experience. The question now arises: how does the pure rational soul happen to unite with a body? At this
point, Plato again has recourse to mythical explanation, combining conceptions suggested by his theory of knowledge and by empirical psychology, with orphic and Pythagorean mysticism. The pure, rational soul, which was created by the Demiurge, once inhabited a star, but having become possessed with a desire for the world of sense, was enclosed in a material body as in a prison. Should it ever succeed in overcoming the lower side of its nature, it will return to its star, otherwise it will sink lower and lower, entering in succession the bodies of different animals. Had the soul resisted desire in its celestial life, it would have continued to enjoy a transcendent existence, and to occupy itself with the contemplation of ideas. Since it has failed in this, it is condemned to pass through a stage of purification. An important phase of Plato’s psychology is the doctrine of eros. Just as sense perception awakens in the soul the remembrance of pure ideas, of truths apprehended in a pre-existent state, so the perception of sensuous beauty, which excites sense love, also revives in the soul the memory of ideal beauty contemplated in its former existence. These recollections of truth and beauty inspire a yearning for the higher life associated with the world of pure ideas. Thus sensuous love and the yearning for the beautiful and the good derive from one and the same basic impulse. The sensuous impulse which seeks the continued existence of the species is, in its higher manifestations, the craving for fame, the urge to create science, art, and human institutions. In yearning for eternal values, the soul yearns for immortality. Indeed, these impulses are construed as evidence of the immortality of the soul, for what the soul passionately aspires to must be attainable.

**Aristotle**

384-322 B.C.)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspect of Education

Aristotle’s Site With Plato – Plato was the first Greek thinker to construct an idealistic philosophy on a comprehensive scale. His system however, presented, difficulties and inconsistencies which had to be considered and, if possible. The early Platonic School did little to develop the thought of its founder; it did what schools generally do, it transmitted his doctrines very largely as they had been received. It left to Aristotle, a pupil of independent mind, to reconstruct the system, to develop it in what seemed to him as much philosophical and scientific attitude. Previously trans cadent thoughts had to be reconsidered: Plato seemed to place
the eternal forms, as Aristotle calls them Beyndthe stars, to separate them from the actual world of experience, and to degrade the latter to mare appearance.

Then there was the conception of the secondary element, the Platonic matter, which needed to be defined more precisely in order to become a satisfactory principle of explanation.

Knowledge, Beauty And Goodness:

Aristotle thought that what distinguished man from the rest of the animal creation was the presence of reason in him. On our view what marks man off from other animals is his capacity for conscious enjoyment and pursuit of values. The history of man’s spiritual growth is marked by his growing power and ability to discriminate between the higher and lower expressions of knowledge, beauty and goodness. During the course of his development man has also learnt to command and manipulate larger and finer resources in the production and enjoyment of the different values. This course of development is more or less retraced by the individual submitting himself to the process of education.

The main object of education is to prepare the individual for interested and conscious participation in those activities of mankind that make for the production and enjoyment of the values. Now the values produced and pursued by man may be conveniently arranged under two broad heads, culture

Ethics

Aristotle’s metaphysics and psychology form the basis of his theory of ethics, which deals the principle scientific and moral status. Too with it’s a correct response from the question of Socrates for the highest good. So the action of a man is come to an end. This end may be the means to a higher end, this to a still higher, and so on; bit finally we must reach a supreme end or purpose, an ultimate principle or good, for the sake of which every other good is to be sought.

What is this highest good?

The goodness of a thing consists in the realization of its specific nature; the end or purpose of every creature is to realize or make manifest its peculiar essence, that which distinguishes it from every other creature. This for man is not mere bodily existence or sensuous feeling, the exercise of vegetable and animals functions, but a life of reason. Hence, the highest good for man is the complete and habitual exercise of the function which makes him a human being.

The View of God As Reflective Thoughts
The Aristotelian view of god as reflective thought-reflective in the literal sense of turning back upon itself-has been subjected to considerable ridicule, and not without some justification. Is it not unintelligible that god should play the individual role of the subject? And the object of knowledge is not self. Knowledge of a literal and direct sort an utter impossibility, even for god. And even though it were admitted to be possible, could it have any real significance? Such thought would be thought in vacuous, thought as pure as to be empty. A god whose thought has no object but its own activity of thought may be likened to a mirror which reflects another mirror and hence reflects nothing. The inadequacies of the Aristotelian conception of god is too patent to require further consideration.

God’s activity consists in thought, in the contemplation of the essence of things, in the vision of beautiful forms. He has no impression, no appetites, no will in the sense of desire, no feelings in the sense of passions; he is pure intelligence. Man is a social being, who can realize his true self only in society and the state. Families and small communities are prior in time to the state; but the state, as the goal of the evolution of human life, is prior in worth and significance to its component societies, in conformity with the Aristotelian principle that the whole is prior to its parts. Social life is the goal or end of human existence, but this doctrine does not commit Aristotle to the complete subjugation of the individual to society and the state. The aim of the state is to produce good citizens. Aristotle presents a reconciliation of the view that the individual is the end of life, and its purpose is to enable the individual citizens to live a virtuous and happy life. Aristotle was perhaps even more successful than Plato in steering a middle course between “statism” and individualism. The constitution of the state must be adapted to the character and requirements of its people. It is just when it confers equal rights on the people in so far as they are equal, and unequal rights in so far as they are unequal. Citizens differ in personal capability, in property qualifications, in birth and freedom, and justice demands that they be treated according to these differences. There are good constitutions and bad once: the monarchy, the aristocracy, and the polity—a form in which the citizens are nearly equal—being good forms, and the tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy bad. As the best state for his own time, Aristotle advocates a city-state in which only those are citizens whose education and position in life qualify them for active participation in government, that is, an aristocracy. He justifies slavery on the ground that it is a natural institution: it is just that foreigners, who alone composed the slave-class in Greece, should not, being inferior to the Greeks, enjoy the same rights as they. The
history of Greek philosophy after Aristotle is a story of continuous decline. During this period there appeared no great and original of the systems: thinkers were for the most part satisfied to repeat the opinion of the great classical philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. The age is characterized by individualism, eclecticism, concern with ethical problem. Individual was rampant in this period of social and intellectual chaos: the individual had no concern except for his own personal welfare, and philosophy was cultivated solely for the light it might throw on the fate and destiny of the individual man. Eclecticism took the place of creative philosophical activity, the philosophers of the time were satisfied to appropriate the insights of their predecessors and to patch them together as best they could. Ethical interests were paramount. Men had little faith in abstract metaphysical inquiries; they occupied themselves with problem about reality only when these seemed to be directly relevant to the conduct of life. Theoretical knowledge was subordinated to practical concerns.

Logic
Towards the logical system of Aristotle, it can be say that is a respective achievement. All of the history of man’s intellectual Pursuits in which only one philosopher has gave a new scientific attitude. So it is true, some anticipations of logical doctrines in the dialectical arguments of Zeno, the Suntleton of the sophists, the Socratic method of definition of concepts, and the Platonic dialectic. But no one has ever defined that Aristotle is the true founder of logic in the sense of a scientific treatment of the valid forms of reasoning. The first work it out in detail and to make it a special discipline. Logic as formulated by Aristotle has dominated, to an almost unbelievable extent, the thought of later times.

So there are two point for logic system in present as-
The first was led by Francis Bacon in his advocacy of the inductive method; and.
The second is the one carried on at the present time by the mathematical logicians.
With these two exceptions, the Aristotelian logic has held undisputed sway over man’s thinking for over two thousand years.

B-II

Contemporary Greek Philosophy
(After Aristotle)

Introduction
The history of Greek philosophy after Aristotle is a story of continuous decline. During this period there appealed no great and original systems; thinkers were for the most part satisfied to repeat the opinions of the great classical philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. The age is characterized by

(i) Individualism,

(ii) Eclecticism,

**Concern with ethical problems.**

**Individualism**

Individualism was rampant in this period of social and intellectual chaos; the individual had no concern except for his own personal welfare, and philosophy was cultivated solely for the light it might throw on the fate and destiny of the individual man.

**Eclecticism**

Eclecticism took the place of creative philosophical activity; the philosophers of the time were satisfied to appropriate the insights of their predecessors and to patch them together as best they could.

**Ethical Interest**

Ethical interests were paramount. Men had little faith in abstract metaphysical inquiries; they occupied themselves with problems about reality only when these seemed to be directly relevant to the conduct of life. Theoretical knowledge was subordinated to practical concerns.

**Stoics**

Brief acknowledgement
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**Metaphysics:**

Stoic metaphysics may be described as a materialistic version of the Aristotelian metaphysics; is Aristotelians translated into the more primitive idiom of pre-Socratic nature-philosophy. The Stoics agree with Aristotle all of things have their existence in two sides as-

In one site at has action moving and forming.

In second site it had acted moved and formed They agree with him also that these two things are not separate entities-although they may be distinguished in thought, but united in one reality.
They differ from him, however, in their notion of the nature of the principles. For them nothing is real unless it either acts or is acted upon; and since only bodies are active and passive, form or force and matter are both corporeal. These, however, differ in degree of their corporeality; force consists of the final site of its as-matter form. They are inseparable, as we have said; there is no force without matter and no matter without force: matter is everywhere permeated with force. The Stoic conception of the world and of life are opposed to the naturalistic, hedonistic and egoistic philosophy of the Epicureans. Stoicism is thus much closer than Epicureanism to the philosophy taught by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. After the death of the great leaders, the essential elements of their theory of life were presented in popular form by the Stoics, a school founded by Zeno at Athens around 300 B.C. It had many followers in Greece and Rome, and continued its existence far into Christian times. Zeno shows the influence of the Cynics and Megarians, as well as of Plato and Aristotle. He frees Cynic ethics from its narrowness and places it on a logical and metaphysical foundation; he makes use of Platonic and Aristotelian notions in modified form, but refuses to conceive from and matter as different in kind, thus reverting to the hylozoism of Heraclitus. The historical formula which describes Stoicism is this: The metaphysical theories of Heraclitus particularly the logos doctrine are used as a foundation for an ethics, which though derived from Cynicism, shows the moderating influence of Plato and Aristotle. The Stoic metaphysics may be described as a materialistic version of the Aristotelian metaphysics it is Aristotelianism translated into the more primitive idiom of pre-Socratic nature philosophy. The Stoics agree with Aristotle that everything that exists results from two principles a principle that acts, moves and forms, and a principle that is acted on, moved, and formed. They agree with him also that these two things are not separate entities although they may be distinguished in thought, but untied in one reality. They differ from him, however, in their notion of the nature of the principles. For them nothing is real unless it either acts or is acted upon; and since only bodies are active and passive, form or force and matter are both corporeal. These, however, differ in the degree of their corporeality; force consists of a finer kind of stuff, while matter, as such is coarse, formless, consists of a finer kind of stuff, while matter, as such is coarse, formless and immovable. The two are inseparable, as we have said; there is no force without matter and no matter without force; matter is everywhere permeated with force. Everything in the world, including the human soul and God, is corporeal. Even qualities are corporeal; they consist of a pneumatic substance which is a mixture of fire and air. It is these
qualities which make each particular object what it is. Fire and air are active elements, the principles of like and mind; water and earth are passive elements, utterly inert and lifeless, like clay in the hands of the potter. The pneumatic substance pervades every particle of matter; it does not merely fill the spaces between the particles. It is present in the smallest piece of reality and is continuous throughout the universe. Each particular thing has qualities which distinguish it from every other thing, and which are due to the material forms permeating them. Only forces have causality, and causes can act only on bodies. But the effect is always incorporeal; a cause produces a state in another body, a movement or a change, which is neither a body nor a quality of a body. Causal action and force are here identities; causal action can be exercised only on a body; the effect which results, however is not a cause or force, but a mere accidental state of the body. If the effect were a body the force would have produced another body, which is impossible. Relations, too are incorporeal. But the active principle, it must be remembered, is alive and intelligent; in this respect, the Stoics approximate the Aristotelian conception of God as pure from. Their sensationalistic and materialistic point of view, however does not permit them to conceive it as pure form or thought. The Stoic metaphysics is a partial reversion from the Platonic-Aristotelian philosophy to the hylozoism of an earlier stage in the development of Greek thought: it combines, in somewhat anomalous fashion, materialism with rationalistic pantheism. The forces in the universe from one all-pervasive force or fire-as Heraclitus had taught and the ultimate principle is the rational, active soul of the world. The principle must be one because the universe is a unity, because all its parts are in harmony; it is conceived as fire because heat produces everything, moves everything, and is a giver of life. Most important of all, the animating principle of things is reason intelligent, purposeful, and good. The universe is a cosmos a beautiful, well-ordered, good and perfect whole. The rational principle is related to the world as the human soul is related to its body. All life and movement have their source in the logos: it is god; it contains the germs or seeds of life; in it the whole cosmos lies potential as the plant in the seed. The Stoic metaphysics, in argument from the harmoniously ordered cosmos to its source in the rational principle is an anticipation of the later teleological argument for God’s existence. The universal reason or soul pervades the whole world just as the human soul pervades the body. But just as the governing part of the soul is situated in a particular part of the body, so the ruling part of the world-soul the Deity, or Zeus, is seated at the outermost circle of the world, whence its influence spreads through the world. The two aspects of God from a single
godhead, though one of them assumes the form of the world, while the other retains its original shape. God, the father of all things, the perfect and blessed being has prevision and will, is a lover of man, benevolent, cares for everything, punishes the wicked and rewards the good. In these respects the Stoic god is like the god of theism, but there is a difference. He is not when considered in his entirety, a free personality, a free creator of the world, but as we have seen, the substance from which everything proceeds with the necessity of a process of nature. The Stoics assign will and forethought to him, but they likewise identify him with necessary law. Neither the pantheistic nor the theistic aspect of the Stoic theology is consistently carried out. As in many modern systems, pantheism and theism dwell together in the Stoic system. It is, however, unquestionably true that pantheistic aspect prevails over the theistic in the Stoic theology.

**Religion:-**

Stoics says-towards the religious level the true religion in equal to philosophy. They were defenders of the popular religion and regarded the universal recognition which it received from mankind as a proof of its truth. Religion was, in their eyes, a necessary support of morality. They objected, however, to the superstitious and anthropological elements in popular religion and offered an allegorical interpretation of them-perhaps the first systematic attempt which had been made in this direction. Piety is knowledge and worship of the gods: it consists in forming an adequate conception of them and imitating their perfection.

Therefore the resignation universal and actual will and constitution as all of the essences reflected in the true religion. True religion and philosophy are one, according to the Stoics. They were defenders of the popular religion and regarded the universal recognition which it received from mankind as a proof of its truth. Religion was in their eyes, a necessary support of morality. They objected, however, to the superstitious and anthropological elements in popular religion and offered an allegorical interpretation of them perhaps the first systematic attempt which had been made in this direction. Piety is the knowledge and worship of the gods: it consists in forming an adequate conception of them and imitating their perfection. Submission to the universal will, or resignation, constitutes the true essence of religion.

God is the source of all being-
God is the source of all existence, of all appositions and differences, of mind and body, from and matter, but is himself devoid of all Plurality and diversity and absolutely one. He is the one who in his infinity contains everything; he is the fist causeless cause from which everything is produced, from which everything emanates; for plurality always presupposes unity; unity is to all being and beyond all being. His transcendence is such that whatever we say of him merely limits him; hence we cannot attribute to him beauty or goodness, or thought or will, for all such attributes are limitations and in reality, imperfections. We cannot say what he is, but only what he is not. We cannot define him as being, for being is thinkable, and what is thinkable points in a legal stage of the subject and its limit its limitation is more than his beauty. Truthful goodness conscience and his will all of these depend on the god, We cannot conceive him as thinking, because this implies a thinker and a thought: even a self-conscious being, who thinks himself, divides into subject and object.

**Plotinus**

Brief acknowledge men
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**Existence of God**

Plotinus described that it is fact that the words had been created by god, but never creation implies consciousness and will i.e. limitation. God did not decide to create a world, nor is the world an evolution from God, For God is the most perfect. The supreme power has been delighted by the god because the god is the super most authority. The universal truth and power has been existence by god. So plotlines declared that the existence of god is universal truth. As-god is that seen from which the various small rivers have floating by the existence of god. He uses these metaphors to convey the absolute power and independence of the first principle. The cause does not pass over into, or lose itself on, its effect; the effect does not limit the cause; the effect is non-essential so far as God is concerned. The whole words had controlled by the god as a-parent in organic reproduction, continues the same after the birth of his offspring. The soul cannot realize its desire to exercise its powers, to act and to form, unless it has something to act on; thus it produces matter the third and lowest level of emanation. Matter, as such, has neither form, quality, power nor unity; it is absolute impotence and privation, the principle of evil. It is farthest removed from God; it is darkness. We can form no image of it; all we can do is to
assume it as the necessary substratum behind the phenomena of changing qualities, as that which persists in our passing world of sense. Upon this matter, the efficient power or souls which are contained in the world-soul and are identical with its ideas, act, fashioning it into a sensuous image or copy of the intelligible world contained in the divine intelligence. These particular powers or souls which impress themselves upon matter, there by producing particular sensible objects in space and in time, are themselves all comprehended in the indivisible world-soul and as such neither exist space nor are spread out. The spatial arrangement of objects is due solely to matter; the beauty, order, and unity of the phenomenal universe are due to the world-soul, which harks back to God. Plotinus conceives the emanation of the world from the world-soul as a necessary consequence of its nature, not as a process that has begun in time-in response, say, to an act of will. The emanation of the world-soul from pure thought, the creation of matter, the differentiation of matter into bodies, constitute one continuous process, which abstract thought can analyze into phases, but which are one eternal and indivisible act. With Aristotle, Plotinus teaches the eternity of the universe. At the same time, he tells us that matter can receive its forms only successively, and that the world-soul creates time in order that it may operate. He views are to be reconciled, he does into indicate: the general thought he seeks to impress in that the world has always been as always will be, and that the world of sense, as a whole is eternal, though its parts change. The human soul, the soul of man is part of the world-soul and as such is super sensuous and free. Originally, before its incarnation, it contemplated the eternal nous in mystical intuition, it pointed toward God and knew the Good; but then it turned its gaze toward earth and body, and so fell. This fall is in part the necessary consequence of the world-soul desire to fashion matter, partly the result of an irresistible impulse for a life of sense on the part of the particular soul itself. In this way the soul has lost its original freedom, for its freedom consists in turning in the other direction, away from sensuality, in accordance with its higher nature. If it fails to do this, that is, if it remains steeped in the bodily life, it becomes attached after death to another human, animal, or plant body, according to the degree of its guilt. The part of the soul which radiates into the material body, however is not the real self but merely a shadow of it, the irrational, animal part of the soul, the seat of the appetites and of sense perception, the source of sin and even of virtue. The true self consists of thought and logos; it can realize its mission only by turning from the sensuous life to thought, and, through it, to God. But this return to God is possible in this earthly life only on rare occasions.
Towards the being, there are three stages of being- Three principal stages may be distinguished in the process of emanation

Absolute ideas in the mind screen.

The spirit.

The materialism

First stage, the being of god describes the existence of ideas. So the god contemplates the pure ideal cosmos.

Thought and its ideas, subject and object, are, however, one at this stage, not separate in time or space: in the divine mind the thinker and his thoughts are one and the same.

This is as it should be if God’s thinking is be perfect truth, for truth implies the oneness of thought and its object. Thinks his own thoughts, which from his very essence; in the divine mind the activity of thought-the thinkers- and the thought are one and the same, not separate. His thought is not discursive, passing from idea from premise to conclusion, but intuitive, static, as it were contemplating the system of ideas as a whole, and all at once.

There are many ideas –as many as their particular things in the phenomenal world-and they differ from one another; bit they from a unified system, as with Plato. In order to reach the goal of union with God, the ordinary virtues will not suffice. Moderation of impulses is not enough; the soul must purge itself of all sensuality, free itself from the contamination of the body. There is, however a still higher stage to be reached than purification, which is only a preparation for theoretical contemplation, or the immediate intuition of ideas; theory is superior to practice, because it brings us nearer to the vision of god. The highest stage. However, union with God. Cannot be realized even by thought of this exalted kind; it is possible only in a state of ecstasy, in which the soul transcends its own thought, loses itself in the soul of God, becomes one with God this is the mystical return to God. This system is a combination of Greek philosophy and oriental religion. It is theistic in teaching a transcendent God, pantheistic in conceiving everything, down to the lowest matter, as an emanation of God. It is religious idealism, for the final goal of the soul is to find rest in the mind of God; and, though this is beyond attainment in this life, man should prepare of it by keeping his mind on God, by freeing himself from the shackles of sense.

The soul
The soul, the second stage of the divine emanation, proceeds from pure thought; wherever there are ideas or purpose, they must seek to realize themselves, to produce something. It is effect, image or copy of pure thought, and-like every effect or copy-less perfect than the original. It is super sensuous and intelligible; it is active and has ideas; it possesses the power of thought, being discursive, in less complete from than pure thought, it is self-conscious, though transcending perception and memory. There are two phases of the soul: in the first it is turned in the direction of pure thought; in the second, it is turned in the direction of the world of sense; in the former, it acts as thought and contemplates pure ideas; in the latter, it is impelled to bring order into matter and has desire. The first phase Plotinus calls the word-soul, the second phase Plotinus calls the world-soul the second phase he calls the world-soul, the second phase he calls nature.

Some time he speaks as if there were two world-souls the second, constituting the inner conscious soul of corporeal existence, emanates from the first-the conscious soul.

**B-Iii**

**Medieval Philosophy**

With Philosophical Aspects of Education

**Introduction**

Our study of the philosophy of middle Ages will be concerned almost associated with the Church of Rome; the Arabian and Jewish philosophies emerging from the Byzantine civilization of the Eastern Empire will be studied in less detail. And chiefly for the influence they exerted on the philosophy of Western Europe. Historians often find arbitrary delimitations of periods convenient for the handling of their material, and have sometimes defined the Middle Ages as the period from the year 395 A.D, when, at the death of Theodosius.

The Empire was divided between his sons; to the year 1453, when Constantinople was taken by the Turks the year 395 has some significance for our own purposes, as marking decline in the vigor of the ancient world. But we do discern at that early date many of the characteristics with which the world medieval is identified.

**St. Augustine**
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The Problem Of The Evil

The problem of the Evil- In order to maintain the divine omnipotence, St, Augustine is driven to the position that God is the cause of everything; in order to maintain his giddiness, he has to exclude evil from the world or to explain it away. The whole of creation is an expression of God’s goodness; in creating the universe he was prompted by his infinite love, bit-set. Augustine hastens to add, for fear of depriving the Deity of absolute power-he was not bound to create, his love inclined him but did not compel him; creation was an act of his free will. Existence of every kind is, therefore, good; we should judge its value in relation to the divine will, not from the standpoint of human utility.

If god has created and predetermined everything and is at the same time an absolutely good being, he has willed everything for the best interest of his creatures, and even so-called evil must be good in its way, like the reflected graph represents that screen on which published the evil in more position in the world. St. Augustine was the greatest constructive thinker and the most influential teacher of the early Christian Church. In his system the most important theological and philosophical problem of his age are discussed, and a Christian world-view is developed which represents the culmination of patristic thought and becomes the guide of Christian philosophy for centuries to some. Augustine achieved a philosophy which, although not thoroughly systematic, touches on all the basic philosophical problems. St. Augustine was greatly indebted to classicism and availed himself of classical terminology sometimes Platonic, sometimes Aristotelian but the dominant factor in his philosophy is the Christian faith of Athanasius and Ambrose which he applies to ethics, epistemology, metaphysics, and the philosophy of history. At the heart of his philosophy is the doctrine of the Trinity, which in his monumental work, On the Trinity, he treats as the inexhaustible principle, accepted on faith, which sheds intelligibility on the whole of reality. In view of the significance of St. Augustine’s views for medieval philosophy, as well as for the Christian theology of the Reformation and the modern period. We shall give a systematic exposition of the various aspects of his philosophy. Characteristic of the spirit of the entire Christian age is the Augustinian view that the only knowledge worth having is the knowledge of God and self. All other knowledge, such as the sciences of logic, metaphysics, and ethics, has value only in so far as it contributes to the knowledge of God. It is our duty to understand what we firmly believe, to see the rational basis of our faith. “Understand in the order that you may believe in order that you may understand.
Some things we do not believe unless we understand them; others we do not understand unless we believe. Intelligence is needed for understanding what faith believes; faith for believing what intelligence understands. “Faith seeks understanding finds. And yet again understanding still seeks Him whom it finds the function of this pursuit is insight or wisdom the highest function of reason when it is directed toward the creative principle. All intelligibility including that attainable by the scientific intelligence depends on this divine creative principle. The ratio scientiar seeks to find the elements, or principle of nature by an analysis of what is given from the outside. On the other hand, the ratio sapientiar turns inward, finding there both God and the soul. Just as the one God is thought of as a trinity of distance, order, and motion, so the substantial unity of the soul, a reflection of the Trinity exhibits existence, knowledge and will. To find the one is therefore to find the other also: the self which Augustine finds, and of which he thinks he achieves a knowledge more reliable than that which he has of external nature, is both a product of and an aid toward the search for God which he undertakes under the stimulus of the doctrine of the Trinity. Furthermore, the self has an intelligibility similar to that of the Trinity; justification or explanation of the self, or soul is not, therefore to be found in the world of nature. Augustine’s dictum, “Believe in order that you may understand,” differs both from Tertullian’s repudiation reason and from the extreme dualism which opposes faith and reason. Reason must first decide whether revelation has actually occurred; when it has been decided that a revelation is authentic, faith affirms it and reason must first decide whether a revelation has actually occurred; when it has been decided that a revelation is authentic, faith affirms it and reason seeks to understand and interpret it. We cannot, however, expect to understand everything we believe but must be prepared to accept the truths of faith solely on the authority of the Church, which is the representative of God on earth. I know that I exist; my thinking and existence are indubitable certainties, and know that there is eternal and immutable truth. My very doubts prove that I am conscious of truth, and the fact that I call a judgment true of false points to the existence of a world of truth. Augustine here conceives truth, after the platonic fashion, as having real existence, and regards the knowledge of it as native to the human mind. Sometimes he speaks as if the mind of man literally intuited the divine ideas; at other times he says that God created them in us. In either case, truth is objective, not a mere subjective product of the human mind; it is independent and coercive; whether you and I apprehend it or not, it exist and has always existed. The source of this eternal and changeless world of truth is god; indeed, the
divine mind is the abode of the Platonic ideas, forms, archetypes, or essences; in addition to the universal ideas, it contains the ideas of particular things.

**The will and its freeness:**

Towards the site of freeness to will-St Augustine opposes the Pelagius theory of the will. Man, in the person of Adam, never affected by sin-site God not only created man free, but also endowed him with supernatural gifts of grace: immortality, holiness, justice, freedom from rebellious desire. But Adam liked the negahigency of god. So he did not get the divine prime with unsucless for getting human facilities. The first Man transmitted his sinful nature, and the punishment necessarily connected with it, his offspring, for he represented the whole human race. And now it is impossible for man not to sin: he went into sin free and came out unfreeze. Adam’s position was not completed to start the sin in humanity and its race so entire human race stands condemned, and no one will be saved from merited punishment except by the mercy and freely bestowed grace of God.

God alone can reform corrupted man. He does not select the recipients of his graced according to their good works—indeed; the works of sinful man cannot be good in the true sense of the term. Only those whom God has elected as beneficiaries of his grace can perform good works; “The human will does not achieve grace by an act of freedom. But rather achieves freedom by grace.”

God can so change the human soul that it will regain the love of the good which it possessed before Adam feel. The knowledge and love of the highest good, or god, restores to man the power to do good works, the power to turn away from the life of sense, the will to emanclpate himself from the flesh. Love of the good is synonymous with freedom; only the good will is free. Underlying this entire teaching is the conviction that unless a man has a notion of the Good, unless he knows what is truly good and loves it, he is lost. Some men possess a good will, others lack it. Augustine’s problem is to account for its appearance in some persons and not in others. His explanation is that in the last analysis, a good will is a free gift of God. Why god should have shosen some for eternal happiness and others for eternal punishment is a mystery; but claim he may have had to salvation. Yet is not predestination identical with fatalism; does it not mean that God has determined beforehand who shall be saved and who destroyed, and that his choice is purely arbitrary? Predestination is the eternal resolve of God to confer eternal life on this man or that by the infallible means of grace. Predestination implies God’s fore knowledge of man’s choice, but Augustine thinks that such foreknowledge is in no way prejudicial to man’s freedom.
Man was free to choose eternal life, he did not shooed it; God knew that he would not and decided beforehand whom to save and whom not. Again we encounter an example of Augustine’s conception of the absolute power of God. He is unwilling to limit divine freedom in the slightest degree; God can do as he pleases with man, and he has settled from all eternity what is going to happen to every individual. Man, in the person of Adam, has had his chance; he abused the privilege. God knew he would abuse it; but since man was under no compulsion to do wrong, no individual has a right to complain if he is not among the elect. Nevertheless, if a man truly loves God if he has the good will, he will be redeemed.

**Anselm**

Brief acknowledgement

With Aspects of education

Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury, opposes the nominalistic heresies of Roscelin in a system of thought based on Platonic and Aristotelian principles. He is the true type of the schoolman; firmly convinced of the truth of the dogmas and yet possessed of a strong philosophical impulses, he seeks to prove by reason what has to be accepted on authority. In his attempt to rationalize the faith, he includes in his theology not only such general propositions as the assertion of the existence of God, but the entire Church doctrine of salvation, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption of man. We must believe the Catholic doctrine that is beyond cavil but we should also try to understand what we believe and why it is true; remembering always, however that where intelligence fails us, it behooves us reverently to bow to faith.

**Proofs for the Existence of God**

Anselm bases his celebrated proofs for the existence of God on the Platonic conception that universals have an Existence independent of particular objects. In his Monologium he employs the cosmological argument, which had already been advanced by St. Augustine, and which need not be repeated here. In his Proslogium, however he offers another proof, also based on Platonic realism; it is the so-called ontological proof, eith his name has become linked in the history of thought. This proof consists in deducing the existence of God from the concept of God, in showing that the very idea of God implies his existence. The idea of God is the notion of something greater than which nothing can be thought that is, the idea of a perfect being. Now if God did not exist, this idea would not be the idea of the greatest thing thinkable; there would be
something greater still. The idea of a being having existence is the idea of a more perfect being than the idea of one having no existence. Hence God, as the most perfect being, must exist. In this way, Anselm seeks to prove that the perfection of God implies his existence. The conclusion, however, does not necessarily follow from Anselm’s premises. His reasoning roves no more than that when we think of a being as existent being. The notion of an existing being is the notion of a being that has more qualities than a being conceived as not existing. He does not prove that God exists, but merely that the idea of an existing God connotes more than the mere subjective idea of God. No doubt, the idea of God includes the idea of existence; but it does not necessarily follow the notion of a perfect being a notion which carries with it the idea of existence, that such a being actually exists. It should be noted, however, that the ontological argument will seem cogent to anyone accepting the realistic presupposition that universals have an extra-mental reality; the realistic theory of universals is thus an implicit premise of the ontological argument for God’s existence. The fallacy in Anselm’s argument was exposed by the monk Gaunib in his anonymously published book Against the Reasoning in Anselm’s proslogium. The being of God in the mind, he declares, is the same as the being of any other thing in the mind, that is, so far as it is thought. In the same way in which Anselm proves the existence of God, one might prove the existence of a perfect island: defining it as the most perfect island which can be conceived, it follows by the Anselmain logi that a perfect island exists. Thomas Aquinas, more than a hundred years later, also subjected this argument to careful analysis and found it inconclusive. It was, however, frequently used in scholastic philosophy e.g. William of Auxerre and, Alexander of Hales.

In the book cur dues homo Anselm offers his theory of the scheme of redemption, which he conceives as a conflict between the justice and mercy of God. The fall of Adam brought with it the sin of the entire human race. God’s justice demands satisfaction, but his love prevents him from inflicting the punishment or suffering commensurate with the sin. Christ, the God-man who is innocent of sin, sacrifices himself for man, thereby satisfying the demands of justice.

**Dun Scotus**

Brief acknowledgement

With Aspects of education

**Faith and Knowledge**
Faith and knowledge- The philosophy of Dun Scouts is based on the following presumptions: The dogmas has this ideas that the highest truth belongs to the faith virtue is reflected in love. So faith and love depends on the will. So both of these depends on visual condition of god so Dum scouts agrees with St. Thomas that there can be no conflict between the truths of reason; and he avails himself of philosophical knowledge to support his own theories and to criticize those of his adversaries.

In his opinion, also reason is incapable of explaining the mysteries of religion and must be supplemented by faith. But Duns Scouts goes far beyond St. Thomas in restricting the sphere of reason; his mathematical studies had taught him what constituted real demonstration, and he did not consider propositions to the divine, the divine purpose, the divine prescience and predestination, the universality of the soul which deals essential existence. The philosophy of Duns Scotus is based on the following presuppositions: the dogmas are beyond dispute; faith is the basis of the highest truth; love is the fundamental virtue; faith and love are based on the will, and are the conditions of the vision of God; the will is superior to the intellect. He agrees with St. Thomas that there can be no conflict between the truth of faith and the truths of reason; and he avails himself of philosophical knowledge to support his own theories and to criticize those of his adversaries. In his opinion, also reason is incapable of explaining the mysteries of religion and must be supplemented by faith.

But Duns Scotus goes far beyond St. Thomas in restricting the sphere of reason; his mathematical studies had taught him what constituted real demonstration, and he did not consider propositions pertaining to the divine nature purpose, the divine prescience and predestination, the immortality of the soul, and the like, susceptible of rational demonstration. On such matters, he held that faith alone can give us certainty. Faith may not entirely exclude doubt, but it does exclude convincing doubt. The aim of theology is practical, not theoretical. Without a revealed doctrine which is the concern of theology, we could not know the purpose of God toward man, for science cannot tell us this. Theology has its own principles and, since it is concerned with the highest possible object, namely God, it takes precedence over all the sciences. Philosophy too has its own principles; it is an independent science, in no way subordinate to theology.

In this teaching a clear separation is made between revealed theology and philosophy, which if consistently adhered to, leads to the emancipation of philosophy from its servitude to theology. Duns Scotus made the separation in the interest of faith, but in so doing, he opened the way for
the liberation of philosophy. He was so thoroughly convinced of the truth of revealed theology that he feared no danger from rational thought; he was confident that reason, if properly employed, could not fail to be in harmony with religion. Reason, it is true, could not demonstrate the dogmas, but neither could it disprove them. For thinkers of a less firm faith than Scotus, there were other possibilities; reason might reach conclusions conflicting with dogma; and then it would be necessary either to accept or pretend to accept both reason and faith, or to abandon the dogma itself. Each of these alternatives was chosen by some thinkers of the period.

**God and its moral law**

Duns Scotus extends his voluntarism from man to God. In God, too, the will is superior to the intellect; he is not determined by his reason. Hence, we cannot know his purpose and understand his acts by rational deductions from principles. It was not necessary for him to create a world, and he could have created a different one from this if he had so willed. Nor is he bound by the order he has established; he can change it, at will, without incurring guilt. Whatever he wills and establishes is right. The universe therefore, is not rational in the sense of being the necessary outcome of rational thought; if it were, we could reason the whole thing out ourselves, think the thoughts of God after him, and confidently predict the course of events. Duns Scotus extends his voluntarism from man to God. In God, too, the will is superior to the intellect; he is not determined by his reason. Hence, we cannot know his purpose and understand his acts by rational deductions from principles. It was not necessary for him to create a world, and he could have created a different one from this if he had so willed. Nor is he bound by the order he has established; he can change it, at will, without incurring guilt. Whatever he wills and establishes is right. The universe therefore, is not rational in the sense of being the necessary outcome of rational thought; if it were, we could reason the whole thing out ourselves, think the thoughts of God after him, and confidently predict the course of events. Because all things are contingent on the will of God, nothing in the universe is rationally necessary. Similarly, the divine commandments which concern our life in world and our relations with one another are not necessary commandments; God does not command us to act in certain ways because the rules are self-evident to reason or necessary; on the contrary, they are necessary because God prescribes them. He could have made a society in which murder and polygamy and the violation of property rights would not be wrong. We cannot deduce these laws from an absolute moral law, we cannot derive them from the command of brotherly love, because they do not follow necessarily from it, and, besides, the law of love is not a law of nature; nor can we prove that the love of God is a
law of nature. Scotus does, however regard certain laws of the Decalogue, the first four commandments. As necessary. In principle, this, of course, amounts to an abandonment of the entire theory of the arbitrary will, for if God is bound by necessary laws in any one case, he is not absolutely free. Scotus justifies the exception in this way: that man should have no other gods but God, that he should not take his name in vain, that he should worship him, are self-evident laws; they follow; from God’s love of himself, and God must love himself; they are not merely the commands of an arbitrary will. Since God is omnipotent, his decrees must be fulfilled. Among his irrevocable decrees are the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked. But who in particular is to be rewarded, and who punished, is not settled. Here we are dealing with particular decisions, not general laws, and, in these cases, God may change his mind and will otherwise. Since he is absolutely free. The divine will is absolutely just because what it wills is absolutely just. Scouts is the great medieval exponent of theological ethics of the voluntaristic type; the source of the moral law is traced to the free decrees of the will of God. Among the pupils of Duns Scotus are Jhon de Bassolis, Antonius Andreae, Francis de Mayronis, and Walter Burleigh.

**St. Thomas**

- Brief acknowledgement
- With Aspects of education

**Free Will and Original Sin**
Free will and Original Sin- a question demanded an official answer: What is the place of man angel; and divine help, in some from or other, was needed to redeem mankind. The fundamental articles of faith that Christ had came in the scheme of salvation. According to one view, which was in the scheme of salvation? According to one view, which was widespread, the whole human race had been corrupted by the sin of the first man or a fallen down from heaven for our salvation seemed to favor such an interpretation: if it was necessary to deliver man from sin, then evidently he could not save himself, he was a slave to sin and by nature a sinner, or had become a sinner in some way; in either case he was not free to save himself.

This conception received support from the Manicheans, a numerous sect accepting the teachings of the Persian Mani, who read Persian dualism and Gnosticism into the scriptures and combined Christianity with the doctrines of Zoroaster. The system of St. Thomas is typical of the movement we have been describing. Its fundamental aim is to demonstrate the rationally of the
universe as a revelation of God. In its general outlines it agree with the Augustinian metaphysics, accepting as guiding principles the teachings which had become the heritage of the Church. But it adopts Aristotle’s method and operates throughout with Aristotelian conceptions: the four kinds of causes and other Peripatetic of explanation. And yet, there is no tendency to weaken the validity of the Church’s dogmas; the naturalism of Aristotle in no wise interferes with the supernaturalism of the Christian scheme of thought, so that no complaint can be made against the strict orthodoxy of St. Thomas Philosophy, according to St. Thomas passes from facts to God; theology, from God to facts. He follows Albert in his distinction between reason and faith: dogmas like the Trinity, the incarnation, original sin, the creation of the world in time, the sacraments, cannot be demonstrated by natural reason: they are not objects of philosophy, but matters of faith, revealed truths beyond reason, but not contrary to reason. We cannot prove them, nor can we disprove them, but we can disprove objections to them. No necessary proof can be offered, for revelation, otherwise we should not know it; but there is nothing unreasonable in the doctrine. Only in case we already believe in the articles of faith can their reasonableness, their intelligibility, their plausibility, be made clear. Any attempt to give a rational proof of the mysteries of religion really detracts from, since there would be no merit in believing only what can be demonstrated to reason. Faith is a matter of will; the will commands acceptance; this compulsion St. Thomas explains as an inner instinct as an inner instinct or as coming to us from without as the result of miracles. The separation of revealed theology from natural or rational theology and philosophy was officially recognized by the University of Paris in a decree that “no teacher of philosophy shall consider any one of the specifically theological question.” It has since been accepted by orthodox Christianity, Catholic as well as Protestant. St. Thomas rendered a genuine service to philosophy by insisting on a distinction which eventually led to the elimination of such question from philosophical discussions; Duns Scotus and his followers went a step farther in also withdrawing rational or natural theology from the jurisdiction of reason, thereby turning all problems concerning God over to faith.

**Ethics**

Ethics The ethics of St. Thomas are a fusion of Aristotelian and Christian elements. Their underlying assumption is that God made everything. For a purpose—for the purpose of revealing his goodness in creation that the nature of everything points in the direction of this purpose, and that every creature will realize the divine ideas and reveal the goodness of god by
realizing its true being. Objectively considered, the highest good, therefore, is God; subjectively considered, the good for creatures is their greatest possible perfection, or likeness to God, St. Thomas agrees with Aristotle that the supreme good for man, which he calls blessedness, consists in the realization of his true self.

Irrational beings are determined by natural or sensuous impulses, implanted by God, to realize their goal; while rational beings seek to realize it consciously and voluntarily. The highest form of action is speculation or contemplation, and the highest object of speculation is God. Hence man realizes his true self his perfection and the highest blessedness in the knowledge of God. But there are many ways of knowing god. We have here the Christian completion of the Aristotlealian ethics. For Aristotle the supreme good was speculation knowledge, philosophy, the pure contemplation of God. The philosopher, or wise man was after all, his ideal. For St. Thomas too knowledge of God is the highest good, but it is gained by intuition: it is a beatific vision, possible only in the life to come. In this sense it is a supernatural good; supernatural, also, in the sense of being a supernatural gift of grace. Since blessedness is nothing but the attainment of the highest good, there can be no blessedness without happiness. Love is another concomitant of blessedness: we cannot contemplate God without loving him. St. Thomas in his ethics. Does not confine himself to the discussion of the summum bonum, but enters upon a careful analysis of moral conduct and a full treatment of the virtues. Acts are called moral which are the result of deliberation and choice; the acts, in other words, of free, rational beings. The goodness or badness of an act depends on the object at which it aims, the purpose or intention of the agent, and the circumstances. These must conform to the rule of reason, which is the principle of human conduct. The supreme criterion of moral conduct is the reason of God, the eternal or divine law, the laws of the old and the new testament. The law of the old Testament has an earthly goal, demands just works and has fear for its motive; the law of the new Testament has a heavenly goal, demands holiness of will, and its motive is love. The law of God, however, in not an arbitrary law; God cannot will anything but the good. Besides the eternal law, there is natural or human law the law which is written in our hearts. Hence, in order to be good, an act should conform to reason quickened by divine law or natural law, as the result of instruction or infusion. Conscience is explained by St. Thomas in the medieval fashion. The intellect is speculative and also practical; reason is endowed with both theoretical and moral principles. As the faculty of moral principles, reason is called synteresis. The synteresis furnishes the major premise of a
syllogism; all evil ought to be avoided; an inferior kind of reason supplies the minor premise: adultery is evil; conscience draws the conclusion: adultery ought to be avoided. It must be remembered that the immoral character of an external act depends exclusively on the will; an act may be good as such, but it may be turned to an immoral purpose and so be bad. An external act, however, which as such is evil, can never be made good by the will directing it to a good end. Thus, St. Thomas emphatically rejects the doctrine that the end justifies the means. As the so-called “passions of the soul,” the appetites of sense, these are not always morally bad; they are so only when they fail to conform to the rule of reason. St. Thomas follows Aristotle’s treatment and classification of the virtues, supplementing them, however with Christian conceptions. No virtue is inborn; all virtues may be acquired by the performance of virtuous acts. Such acquired virtues lead to imperfect or incomplete happiness, which is possible in this life. In order to realize eternal blessedness, a supernatural principle of grace must be added to the soul by God, a higher form which makes possible a higher perfection and a highest being. Certain supernatural virtues are poured into man, or infused, by God: the three theological virtues.

**Anselm**

Brief acknowledgement

With Aspects of education

**Theology:**

Theology –God is pure form, pure actuality. We have knowledge by of God by faith, but we can also attain to knowledge of him by reasoning, in the manner already indicated that this knowledge is not to direct but its site on indirect system. So the knowledge has passed from known to unknown from effect to cause from conditioned to the unconditioned sited we know existence of God from his creation; we can prove it only by the a posteriori method. St. Thomas rejects the ontological argument of Anselm and makes use of a number of already employed by Aristotle, St. Augustine, and the Arabian philosophers. (a) Everything that is moved requires something to move it, every effect implies a cause: there must, therefore, be first unmoved principle of motion; otherwise we should be compelled to go on ad indium in the causal serial series, and never reach the end.

There must be something that exist per se, by itself that does not need anything else through ethic it exist per se, by itself, that does not need anything else through which it exists (Aristotle).
The existence of god and its proofs:-

Towards the proofs for the existence of god has declared from concept of God, in showing that Proofs for the Existence of God - Anselm bases his celebrated the concepts of the platonic ideas in it that universal have an existence independent of god on the platonic conception that universals have an existence independent of particular objects. In his Monologue (written ca. 1070) he employs the cosmological argument, which had already been advanced by St. Augustine, and which need not be repeated not be repeated here. In his Proslogium, however, he offers another proof, also based on Platonic realism; it is the so-called ontological proof, with which his name has become linked in the history of thought.

This proof consists in the very idea of god implies his existence. The idea of God is the notion of something greater than which nothing can be thought- that is, the idea of a perfect being. Now, if God did not exist, this idea would not be the idea of the greatest thing thinkable; there would be something greater still. The existence of being and the thoughts of existence have more proofs but in all one having no existence. The conclusion, however, does not necessarily follow from Aneslm’s premises. His reasoning proves no more than that when think of a being as existing, we are thinking of a being as existent, we are thinking of a being that is more perfect than a non-existent being. The notion of an existing being is the notion of a being that has more qualities than a being conceived as not existing. He does not prove that God exists, but merely that the idea of an existing God connotes more than the mere subjective idea of God. No doubt, the idea of God includes the idea of existence; but it does not necessarily follow from the notion of a perfect being, a notion which carries with it the idea of existence, that such a being actually exists. It should be noted, however, that the ontological argument will seem cogent to anyone accepting the realistic presupposition that universals have an extra-mental reality; theory of universals is thus an implicit premise of the ontological argument for God’s existence. The fallacy in Anselm’s argument was exposed by the monk Gaunilo in his anonymously published book Against the Reasoning in Anselm’s Proslogium. The being of God in the mind, he declares, is the same as the being of any other thing in the mind, that is, so far as it is thought. In the same way in which Anselm proves the existence of God, one might prove the existence of a perfect island: defining it as the most perfect island which can be conceived, it follows by the Anselmian logic that a perfect island exists. Thomas Aquinas, more than a hundred years also subjected this argument to careful analysis and found it inconclusive. It was, however, frequently used in
scholastic philosophy by William of Auxerre and Alexander of Hales. In the book cur Deus homo? Anselm offers his theory of the scheme of redemption, which he conceives as a conflict between the justice and mercy of God. The fall of Adam brought with it the sin of the entire human race. God’s justice demands satisfaction, but his love prevents him from inflicting the punishment or suffering commensurate with the sin. Christ, the God-man who is innocent of sin, sacrifices himself for man, thereby satisfying the demands of justice.

**Albert-**

Brief acknowledge me

With Aspects of education

**Relation Of Will To Intellect:** - we find echoes of the faith vs. reason controversy when we turn to the related question of whether the higher of the two principal faculties of the soul is the will or the intellect; the Middle Ages thought of faith as primarily engaging the will, whereas reasoning, by definition, engaged the intellect. The question is whether action of the will is able to generate intellectual ideas, or whether the intellect on its own initiative presents the will alternatives in the form of ideas. The question of the nature of that free will, which it is a major concern of all Christian philosophers to defend, is of course here involved. Any discussion of the will in scholastic philosophy is complicated by the connection between the will and a divinely ordained grace which supposedly moves the will. The basic question at issue is whether the will is absolutely self-determining or whether the will is itself determined by knowledge of the good. The line of controversy are clearly drawn between Augustinians including Scotus and Occam, as advocates of the will, and Aristotelians, notably St. Thomas, as advocates of the intellect.

**Metaphysics-**

Metaphysics- since science has the universal for its object, universals must be real, and otherwise there could be no truth. But universals are not real in the sense of existing apart from particular objects: they are not ‘‘subsisting’’ things, i.e., they do not exist as entities. The university exists in particular objects as the one in the many, as the essence of things, or their qualities, their whiteness, as St. Thomas calls it. At same he line Aristotle’s ideas has influenced to Albert about the existence of god, as well as abstractions from things in the mind of man. Forms or universals
are, therefore, necessary principles of explanation in metaphysics. They do not, however, taken by themselves, account for the world of natural objects; with Aristotle, St. Thomas introduces a second principle, matter: nature is a union of form and matter. The nature or substance of a corporeal being consists of form and matter: by substance he means that through which a thing is what it is; natural objects are what they are through matter and form.

**White Head**

Brief acknowledgement

With Aspects of education

**Metaphysical Construction**:-

Metaphysical construction: As a synoptic study metaphysics tries to offer us a scheme of generalities or an overall map of the universe. In its construction there are two steps at least, according to whitehead. A metaphysician is usually conversant with a number of concepts in any restricted field of enquiry.

According to his range, depth and quality of experience and temperamental interests, he picks up one or some of these concepts and transforms them into a scheme of key-notions.

This affected by extending the concepts to cover all the facts. Of course, the concepts in order to become Key-notions must be ‘applicable’ and adequate’ with regard our total experience. The adequacy of metaphysics, according to Pepper and Prof D.M. Emmet, lies in the ‘comprehensiveness’ and natural ‘facilities’, with its creative notions can illumine our variegated experiences.

**Jewish**

Brief acknowledgement
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**Heretical Tendencies**

:-Heretical Tendencies- On the doctrinal side, the heretical tendencies which accompanied early attempts to make a platform dogma. Christianity never disappeared. In be tracing the evolution of the dogma. We have already called attention to numerous sects whose teaching was
antagonistic to orthodox doctrine. Macron, a fervent adherent of the Pauline faction of the new religion, who condemned everything, Jewish and Peter, became the father of a movement that continued in one form or another for centuries. We find the descendants of the Marionettes’, the Pelicans, in Armenia and Asia Minor from the fifth century onwards; the in Bulgaria from the tenth on. In the eleventh century, a sect called Cathareses or Catherin, with similar teachings, appeared in southern France. For centuries the Church waged a relentless war against the Aliveness, as the sect came to be named, and with the aid of the terrible Inquisition succeeded in destroying it, root and branch. In the twelfth century a similar sect arose in northern Italy, the Wildness, founded by Peter Waldo in 1170, which, under the name of the Voodooos, still exists today.

B-IV

Modern Philosophy

With Philosophical aspects of education

Brief acknowledgement

Humanism Aspect

Humanism- When man turned his back upon the past and yearned for new things, two ways lay open to him: he could either create new forms of life, art and thought, or revert to the models of antiquity. The latter course was chosen first. Accustomed as the medieval mind had been to authority and tradition, it was unable at once to strike out along new paths. The intellectual reformers turned to classical antiquity for inspiration: the culture of Greece and Rome is revived or reborn and humanity is rediscovered. With the fifteenth century comes the awakening of the Western world to an appreciation of the long neglected heritage of classical civilization. A hundred years earlier, the Italian poets Dante (1265-1321), Boccaccio (d. 1375), and Petrarch (d. 1374) had cultivated a taste for the classics, and had used the mother-tongue as a literary medium. Laurens Valla now purifies the barbarous Church Latin and makes Cicero and Quintilian the models for Latin style.

Empiricism and rationalism aspect

Empiricism and Rationalism- western philosophers have accepted that reason and experience are the sources of knowledge do the empiricism and rationalism situation is essential for knowledge of misapprehension. So rationalism declares that revelation with authority is essential reasons for
knowledge, So all systems of modern philosophy are rationalistic with the site of empiricism. To be sure, there are modern world-views which seek the source of truth in feeling, faith, or intuition rather than in the intellect; but even the concept of faith with feeling has connect with philosophical principles. So the faith and truth are essential for knowledge.

On the other hand its mean that rationalism views are that a good judgment is permanent for knowledge. So the aim of truthfulness situation is necessary for knowledge. So empires and rationalism are connected to one another

**Herbert Cherbury**

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

**Natural Religion**

Natural Religion of Herbert Cher bury- The new philosophy of the Renaissance offers, as we have seen, natural or rational instead of supernatural explanations of things; it applies its rationalistic method not only to metaphysical systems, but also to fields of thought such as politics and religion. Herbert of Cher bury evolved a philosophy of religion based on a theory of natural knowledge and independent of any positive or historical religion. He regarded as rational or natural truths common to all religions, that there is one God that he ought to be worshiped, that worship consists of piety and virtue, that we must repent of our sins, and that there are present and future rewards and punishments. These, in other words, are the beliefs to which a natural man, unhampered by prejudices and following his own reason, would come; they are truths implanted by nature.

They blear to the group of novitiate communes or universal notions, which are of divine origin and have as their distinguishing marks priority, independence, universality, certainty, necessity- in the sense of utility- and immediacy. This original natural religion of man has, according to Herbert, been corrupted by priests, but Christinanty has done much itself be rational. Herbert of Cherbury is the predecessor of the deists and the advocates of the theory of natural or rational religion in the eighteenth century. A note of skepticism similar to that heard in nominalism and mysticism id found in a number of French thinkers of the Renaissance, who were influenced by Greek skeptical writings, Thus Michel de Montaigne the author of the celebrated Essays, doubts the possibility of certain knowledge, for reasons with which we have become familiar in our account of Greek skepticism. He despairs of reason and recommends a return to uncorrupted
nature and revelation. Although we cannot have knowledge edge he urges that we do our duty and submit to the divine commands. According to Pierre Charron The skeptical attitude keeps alive the spirit of inquiry and leads us to faith in Christianity, the true religion. He emphasizes the practical ethical side of Christianity. Francis Sanchez, too denies the possibility of absolute knowledge; finite beings cannot grasp the inner essence of things or understand the meaning of the universe as a whole; but he holds that we can know secondary causes through observation and experiment. Latter French skeptics are La Mothe le Vayer and the Bishop Pierre Huet. Joseph Glanvil, Hiernymus Hirnheim, of prague, and pierree Bayle author of the Dictionnaire historique at critique is, in some respects, affiliated with the same movement.

**Religious Reform- Belief, Sprit Of The Reformation**

Religious Reform – Belief:-Spirit of the Reformation - The Italian Renaissance rebelled against authority and the scholastic system, and found inspiration in the literary and artistic products of classical antiquity. It was the protest of the mind against intellectual coercion. The German Reformation was a religious awakening, or renaissance-the protest of the heart against the mechanization of faith. As humanism had turned to ancient philosophy, literature, and art for help, so religion now turned to the bible and the simple faith of the early Fathers, especially St. Augustine, for support. In place of scholastic theology the elaborate system of indulgences, and the ritual of the Church, the Reformation emphasized inner religion and personal worship: justification by the faith instead of justification by works.

It resembles the Renaissance in its contempt of “barren scholasticism,” its opposition to ecclesiastical authority and temporal power, and in its exaltation of the human conscience; but it does not go with it in its glorification of the intellect, nor share its optimistic joy of life. Luther had come under the spell of the nominalistic mystics and shared the suspicions of primitive Christianity that reason is blind in matters concerning the salvation of our souls. He believed that a thing may be false in philosophy and the true in a theology rooted in faith, and he despised that scholastic no less than the true Aristotle. But in apite of the anti-rationalistic attitude of the leader of the Reformation, the new religious movement forstered the spirit of critical reflection and independent thought no less than the Renaissance had done. In refusing to accept the Chusch as the armiter of Christian faith, and in appealine to the Bible and the individual conscience, it gave reason the right to sitin judgment on religious dogma and encouraged rationalism and
individualism. This is not what Luther had aimed at, but is was an inevitable practical consequence of his protest against the authoritative Church and its theology a consequence which Protestantism at large did not hesitate to draw. Indeed, the reformers themselves differed in their interpretation of important Christian dogmas, and the new church soon divided into separate sects: Luther accepted the mystical presence of Christ in the Eucharist; Zwingli, the most liberal of the reformers, regarded the sacraments as symbols; and Calvin taught the doctrine of predestination, which the Catholic Church had refused to accept in spite of her respect for the great St. Augustine.

The spirit of modern philosophy

The spirit of modern Philosophy Characteristics of the Modern Era- The modern philosophers have been declared that their thoughts are reflected from their spirit. Their thoughts have not been in favor of proper authority because they have wanted freeness in all side. The deeply thoughts about religiously and morality stages have suffered by the principles of modern philosophical attitudes from ancient fine to till this time. All philosophers have been recommenced to all religions and traditions yet they have we the importance to nationality. From the politically situation they have been regard democrat is institutes so they are manifested in present-day demands for equal rights and social justice.

The modern philosophical spirit is against all of the religious places of the state because it has recommended to the doctrine of spirit in philosophical ground with moral religious and spiritual level. The history of the new era may be viewed as an awakening of the reflective spirit, as a quickening of criticism, as a revolt against authority and tradition, as a protest against absolutism and collectivism, as a demand for freedom in thought, feeling, and action. The leaven which had begun to work in the transition period of the Renaissance and the Reformation continued active throughout the following centuries and has not yet come to rest. The political conflict was settled in favor of the state, and the state gradually took the place of the Church as an organ of civilization: ecclesiasticism gave way to nationalism. Within the State itself there appeared a growing tendency towards constitutionalism and democratic institutions, which is still manifested in present-day demands for equal rights and social justice. The spirit of independence which had raised its voice against the authority of the Church in time attacked the paternalism of the State, and the doctrine of political non-interference became the ideal of the individualist. The same spirit found expression in the economic sphere: slavery, selfdom, and the
old guild system gradually disappeared the individual therw off his f errers, and demanded to be let alone in working out his economic salvation. This modern theory of economic individualism is commonly referred to as the laissez faire doctrine. We are confronted with the same phenomenon in the empire of the intellect, with the same antagonism to tutelage, the same demand for a free field. Reason becomes the authority in tutelage, in science and philosophy. As we pointed out before. The notion begins to prevail that truth is not something to be handed down by authority or decreed by6 papal bulls, but something to be acquired, something to be achieved by free and impartial inquire. The gaze is turned from the contemplation of supernatural things to the examination of natural things, from heaven to earth theology yields her crown to science and philosophy. The physical and the mental world, society, human institutions, and religion itself are explained by natural causes. What characterizes the higher intellectual life of the period following the middle Ages is an abiding faith in the power of human reason, an intense interest in natural things, a lively yearning for civilization and progress. Knowledge, However let it be noted, is esteemed and desired not only for its own sake, but also for its utility, for its practical value: knowledge is power. Nearly all the great leaders of modern thought, form Francis Bacon onward, are interested in the practical applications of the results of scientific investigation, and look forward with an enthusiastic optimism to a coming era of wonderful achievement in the mechanical arts, teashnology, medicine, as well as in the field of political and social reform. The individual likewise throws off the yoke of the church in religion and morals; the appeal to reason in matters of the intellect is matched by an appeal to faith and the conscience in matters of belief and conduct; he refuses to accept an intermediary between himself and his God. However Luther may have differed from the leaders of the Renaissance, the influence of the of the reformation eventually helped to quicken the spirit of religious, moral, and intellectual independence and contributed its share to the emancipation of the human soul from external authority. Modern philosophy, in its beginnings, breathes the spirit of the modern times, the characteristics of which we have endeavored to describe. It is independent in its search for truth, resembling ancient Greek thought in this respect. It is rationalistic in the sense that it makes human reason the highest authority in the pursuit of knowledge. It is naturalistic in that it seeks to explain inner and outer nature without supernatural presuppositions it is, therefore scientific, keeping in touch with the new sciences, particularly with the sciences of external nature. Although modern philosophy arose as a proterst against the old scholastic system, it did not,
completely break with the past. Traces of the scholastic philosophy remain in its blood for a long time to some, the early modern thinkers constantly criticize the scholastic method, but many of the old conceptions are bodily taken over by them, and influence both their problems and their results. The theological bias is not entirely absent: Bacon, Descates, Locke, Berkeley, and Leibniz all accept the basal doctrine of Christianity. It is true, we are not always able to judge the condor of their protestations, but even insincerity in this regard would be a proof of the theological influence.

**Francis Bacon**

(1561-1626)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

Francis Bacon was the philosopher who has too legislative ideas. With this he has been interested in too politics. He has honored by Queen Elizabeth and king James 1. He was posted on the honorable posts as Lord Chancellor.

He was regarded for the post of a judge for excellent work efficiency in 1621. He has never affected by ill eagle affaire in his judicial judgments’, once though he was found quality by some affairs but the king has gave pardon to him. But after that he retired. In 1592 bacon was a professor in logic department at Cambridge University. He has been taking interest in philosophical study in his country. His ideas are not equal to sir William temple because he was in favor of peter ram as which was against to Aristotle.

**Philosophy of man**

Bacon’s ideas – towards the philosophy of a man has considered that it calls human philosophy, so man has its own philosophy, because a man has membership of his society. In the human philosophy a man has been doing study of body and soul. Its studious topics are as physical and mental worries, relation of the mind and the body, dreams and its effects on the body and mind. He describes as science of all knowledge of man as a psycho-physical individual; his is a comprehensive philosophical anthropology which draws upon the more specialized psychological and physiological inquiries.

In the sense of the study of man and his scientific issues which was far removed from the classical humanism of renaissance philosophers, and destined for a twentieth-century revival by philosophers like john dewey. The human soul has a divine or rational and an irrational part. All
problems relating to the former must be handed over to religion. The sensitive soul is corporeal, attenuated by heat and rendered invisible, and in the case of the more highly developed animals, resides chiefly in the head. The faculties of the soul are understanding, Reason, imagination, memory, appetite, will, and all those with which logic and ethics are concerned. The origins or these faculties must be physically accounted for Bacon’s treatment of the questions relating to voluntary motion and sensibility is suggestive. How can so minute and subtle a breath as the material soul initiate motion in bodies so gross and hard as the physical objects which man handles and manipulate? What is the difference between perception and sense? Becon finds a manifest power of perception even in inorganic bodies, and a kind of appetite to choose what is agreeable, and to avoid what is disagreeable to them: the loadstone attracts iron, one drop of water nites with another, one body “feels” the impact of another, perceives the absence of a body that is removed from its environs; perception is diffused through all nature. Becon’s willingness to indulge in such speculations shows how hard it was for the man of his time to divest himself of the old medieval conception of an animated nature. Logic treats of the understanding and reason; and ethics, of the will, appetite, and affections; the one produces resolutions, the other actions. The logical arts are inquiry or invention, examination or judgment custody or memory, elocution or delivery. The study of induction belongs to the art of judgment. Ethics describes the nature of the good and prescribes rules for conforming to it. Man is prompted by selfish and social impulses. Individual good self preservation and defense-differs radically from social good and frequently conflicts with it, although, at times, they may coincide. The social good is called duty, and it is the business of the science of government to discover the fountains of justice and public good and to reinforce their claims even when they conflict with the interests of the individual. Philosophy, in the broad sense, is the apex of the pyramid of knowledge. It is founded on the just, pure, and strict inquiry into all the subjects of study already proposed by Bacon. His purpose was not to offer a universal system, but “to lay more firmly the foundations and extend more widely the limits of the power and greatness of man.” He did not believe that the time had come to propound a speculative theory of the universe; indeed, he seemed to have been doubtful of the possibility of reaching such knowledge at all.

**Metaphysics and theology**

metaphysics and theology – Bacon divides theology in two categories as – (1) Natural (2) Revealed Theology from the site of natural theology Bacon describes that natural theology has
been concerning to the god. It has dealt by nature is light and the light has controlled to the all creatures of god. So the criteria of natural theology and its knowledge describes to the rules and regulation of nature. Now towards the side of inspired or reve a theology Bacon declares that the truth knowledge has reflected from the conclusion of experience. The experienced knowledge is the super knowledge in philosophy which dealt by the mind of a man and that mind has related to the religion and metaphysics. So metaphysics connected with theology Therefore, though it is knowledge, but it is not full knowledge of god because it is not clear about heaven yet the science knowledge does not declare too complete knowledge about philosophy.

As the sun and the earth, the moon and the heaven here their secrets so philosophy describes about its knowledge. This applies not only to the great mysteries of the Godhead, but also to the true interpretation of the moral law, a large part of which is too sublime to be attained by the light of nature. Becon, therefore requidiates the attempt of the schoolmen to deduce the truth of the Christian religion from the principles of the philosophers; the scholastic union between science and faith is a failure. Once the articles and principle sof religion have been postulated, however, we can by reason deduce inferences from them. If we accept the premises, we must accept the conclusions. “Thus in chess or other games of like nature, the first rules and laws of the play are merely positive postulates, which ought to be entirely received, not disputed: but the skillful playing of the fame is matter of art and reason.” The cleavage which Becon makes between theology and philosophy is the inheritance of the closing Middle Ages; by relegating the dogmas to a separate territory, the field was left for philosophy. His attitude toward theology is really one of indifference. It may surorise us that he devotes so much attention to such subjects as astrology, dreams, divination, etc, but these things were widely believed in his day, and a scientific treatment of them did not seem out of place at the time.

**Thomas Hobbes**

(1588-1679)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

Thomas Hobbes studied scholasticism and the Aristotelian Philosophy at Oxford, traveled extensively on the continent as the tutor and companion of young English noblemen, and become acquainted, in Paris, with Descartes, Gassed, and Messene. He fled to France in November 1640, after the assembling of the Long Parliament, returning in 1651 to make his peace with
Cromwell. Aim and Method-From this side the Thomas Hobbes Describes about the reflections of the modern philosophical spirit. With all philosophers also Thomas Hobbes attempts to break completely with the past; the weeding out of inveterate opinions is the first task of philosophy. Greek philosophy is to him an aberration.

Like Thomas Hobbes describes the utility of philosophy and science, he says that complete knowledge has its own power. He declared that the science of god and angels depends on too philosophical knowledge.

**Theory of knowledge**

Towards the side of philosophy Thomas Hobbes describes that the knowledge of causes has reflected in effects and the knowledge of effects has reflected in causes. It is that the sense proceeding and their ideas towards experience have analyzed to understand of its philosophy for their synthesis and its conclusion depends on its universality and reasoning, experience and principles are too being with science for reasoning, his ideas is as conceptual arithmetic the logical addition and subtraction of concepts have been completed with all ideas. So the principles of reasoning has developed with cause because it is depends on effects.

Therefore he believed that the man of which we can know the causes and effects is subject-matter for philosophy. The problem, therefore is to find a first principle, a starting-point for our reasoning, a cause on which to ground all effects. This Hobbes finds in motion. Every body of which we can know the causes and effects is subject matter for philosophy. There are natural bodies, and artificiaal bosies or the commonwealth, a body made by man. Hence we have natural philosophy and political philosophy, which is made up of ethics and polities proper. Primary or first philosophy is a science of the fundamental principles or definitions of all science; it is a kind of prelude to the other branches, treating of space, time, body, cause, effect, indentity and difference, relation, quantity, and the like. By analyzing particular things, we ultimaterly reach their most universal properties and at once know their causes, since these are manifest of themselves, having but one universal cause motion. The last things cannot be demonstrated until the first are fully understood. Hence, philosophy is the science of the motions and actions of natural and political bodies, and everything can be explained by motion: the nature of man, the mental world, and the State, as well as the occurrences of physical nature, can be explained mechanically. Whence do these principle aries, how does our knowledge originate? The origin of all our thoughts are the senses. Sensations persist or are retained in memory which Hobbes
describes as “decaying sense.” The memory of many things is experience. Images or thoughts succeed one another in the mind, whence we have a train of thoughts, which can be regulated by desire and design. The function of speech is to transfer our mental discourse into trains of words, which helps us to register our thoughts as well as to communicate them to others. In the right definition of names lies the first use of speech, which is the acquisition of science. In science we use universal terms but the thing themselves are not universal, there is nothing called “man” in general. Hence neither knowledge of fact nor knowledge of consequence is absolute, but conditional. Whereas Bacon emphasizes the role in knowledge of experience and induction form experience, Hobbes shows the need of demonstration or the deductive method. But holding, as he does, that the principles from which we reason have their source in sense, he loses his firm faith in the possibility of any method to reach absolute knowledge. Locke later on strengthens these doubts by declaring that we can have no science of bodies at all. Knowledge then, has its origin in sense impressions. Now, what is sensation and how is it caused? Through our sense-organs we receive different sensations: colors, sounds, tastes, smells, etc. These processes are caused by the action of some external object on the organs of sense. Motion is produced in organ and carried through nerves into the brain and thence into the heart. There a reaction ensues which makes it appear that there is some outward. The sensations, then, are nothing but motions in the brain, or spirits, or some internal substance of the head. The sensation, or image or color is but an appearance, an apparition of the motion, agitation, or alteration which the object works in the brain. Sensations are not qualities of things themselves; they are but motions in us. Now since only motion can produce motion there can be nothing outside except motion. All sense is fancy, but the cause is a real body. There I spearance. The reality outside is a moving reality; we perceive it as color or sound. Our picture of the world obtained through sensation is not the real world. If this is true, how do we know what is the nature of the world? Hobbes does not answer this problem, for it did not disturb him; he dogmatically assumes with the scientists of his day that the world is a corporeal world in motion. As we shall see later, Decartes attempted to prove the existence of an extended moving reality deductively, from the self-certainty of consciousness; but the English empiricist was not troubled by skeptical doubts with respect to external things.

Metaphysics-
Metaphysics – in philosophical site a importance of the body remains in the space, so it is actual space except other side space the object situated in ideal space. The ideas for space remains in man’s mind because all ideas produced by mind, anybody never consider to the accidental issues as action motion color rest hardness etc, all of the have been success by others. in such a way that a body does not consists action motion situation is a regular but its regularity does not has any cause without any motion. As a motion deals one another, it means the activity depend on its object which has change a object to object.

So by the work efficiency has been changing into the particular body to body by the effect of some generate and accidents.

Therefore it calls the cause and effect connection which is the relation of motions.

When one motion produces another, it does not mean that one accident goes out of one object into another, but that one accident persists and another is generated. A body is said to act or work on something to another body, when it either generates or destroys some accident in it. This is the relation of cause and effect. The efficient cause of all change and motion is motion. Power is not a certain accident that differs from all acts, but is called power because another act shall be caused by afterwards. The question of the beginning or motion cannot be answered by philosophers, but only by “those that are lawfully authorized to order the worship of God.” When he created the world, God gave to all things whatever natural and special motion he thought good. There are not, as the schoolmen had held, any incorporeal substances or spirits in addition to bodies. Substance and body are identical hence to speak of incorporeal substances is to speak of incorporeal bodies, which is a contradiction in terms or an absurdity of speech. Besides, If there were spirits or souls, we should not know them for all our knowledge is based on sensation, and spirits presumably do not affect the sense. The Bidle does not teach that there is an incorporeal or immaterial soul, but rather supports those who hold angels and spirits to be corporeal. God himself Hobbes is inclined to think is body or a corporeal being. That there is a God we know and can prove in the causal way, but what he is we do not know.

**Rene Descartes**

(1596-1650)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

Was at the birthplace of Rene Descartes was the son of a noble family.
He was educated in philosophy, mathematics, ancient language by his teacher. This latter study alone he found the certainty and clearness he craved; the others did not satisfy him, and he abandoned them upon leaving school (1612), to seek only after such science “as he might discover in himself or in entered the armies of Maurice of Nassau (1617) and General Tally (1619), and mingled with all sorts and conditions of men. During this entire period his intellectual interests never flagged; we frequently find him in meditative retirement, even at the headquarters of the army.

The problem that stirred him was how to reach such certainty in philosophy as characterizes mathematics; he prayed for divine illumination, vowing a pilgrimage to the shrine of Loretta in case his prayer should be answered.

**Existence of the external world**

Rene Descartes declares about existence of the external world there are various worlds In the Brahamand, so the existence of the external world is confirmly existed which have controlled by the god as the same world. In all of the worlds various creatures have been living. Among these a man is the most yet a man’s body have been suffering with more feelings as pain feelings, pleasure etc. and since our desires and appetites are often misleading, all of these are connected with bodies and its causes. But the body is not universal it is mortal. Against it, the soul is immortal. Its existence is universal so it became the rebirth in this world or external world. So the complete procedure of this world and external world has been controlled by the god.

He cleared that a real body has reflected in many divine works, however, compatible with the divine goodness, and with divine good sense. For this a man has been suffering by god ad divine intellectual power. Hence all of these are as god gifts to the man in this world and too external world because the god had controlled to the whole brahamanda. What then, is the nature of external things? What we clearly and distinctly perceive in body is the essential attribute of body. Sounds, colors, taste, smell heat and cold are not attributes of body: we are unable to conceive these clearly and distinctly, they are confused; what we sense is not the body’s true reality. The attribute of body is extension, and nothing else; body and extension are identical. Extension is spatial continuum of three dimensions, length breadth, and thickness; everybody is a limited spatial magnitude. There is no empty space or vacuum, for wherever there is space, there is body. Space is infinitely divisible; there are no ultimate parts of space, hence matter is infinitely divisible, i.e. there are no atoms. The smallest parts of bodies are still further divisible; they are
not atoms, but corpuscles. Nor can extension stop anywhere for the corporeal world is infinite. All the processes of the external world are modifications or modes of extension, may be divided without end, the parts may be united and separated, whence arise different forms of matter. All variation of matter, or diversity of from depends on motion. Motion is the action by which a body passes from one place to another. It is a mode of the movable thing, not a substance. All occurrence is transference of motion form one part of space to another. “Motion is the transporting of one part of matter on of one body from the vicinity of those bodies that are in immediate contact with it, or which we regard at rest, to the vicinity of other bodies.” The physical world can be explained in terms of mechanics. There is no action at a distance all occurrences are due to pressure and impact. Hence, there must be a universal ether to account for the facts of astronomy. Body conceived as mere extension is passive and cannot move itself; we must, therefore, have recourse to god as the first cause of motion in the world.” God originally created matter along with motion and rest, and now by his concourse alone preserves in the whole the same amount of motion that he then placed in it.” This view of the prime mover was widely held in the time of Descartes and later. It is the old Aristotelian conception which Galileo and Newton both accepted. To insure against divine interference with the world, however, which would mean the abandonment of the mechanical theory and a relapse into scholasticism, Descartes holds that God has given the world a certain amount of motion; motion is constant. We have here the germ of the theory of the conservation of energy. The physical magnitude called “motion” by Descartes, the constancy of which he asserts, is presumably what physicists call momentum or quantity of motion-the product of mass and velocity. In asserting the constancy of motion, Descartes in not making the palpably false claim that velocity of motion is a constant. Bodies cannot of themselves initiate or stop their motion; they can neither increase not decrease the amount of motion in the physical universe, and hence the quantity of motion and rest must remain the same. Since God is immutable, all changes in the world of bodies must follow constant rules, or laws of nature. All laws of nature are laws of motion. All differences in bodies are explained by different relations of the parts; solid bodies are bodies in which the parts are united and at rest; fluids are bodies in which the parts move.

**Relation of Mind And Body**-

Relation of mind and body –about it R. Descartes has gave his ideas that the mind is situated in the body. Both are connected to one another, though some difference can be seen as
Mind has the sensitive power for thinking in overall, but body does not do same.

Mind is active but body is passive.

In philosophical language mind and soul has suitable thoughts in all circles but body is depends on mind for all activities. The mind certainly feels that what I am? It is so clearly and truly for the body. It is existed with mind. So he declared that substance which has intellect power and imagination for doing action – motion of mind and body. In thought, however Descartes include will and evidently also such higher emotions as are not the result of the union of body and mind.

What particularly attracted Descartes to this extreme dualism was that it left nature free for the mechanical explanations of natural science. Mind is eliminated from nature and given an independent territory of its own. Physics is allowed to go its own way, all purposes or final causes are banished from it domain. A division is made between mind and body similar to the division made between theology and philosophy in days of scholasticism. This teaching Descartes applies to the entire organic world, even to the human body. The human body is, like the animal body, a machine. The moving principle of the body is the feat in the heart; the organs of motion are the muscles; the organs of sensation, the nerves. Animal spirits are distilled in the blood in the heart and rise though the arteries into the brain, and thence into the muscles and nerves. All the functions of the body follow naturally, in this machine, from the arrangement of the organs as necessarily as the movements of a witch follow from its pendulum and wheels. It is not necessary to assume the presence in man of a sensitive soul or any principle of viral motion other than the blood and the animal spirits. Descartes repudiates the vitalism of organic nature. If these two substances exclude one another it follows that there can be no interaction between them; mind cannot cause changes in the body, and body cannot changes in the mind. Descartes, however, does not consistently draw the consequences of his premises. There are certain facts which point to an intimate union between body and mind in man: appetites of hunger and thirst; emotions and passions of the mind which are not exclusively mental affections; sensations of pain, color, light, sound, etc. These we cannot refer to the body alone or to the soul alone, but must explain by the close and intimate union of the two. The union is not to be conceived as analogous to that of the pilot to his vessel. Mind and body compose a substantial unity. All the sensations just mentioned are merely confused modes of consciousness, the result of this union; man is not a pure spirit. Motion in animals, and often in ourselves occurs without the intervention of reason; the senses exited by external objects simply react to the animal spirits and
the reactions are mechanical the animal is nothing but a machine. But in man bodily motion may produce sensations. If I were merely a thinking being if my soul were not somehow intimately conjoined with my body, I should, for example, know that I am hungry, but not feel hungry. I should not have sensations and feelings which are confused modes of consciousness resulting from the intimate union of body and mind. Just how this intimate union is to be conceived, is not made clear by Descartes and, indeed, it is not possible within the framework of his dualism. Descartes warns us against confounding mind and body with one another. Thought and extension, he says, are combined in man, in unity of composition, but not in unity of nature; the union should not be compared with a mixture of two bodies. He teaches that thought can be troubled by the organs without being the product of them”; sensations, feelings, and appetites are disturbances in the soul resulting from its union with the body. In spite of the union, however, body and soul remain distinct; God has put them to gather, but they are so separate in their nature that either could be conserved by God apart from the other. Descartes seems to adopt the position that the relation between mind and body is not that a physical state. Become, produces or cause a mental state, or vice versa, but rather that the mind is simply troubled by organic processes. His obscurity and vacillation on this point are due to his obscurity world on purely mechanical principles, and at the same time to leave a place for the action of a spiritual principle. The facts of experience point to an intimate connection between the two worlds which his clear-cut distinction between them seems to render impossible. Descartes at time accepts the theory of causal interaction without hesitation. The soul though united with the whole body, has its principal seat in the pineal gland of the brain. Movement in the animal spirits are caused by sensible objects and transferred to the pineal gland; in this way sensations are produced. The soul can also move the gland in different ways; this motion is transferred to the animal spirits and conducted by them over the nerves into the muscles. Here the relation of mind and body is clearly conceived as causal; through the mediation of the pineal gland a certain interaction between mind and body takes place. But Descartes does not succeed in showing how this interaction is compatible with his metaphysical dualism of thinking and extended substance.

**Benedict De Spinoza**

(1632-1677)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education
Baruch (Benedict) de Spinoza was born in Holland the wealthy Portuguese Jewish merchant. He studied Hebrew literature with the intention of become a rabbi, but found, but found as little to satisfy him in Jewish philosophy as Bacon and Descartes ha found in the Christian system. In his state of doubt he become acquainted with the work of Descartes and renounced Judaism. Expelled from the synagogue (1656) and forced to leave Amsterdam, he took up his abode in various Dutch towns and finally settled at The Hague (1669), where he gained his livelihood by grinding lenses. In his profound love of truth, his unselfishness, and his simple mode of life, he exemplified the virtues of the philosophers. But his pantheistic system aroused intense and almost universal indignation, and Spinoza was for centuries despised as an atheist.

The only work of his that appeared under his own name during his lifetime was the exposition of Descartes system, Cogitate metaphysics (1663).

**Attributes of God**

Attributes of god – how from the point of view, the attributes of attributes of universe and its reality. B. Spinoza declared that the intellectuality with its performance has reflected in substance.

Firstly with this Spinoza consider attributes to the reality of knowledge and its idea does not in favor of god, so this is idealistic interpretation of the doctrine of attributes others among them K. Fisher, regard the attributes as real expressions, actual components. According to the nature of god it is not noble idea for humanity.

The second, or realistic interpretation, is in correctness situation, so Spinoza declared that essential ideas are valuable for the object of attributes of god. They have been governing physically activities are better than mental activities.

In reality, the attributes of god have presented by the human mind on the actual ground of philosophical thoughts. Of these infinite attributes, the mind of man can grasp but two. Nature expresses itself in an infinite number of ways, of which only extension and thought are knowable by man, who is himself a physical and mental being. God or nature therefore, is at least both bodily and mental. Wherever, then, there is space or matter, there is soul or mind, and vice versa; the two attributes, being essential to the nature of substance, must be present wherever the substance is found, that is, everywhere. Each of the two attributes is infinite in its own kind, but not absolutely infinite—neither thought nor extension is the sole attribute; since there are infinitely
many attributes of god, none of them can be called absolutely infinite. These attributes are absolutely independent of one another and cannot influence each other: mind cannot produce changes in body in nor the body changes in mind.” “When two things have nothing in common with one another the one cannot be the cause of the other.” Spinoza thus accepts the doctrine of the occasion lists and of Malebranche, that only like can produce like, that mind cannot produce motion nor motion mind. We cannot explain the mental by the physical, as materialism does, nor the physical by the mental, as idealism does. Both the mental and the physical realms, the world of thought and the world of motion, are manifestations of one and the same universal reality, and are of equal rank; neither is the cause not the effect of the other, both are the effects of the same cause, both flow from the same substance. The one indivisible nature, or God, regarded in one of his aspects, is a space-occupying, moving thing; in another aspect, it is in ideal world. This is what may be called a double-aspect theory; it is likewise a form of psycho-physical parallelism; the order and connection in the one realm are the same as in the other. To our notion of a circle there corresponds a real circle existing in nature.

**Intellect and Will**

In so far as the soul knows ideas, it is intelligence or intellect; in so far as it affirms and denies what is true and false, we call it will. Neither the intellect nor the will is a faculty of the mind; there are no soul-faculties, only ideas exist in the mind. The soul is reduced to ideas; it is an idea of the body: it mirrors philosophical processes. No ultimate distinction is made by Spinoza between knowing, felling or emotion, and willing. Volitions, too, are nothing but ideas of things; the particular act of will and the particular idea are identical.

Hence, intelligence and will are essentially the same: the will is an idea affirming or negating itself. This act of affirmation or negation, which is an act of judgment, is not, as with Descartes, an act of free or capricious choice, but is determined by the idea itself. There is no such thing as free will; Everything in nature is determined, everything follows necessarily from something else and all things are ultimately conditioned by the universal substance. The human soul is merely a mode of the divine thought; besides, every particular act of will is a made of thought determined by another mode. Will and intelligence, then, are identical. Corresponding to the stages of the intellect sensation or imagination and reason, we have different stages of the will; passions and will proper. The passions, which literally represent the passive side of the human mind are confused and inadequate ideas corresponding to physiological states. To our ignorance and
confusion are due the passions of love, hate, hope and fear. In so far as the mind has clear and distinct ideas, in so far as it has knowledge and understanding it is not passive but active: it is rational. Spinoza’s main polemic is against absolute freedom of choice or a groundless will; he is not prepared to deny all significance to freedom as applied to man. When the soul comprehends the meaning of things, or has adequate ideas, it has no passions and ceases to be in bondage. The more confused a man’s knowledge, the more he is passion’s slave, the more limited, the more important and dependent he is. The clearer his knowledge the more rational he is; the better he understands the universe in all its relations, the freer he will be form passions and the less dependent on them. To know means to be free from hate and fear, anger and envy, even from love and hope pity their necessary relations to God, will love god; this intellectual love of God is the love of God for himself, for man is a mode of God. Man must not expect God to reciprocate this love. The passions are not errors of human nature, but properties necessarily belonging to it.”

There are there fundamental passions: desire, joy, sorrow. The basis of all passion is the desire for self-preservation. Everything strives to maintain itself in it being; in man, too, there is such striving to preserve the bodily and mental life. What human nature strives for, the human mind is conscious of; this conscious striving is voluntas, will, when related to soul alone; or cupiditas, conscious appetite, when related to soul and body. What promotes our desires is good, the opposite bad. Every man, therefore, aims to increase his being; when it is intensified, he feels joy otherwise sorrow. Joy is the transition from lesser to greater perfection; itself; if a man were born perfect, he would not have the feeling of joy. Man seeks to preserve the joyful feelings and to rid himself of sorrow. We love whatever causes pleasure in us, we hate that injures us. Hope or fear is aroused by the anticipation of future pleasure or pain. The individual believes he is the cause of his own acts, hence he feels self-satisfaction when they are pleasant and remorse when they are painful. The more active we are the more pleasurable our feelings, and the greater our sense of power. Hence, such emotions as envy and pity are bad for us, they lower our sense of power and our vitality. Like Descartes, Spinoza is one of the forerunners of modern physiological psychology.

**Intellectual Love of God**

Our highest good may consider for love to god which is eternal, like reason itself. As we think, that we have eternal ideas for the existence of the mind, because the time and its duration unlimited. The term god is variously employed in Spinoza’s system; He is identified
with the universe, or he is identified with his attributes, Or he is absolute unified substance with its infinite attributes, or he is the unified substance itself, higher than these attributes. His real meaning probably is that the universality of the god is permanent in the world and too unity. He described the forms of god as intellectuality, personality, willing, feeling, conscious etc. are not completed towards any purpose. His action is casual not purposive because all of the events have been conducting by the nature. Hence God’s thinking is conducted by Laws, Rules and Regulations of the world. Mixed modes and relations have no reality other than in the minds of men, they do not claim to be copies of things really existing; they are only in that they are so famed that there is a possibility of something existing conformable to them. They are themselves archetypes, and so cannot be chimerical unless inconsistent ideas are jumbled together in them.

**John Locke**

(1632-1704)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

John Locke Brittan- (29-08-1932 to 28-10-1704) has been in philosophical study of science and medicine at Oxford. He dealt instructive method which still prevailed at the university, but found great satisfaction in the writings of Descartes. For many years (1666-1683) he has been doing service for the post of a secretary. He was a teacher of his son and grandson, and followed his patron to Holland into exile. Returning to England (1689) after the deposal of James II and the ascension of William of Orange to the throne, he was busy in public services some years in the last time of his life (1700-1704) in the household of Sir Francis Mash am, which was the philosopher’s daughter Cud Worth. He has been collected works, 1853; which work was in philosophical circle. The work has edited by St. John for his library.

**Nature and Validity Of Knowledge**

Nature and Validity of knowledge- the complete matter for getting knowledge is essential for the mind, because a mind acts on them and makes complex ideas. The question arises, what cognitive value do such ideas have, what condition must they fulfill in order to be knowledge. Ideas should be clear and distinct, because an obscure idea makes the use of words uncertain. Real ideas are such as have a natural background in which confirmed to the real existence of
things with which they correspond and which are their archetypes. Our all thoughts must be real because all of these ideas have been reflecting from the existence of mindly images. The valuation of some thoughts in depends on the qualities of the body because all of these are from outside of our mind. Mixed models and relations have no reality other than in the mind of man, they do claim to be copies of things really existing; they are in real situation because they have their validity towards their existing. J. Locke says that the natural and real thoughts have their validity, because the natural validity is essential for knowledge. All knowledge is gained by means of ideas and our most certain knowledge edge is nothing but perception of the connection or agreement, and repugnancy or disagreement, of any of our ideas. We perceive that white is not black, that the idea of white and the idea of black do no agree. There are different degrees of evidence in knowledge. Sometimes the mind perceives the agreement or disagreement of two ideas by direct inspection, without the intervention of any other ideas. This is intuitive knowledge. The mind perceives at once that white is not black, that a circle is not a triangle, that three is greater than two. This is the clearest and most certain knowledge of which human frailty is capable; it need not be proved and cannot be proved; it is irresistible, self-evident. On the certainty of direct intuition depends whatever certainty and evidence our knowledge possesses. Sometimes our mind, though it is unable to perceive the agreement or disagreement between two ideas immediately, can establish it indirectly by comparing them with one or more other ideas. This knowledge by intervening ideas is called mediate, rational, or demonstrative knowledge. Its proof are certain, yet its evidence is not quite so clear and bright, nor the assen so ready as in intuitive knowledge. Every stap in demonstrative knowledge must have intuitive certainty, in order that the conclusion may be certain. Such demonstration is employed in mathematics and wherever the mind can perceive the agreement or disagreement of ideas by the help of intermediate ideas. In both intuitive and demonstrative knowledge we have certainty; whatever falls short of one of these is faith or opinion, but is not knowledge in the strict sense. What shall we say of our knowledge of the external world? We have in the mind ideas of external objects; that we have them is as certain as anything can be. But is there anything more than the ideas; can we with certainty infer the existence of any extra-mental reality which corresponds to them; is there a real world outside? Something, as in drems, we have ideas to which nothing corresponds at the time. Ordinary perception when we are awake and presumably subject neither to hallucination nor illusion affords a kind of evidence which is beyond any reasonable doubt; our
knowledge of the particular existence of finite, external things, thus goes beyond bare possibility; and yet does not reach perfectly intuitive or demonstrative knowledge. Locke calls it sensitive knowledge. I have no self-evident knowledge of real existence except of myself my God; my own existence I know by intuition, the existence of God is made clearly known to me by reason. The apprehension I have by my senses of the existence of things outside me, though not so certain as intuitive knowledge or the deductions of the reason, yet has an assurance that entitles it to the name of knowledge. But besides this assurance provided by the senses themselves, We have the further confirmation that perceptions differ intrinsically from memory-images, that they are often accompanied by pain, and that the senses corroborate one another’s testimony.

**Ethics**

From the ethics, J. Locke has given the philosophical theory for ethics, which name was empirical theory. In it being is truth but the ego or egoism has finished in it. In this theory, a theoretical truth is better than the practical or moral truths. We make moral judgments without having any rules “written on our hearts”. People do not consider the moral knowledge but they consider truthfulness, a same way in which they come same way in which they come to know other things namely, by experience. Moreover, men learn such rules through their education, environment, and the customs of their country.

We instill into the minds of children those moral doctrines which have them retain and profess; and our children, when they grow up, find these truths present in their consciences and unable to recall how they were originally instilled, regard them as imprinted by God and nature. Conscience is nothing but our opinion of the rightness and wrongness of our own actions in the light of such acquired moral knowledge. Nature has placed in man a desire for happiness and an aversion to misery, and these are natural tendencies, or practical principles, which influence all our actions; but they are inclinations and not truths of the understanding. We call that good which is apt to cause pleasure in us, and evil that which is apt to cause pain. Everyone constantly pursues happiness and desires whatever contributes to it; it is this desire or uneasiness which determines the will. Happiness in its fullest extent is the utmost pleasure we are capable of, and misery the utmost pain. Now certain modes of conduct produce public happiness and preserve society, and also benefit the agent himself God has joined virtue and public happiness together and made the practice of virtue necessary to society. Men discover these forms of virtuous behavior, and embody them in rules of practice. Everyone reaps advantage to himself from the
observance of the moral rules and, therefore, recommends them. It would be futile for one intelligent being to prescribe a rule for the actions of another if he did not have the power to reward obedience and punish disobedience by some good or evil that is not the natural consequence of the act itself. There would be no need of a law if the natural consequences of actions had sufficient motive force to induce them. The laws of society determine the wills of man by rewards and punishments, pleasure and pain, and are enforced by the will and power of a lawgiver. There are there sorts of law: divine law, and the of opinion or reputation. The divine law is the which God has set for the guidance of the actions of men, whether promulgated to them by the light of nature or the voice of revelation. God has the power to enforce to this law by rewards and punishments of infinite weight and duration in another life. Divine law is the basis of duties and sins. The civil law is the rule set by the commonwealth, and is accompanied by legal rewards and punishments; civil law is the basis of the notions of crime and innocence. But the great majority of men govern themselves chiefly, if not solely, by the law of fashion or private censure. Commendation and disgrace are strong motives, causing men to accommodate themselves to the opinions and rules of those with whom they converse. No man who offends against the fashion and opinion of the company he keeps can escape the punishment of the dislike and censure of his fellows. Virtue is everywhere thought praiseworthy; and nothing which lacks public esteem is called virtuous. Men compare their actions with these laws or rules and, according to their agreement or disagreement with them, call them good or evil. The true sanction of virtue, however, is the will of god; the will and law of God constitute the only ultimate touchstones of morality. In the main, virtues and vices are everywhere the same, and correspond with the unchangeable rule of right and wrong established by the law of God. Obedience to the laws of god secures and advances the general good of mankind; and hence no rational human being caring for their own interest, could fail to commend the right and blame the wrong. Locke’s ethics is the old Greek hedonistic interpretation of morality, supplemented and reinforced by a narrow conception of Christian theology. virtue is nothing else but doing of good either to oneself or to others. The most lasting pleasures in life consist in heath, reputation, knowledge, doing Good, and the expectation of eternal and incomprehensible happiness in another world. Locks shows how we may derive our moral knowledge from experience. He believes that we may also reach it by reasoning from certain first principles, I.E. by demonstration. Moral truth like mathematical truth is capable of demonstration. The idea of a
supreme Being infinite in power goodness, and wisdom, whose workmanship we are, and on whom we depend; and the idea of ourselves as understanding rational beings, would I suppose, if duty considered and pursued, afford such foundations of our duty and rules of action as might place morality among the sciences capable of demonstration where there is no property there is no injustice, is a proposition as certain as any demonstration in Euclid. No government allow absolute liberty; the idea of government being the establishment of certain rules or laws which require conformity to them and the idea of absolute liberty being for anyone to do whatever he pleases, I am as capable of being certain of the truth of this proposition as of any in mathematics.”

Locke recognizes three modes of moral knowledge; we have an empirical knowledge of right and wrong, a demonstrative knowledge, and a revealed knowledge, all of which agree. God has so arranged it that, given a desire for happiness in human nature, man will evolve a moral code to promote his happiness. God has also endowed him with reason which will enable him to acquire moral truth by demonstration. And, finally, he has revealed in the Scriptures the same laws which can be reached by experience and reason. Free will. Freedom, according to Locke is an idea pertaining not to volition or preference but to the person, having the power of doing or forbearing to do according as the mind shall choose or direct. The free will problem is, in Locke’s opinion, meaningless; for the concept of freedom has significant application to man’s power of action but not to his will. We cannot say that aman’s will is free,” it is as insignificant to ask whether a man’s will be free, as to ask whether his sleep be swift be or his virtue square.”

The will is one power or ability, namely, the power of an agent to think his own actions and to prefer their doing or omission; freedom is another power or ability the power to do or forbear doing any particular action according as he himself wills. So that when we ask: Is the will free? We are really asking: has one power another power? Which is an absurdity. A man is free so far as he has power to think or not to think, to move or not to move according to the preference or direction of his own mind. Wherever he has not the power to do or forbear any act according to the determination or thought of the mind, he is not free, though perhaps his act may be voluntary. It is some pressing uneasiness that successively determines the will and sets us upon those actions we perform. This uneasiness is desire, an uneasiness of the mind for want of some absent good. God has put into men the uneasiness of hunger and thirst and of other natural desires, to move and determine their wills for the preservation of themselves and the continuation of the
species. The most pressing uneasiness naturally determines the will and the desire, in its turn, is
directed toward happiness. Locke’s account of human motivation interprets happiness, desire and
volition in their relation to one another, but finds no place in the scheme for free will.

**Theory of Education**

Towards the educational theory, J. Locke says that there are more theories of education by
modern philosophers but Locke recommended to the method of instruction theory. He had
focused the empirical system in its philosophical education which supported to psychological
and ethical education. As say that soul being at birth devoid of all principles except the desire
for pleasure and the power to receive impressions, the purpose of education is to learn by
experience and to realize happiness In order to attain it, A healthy body and sound sense organs
are requisite; the body must hardened by exercise and habit. He prescribes physical training or
the child and considers a frugal mode of life imperative. The personality of a child is developed
by natural manners with empirical system.

Locke also emphasizes the importance of object lesson of learning by play, and of arousing the
pupil’s mental activities; study is to be made a delight. Above all, the social end of philosophical
education must not be close up for the youth generation because it is essential to become the best
citizens for society and country.

**Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz**

(1646-1716)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz was born in Leipzig, and he was educated in philosophy law, maths
from jana university and Altdorf receiving his doctorate in law from the last named institution at
age of twenty. Among his teachers were Jacob Thomas us, the father of the celebrated Christian
Thomas us, and E. Wiggle. After a sojourn at Mayans (1670-1672), where he was he engaged
in the reform of the legal procedure of the Electorate, and a diplomatic mission to Paris (1672-
1676),

He was called to Hanover as court councilor and librarian, a post which he held until his death.

**The Doctrine of Monads**
The Doctrine of Monads: Body, then, is a plurality of simple forces. Since many things exist, there is not one single force in nature, but an infinite number of forces, every one of which is a particular, individual substance. Force is indivisible or simple; hence it is immaterial and unexpended. Simple substances or forces are called by Leibniz metaphysical points, formal atoms, essential forms, substantial forms, monads or units. They are not physical points, for these are nothing but compressed bodies; they are not mathematical points, for these, though "true" points, are not "real", but merely "points of view". Only metaphysical points are true and real; with them there would be nothing real for without units there could be no manifoldness. Moreover, such centers of force must be eternal: they cannot be destroyed only a miracle could destroy them nor can they be created: monads can neither arise nor disappear.

The original scholastic conception of individual active substantial, forms, which Leibniz carried away with from the university, is thus transformed into the doctrine of individual forces. Leibniz established that the world of bodies is composed of an individual number of dynamic units, or immaterial, unexpended, simple units of force what else can we say of the monadic unit, where can we study it? In ourselves. We discover such a simple immaterial substance in our own inner life the soul. What is true of the soul, will be true, in a measure, of all monads. Reasoning by analogy, Leibniz interprets the monads as spiritual or psychic forces. There is in them something analogous both to our sensations and to our conations or tendencies to action; they have "perception" and "apparition." The same principle that expresses itself in the mind of man is active in inanimate matter, in plant, and animal. There is force everywhere; every part of matter is like a garden full of plants; all matter is animate, alive even to its minutest parts. But how can there be mind in the stone, or even in the plant? Mind says Leibniz, is not absolutely the same in stone, plant, and man. For Descartes there is nothing unconscious in mind and nothing unextended is matter. The facts of physics, however, show that in nature force is essentially akin to mind, whereas the facts of psychology show that the mind may at time lapse into unconsciousness. Leibniz has overcome the Cartesian dualism by establishing a continuity between the physical and psychological realms. Body and extension are not identical terms; neither are mind consciousness coextensive. Mind consists of perceptions and tendencies. Perceptions differ in clearness and distinctness in different monads; indeed, the human mind itself reveals perceptions of different degrees of clarity. When I attend carefully to an object, its elements stand out clearly and distinctly, whereas the surrounding parts become successively
more and more obscure and indistinct, until they are scarcely discernible at all. The farther an object is removed from the focus of my attention, the smaller and fainter it is. There are, therefore, clear perceptions and obscure perceptions; the latter are called “small perceptions,” petites perceptions. Sensation cannot distinguish in the roar of the ocean the different elements or the minute perceptions produced by the motion of each separate wave, and yet every one of these separate sounds is contained in the sensation. Just as there are different degrees of clearness within the individual monad, so monads differ among themselves in the clearness of their perceptions. In the very lowest monads, everything is obscure and confused, resembling sleep; they spend their entire existence in a comatose state. Such dormant life we find in the plant. In animals there is perception with memory, i.e. consciousness; in man consciousness become still clearer; here it is called apperception, being a “reflexive knowledge of the inner state,” or self-consciousness. Every monad has the power of perception or representation; it perceives or represents and expresses the entire universe. In this sense it is a world in miniature, a microcosm; it is a “living mirror of the universe,” a concentrated world, a world for itself. But each monad represents the universe in its own way from its unique point of view, with its characteristic degree of clearness; it is limited, an individual, and has other individuals outside it. The higher the monad, the more clearly and distinctly it perceives, expresses or represents the world; the monads with which it is most closely associated constitute its own body, and these it represents most clearly. From this teaching it follows that “everybody feels everything that occurs in the entire universe, so that anyone who sees all could read in each particular thing that which happens everywhere else and besides, all that has happened and will happen, perceiving in the present that which is remote in time and space. The monads, moreover, from a graduated progressive series, form the lowest to the highest. The universe is composed of an infinite number of monads in a gradually ascending scale of clearness, no two monads being exactly alike. The law of the identity of indiscernible, which is a cardinal principle of Leibniz’s metaphysics, affirms that no two monads are exactly alike—if two monads were indistinguishable or indiscernible one from the other they would necessarily be identical, i.e. would really be one monad. Another fundamental principle of Leibniz’s metaphysics is the law of continuity. There are no leaps in nature, no breaks in the line from the lowest to the highest; there is a continuous line of infinitesimal differences from the dullest piece of inorganic matter to God. God is the highest and perfect monad, pure activity the original monad, the monad of monad. The principle
of continuity demands the existence of a supreme monad. Leibniz’s pluralism of monads may be profitably compared to earlier monistic and pluralistic philosophies. His pluralism contrasts most sharply with the monism of Spinoza. The latter accepts one absolute substance, Leibniz an infinite number of them. Descartes is a pluralist in one important respect; he asserts the existence of a plurality of individual things; but he considers them as modifications of one or the other of two substances diametrically opposed in essence mind and matter. The monads of Leibniz, on the other hand, are essentially alike although differing from one another in degree. The atomists were also pluralists, in that they asserted the existence of many homogeneous realities; but their atoms are material whereas Leibniz’s monads are spiritual.

**Ethics**

Ethics- Ethics is a rational science. There are certain moral principles native to the soul which cannot be demonstrated, but from which other moral truths necessarily follows. Moral principles operate unconsciously in us, as instincts, but we may become aware of them and express them as moral truths. Thus the truth that ought to seek pleasure and avoid pain is based on the instinctive desire for happiness a confused knowledge resting on inner experience. This principle can be enunciated as a moral truth, and from its other moral precepts can be deduced. Moral instincts guide men directly and without the need of deliberation, but not irresistibly, for they may be corrupted by the passions and by evil habits.

The principle of justice is found even in savages and forms a part of their nature; it is so basic that even a band of robbers would have to obey it in order to preserve its unity. Although tradition, habit and education help in developing the moral tendencies of the soul, they are ultimately rooted in human nature itself. It is true that men do not always obey the inborn laws of morality; but this does not prove that they are ignorant of them. It is not an argument against the innateness of a moral principle to say that it is not recognized as such, nor is the public violation of such a law an argument against its validity; it is rather a proof of men’s ignorance of the moral law. The fact is, these rules are not always clearly perceived, but need to be proved just as the propositions of geometry require demonstration. Sustained attention and methodical reflection are necessary to bring them to the surface, and even scholars may not be fully conscious of them.

Mental life is, as we have found, essentially perception and appetite, that is, cognition. The union of appetite and perception is called impulse or desire. Will is conscious impulse or striving,
impulse guided by a clear idea. Hence it is never an indifferent will, or caprice, but is always
determined by an idea. Man is free in the sense that he is not determined from without the monad
has no windows by which anything can enter to compel it; he is however determined from
within, by his own nature, impulses and ideas. Choice follows the strongest desire. To desire to
be free to decide arbitrarily for one act but not another is to desire to be a fool. Leibniz is an
ardent advocate of freedom of the will, but the freedom on which he so strongly insists is not the
freedom of caprice or indeterminacy, but of the inner self-determination of the monad.

**Logic and theory of Knowledge**

Logic and Theory of Knowledge - Leibniz’s theory rests on his metaphysical presuppositions.
He accepts the rationalistic ideal of genuine knowledge as a system of universal and necessary
truths based on principles, and not de derived from experience. The universe is a mathematical-
logical order which reason alone can decipher. Since the soul-mondad is an independent being
which no external cause can influence, knowledge cannot come to it from without but must arise
within the soul itself. The soul, therefore, cannot be an empty tablet upon which nature writes its
characters, as Locke had supposed.

All our knowledge lies implicit in the mind sensation and understanding alike; experience does
not create it, but it is brought out, cleared up, made explicit by experience. Nothing can exist in
the intellect that did not first exist in sensation except, Leibniz adds, the intellect itself. But even
if we disregard the monadic theory, he declares, it can be proved that knowledge does not come
from the senses. Locke had argued that there can be no such thing as innate or a priori
knowledge for if there were we would always have been conscious of it. Leibniz replies that this
argument is valid only on the assumption that nothing could be native to the mind without the
mind’s being conscious of it. If the Cartesian identification of mental life with consciousness
were legitimate, Locke’s argument would no doubt be valid. But the mind is not always
conscious of its ideas; Leibniz asserts the existence of “minute” perceptions of which the mind is
unconscious. May not innate ideas exist in the mind in this unconscious fashion? Leibniz finds
other serious weaknesses in Locke’s empirical theory of knowledge. The propositions derived
from experience, or reached by induction, are wanting in universality and necessity; they do not
yield certain knowledge: however numerous the examples of an occurrence may be, they do not
prove that the event will always and necessarily take place. We possess knowledge which does
not depends on the testimony of the senses: propositions that are universal and necessary, as, for
example the truths of mathematics. It is evident that the mind itself adds something in this case which the senses cannot furnish. Logic, metaphysics, ethics, theology and jurisprudence abound in propositions which rest on principles having their origin nowhere but in the mind itself. To be sure, without sense experience we might never become conscious of such principles; out senses furnish the occasion for our perceiving them, but they do not produce or create them. Without basic principles there would be no science at all, but only a collection of factual details. The final proofs of necessary truths come from the understanding alone, and the other truths are derived from experiences or the observation of the senses. Our mind is capable of knowing both, but it is itself the source of the former. However numerous the particular experiences we have of a universal truth may be, we can never be absolutely sure of it by induction, unless we know its necessity through reason the senses can arouse justify, and verify such truths, but not demonstrate their eternal and inevitable certitude. Such innate truths do not exist in the soul as conscious truths: We cannot read off the eternal laws of reason as the edicts of the praetor are read off from the book but we can discover them in ourselves by attending to them when the senses offer us the occasion.” Ideas and truths are innate as tendencies predispositions and natural potentialities, but not as action, “although these potencies are always accompanied by certain, often insensible, actions, which respond to them.” In this sense, arithmetic and geometry are potential in us; we can draw them out of ourselves without employing a single empirical truth. That such truths are discovered as Locke had insisted later than the ideas of which they consist, proves nothing against their originality; nor does the fact that we first learn the signs, then the ideas, and hen the truths themselves. General principles the principle of identity, for example constitute the very life of our thinking; the mind depends on them every moment although great attention may be required to become aware of them. We instinctively employ even the rules of logic in our natural reasoning, without being conscious of them. That there are also such innate principles in the field of ethics, we have already seen.

A bare faculty of receiving ideas is, therefore a fiction. In the same way, the pure faculties or powers of the schoolmen are also fictions or abstractions. We never find a faculty anywhere that is shut up in itself, that does not do anything: the soul is always predisposed to act in one particular way rather than in another, i.e. it possesses definite tendencies. Experience is necessary to stir up the sol, but it cannot create ideas. The soul is not a piece of wax on which impressions are stamped; those who regard it thus, make a material entity of it. The empiricist
objects that there is nothing in the intellect that did not previously exist in sensation. He is right, says Leibniz, only he should add—except the intellect itself. The soul contains within itself the categories of being substance, unity, identity, cause perception, reasoning, and quantity-concept which the senses could never give us. In this teaching, Leibniz aims to reconcile the differences between apriorism and empiricism, a tack which afterwards undertaken on a much larger scale by Kant. He also partly anticipates Kant in his conception of space as a form of the mind. Sense perception and intelligence are, as functions of the indivisible monad, identical in kind, but they differ in degree. Sensations are obscure and confused ideas, while the objects of the understanding are clear and distinct. Sense perception does not see things in their true reality, as they are in themselves, that is, active spiritual substances or monads, but perceives them obscurely and confusedly as phenomena, as spatial. The coexistence of monads, which of clear conceptual thought is a harmonious order of spiritual substances, is perceived by sense perception as an extended phenomenal world. In other world; the perceiving subject sees and imagines the spiritual order in terms of space: our ideas of space, figure, motion rest,” Leibniz tells us, “have their origin in the common senses in the mind itself for they are ideas of the pure understanding, which however have reference to the external world.” According to this view the idea of space is native to the mind, as Kant later taught. Space is not real: it is a mere phenomenal appearance within a monad or system of monads. Rational knowledge is possible only through innate principles, on which our valid reasoning’s are based. Among there the principle of contradiction, which is the criterion of truth in the sphere of pure thought, and the principle of sufficient reason, which is the criterion of truth in the sphere of experience. The principle of sufficient reason has not merely a logical meaning of Leibniz every judgment must have a ground of reason which proves its truth; it is a metaphysical principle as well everything must have a sufficient reason for being. Reason denotes both logical grounds and real ground. On the principle of sufficient reason are based physics, ethics, metaphysics, and theology; “Unless we accept it, the proof of the existence of God and of many philosophical theories goes to pieces.” The universe is a rational system in which nothing happens without a sufficient reason; it is conceived in analogy with a logical system in which the propositions are rationally related. The problem of philosophy is to discover the fundamental principles or presuppositions of knowledge, which are at the same time the fundamental principles of reality. There is the same necessity in the real universe as there is in a system of logic. Leibniz’s logic influences his
metaphysics. But his metaphysics in its turn influences his logic; we have already seen how his conception of knowledge as a development of principles immanent in the mind, rests on his idealistic Monadology. His individualism does not follow a necessary consequence from his logical conception of the universe; the existence of independent individuals cannot be justified to the logical reason. Leibniz, however finds a teleological explanation for the existence of the individual; the production of individuals is a goal of the divine creative will, and finds its ultimate reason in the goodness and perfection of God. Moralistic value is here read into the logical ground of the universe; Leibniz belongs to the great philosophical tradition which conceives of value as integral to reality. Besides clear and distinct knowledge there is confused knowledge. Thus for example, harmony and beauty are based on certain proportional relations. These may be clearly known by the scholar, but they need not be; they express themselves in a feeling of esthetic enjoyment, which is therefore an obscure perception of harmony or from. So, too, the soul may perceive the order of things the harmony of the cosmos, without possessing a clear and distinct knowledge of it; in so doing, it has an becoming clear.

**George Berkeley**

(1685-1753)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education George Berkeley was born in Ireland; he had been studying in Dublin at Trinity College. His journey of colonie in 1734. In 1732 he was sent to Rhode Island to establish missions.

Among his works are following as:

An essay towards a new theory of vision (1709), Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge (1710), dialogues between Hulas and poisonous (1713), Alphorn, or the minute philosopher (1732).

Complete worked By A.C Fraser, Voles, 1871, 2nd rd. 1901.

Selections from Berkeley, and By Fraser, 5th Work 1900; essay principles, dialogues, and by M. W. Calkins 1929; Berkeley principles and human Treatise and by P. Wright 1935.

**The World of Spirit**
Every Man says there must be some cause of the sensations or ideas in my mind. And so there is, and this cause must be an active substance. It cannot, however, be a material substance, for there is no such thing; hence it must be an incorporeal, active substance or spirit. The spirit is super being. It is single existence. Its dividation is impossible. Its thoughts which calls understanding. The thoughts arranged by spirit for its action-motion which can call will. For it, these thoughts are not concerned with soul or spirit because all of these in passive site, but spirits is active site. So we cannot describe about spirit’s actions-motions but we may its being too with only the effects which it produces. Still now we consider the thoughts of mind which supported by the soul as – willingness, love thoughts, ideas of hates etc. so all of these irrigated by spirit.

Notion in contradistinction to idea is thee technical term by which Berkeley designates the vehicle or medium of our apprehension of minds and their operations. Some ideas I can make and unmake at pleasure; in this respect my mind is active and I have over my own thoughts. But over my sensations I have no such power. I open my eyes; in not in my power to choose whether I shall see or not, to determine what particular object shall present themselves ot my view. The ideas imprinted on my senses are not creatures of my will. Hence, there is some other will or spirit that produces them. The ideas of sense are stronger, more lively and distinct than those of the imagination; they have likewise a steadiness, order and coherence and are not excited at random, as are those which are the effects of human will, but appear in regular train or series, whose uniform connection sufficiently testifies to the wisdom and benevolence of their author. Now the uniform rules in conformity with which the supreme mind excites in us the ideas of sense, are called the laws of nature; and these we learn by experience, which teaches us that such and such ideas are attended by such and such other ideas in the ordinary course of events. God, in other words, arouses in us ideas in a constant and determinate order; he has connected with the idea of food the idea of nourishment; with the idea of sleep, the idea of refreshment; with the visual sensation of fire, the bodily sensation of warmth, if there were no such regular order in our sensations, we would be eternally at a loss to know what to expect next and would not know how to act; that there is such regularity in the flow of our sensations enables us to regulate our actions for the benefit of like. We notice this connection between our ideas and erroneously come to believe that the ideas cause each other, that fire produces warmth, that sleep causes refreshment, that collision of bodies cause sound. The ideas imprinted on the senses by God are called real things; and those excited in the imagination, being less regular, vivid and constant, are more
properly termed ideas or images of things which they copy or represent. But our sensations are ideas, nevertheless; they exist in the mind; they are simply more vivid, strong, orderly, and coherent ideas than our images; they are less dependent on the thinking substance which perceives them, they are excited by the will of another, more powerful spirit.

**Knowledge of Ideas, Spirits and Relations**

Spirit- Knowledge of Ideas, Spirits, and Relations- Spirits, then are active, indivisible substance; Ideas- these are reflecting from freedom of mind. All ideas have not remaining the own existence but have been controlling by spiritual power. When the mind has been thinking towards the situation of ideas in its various questions have arised to that reasons. After some thinking in the mind in which the situation of knowledge is being, the ideas will spread out as the same. Relations: for the sense of relations of things with the ideas both are related where are no things there is no ideas in the mind. Berkeley holds that, ideas, spirit, and relations are all objects for the knowledge of human beings as – the knowledge of subjects and its objects with the point of views in proper way rationality of real spirit, ideas and things.

Therefore the spirit is supreme authority ideas are the sense of mind. Its relations are universe. We may be said to have some knowledge or notion of our own minds, of spirits, and active being whereof, in a strict sense, we have no ideas. In the same way know and have a notion of relations between things or ideas relations which are distinct from the ideas or things related, inasmuch as the latter may be perceived by us without our perceiving the former. Berkeley holds that ideas spirits, and relations are all objects of human knowledge and subjects of discourse; and that “the term idea would be improperly extended to signify everything we know or have any notion of. Ideas imprinted by the senses are real things but they cannot subsist without the minds which perceive them”; they are not replicas of an archetype existing outside the mind. They may, indeed, be called external in the sense that they are not generated within the mind itself, but imprinted by a spirit distinct from that which perceives them. Sensible objects may also said to be “without the mind” in the sense that when I shut my eyes the things still exist; but they must be in another mind.

**David Hume**

(1711-1776)

Brief acknowledgement
With aspects of education

David Hume; born in Edinburgh in 1711, studied law, served as secretary to General St. Clair and latter to Lord Hertford (1763-1766) became librarian to the law faculty Edinburgh in (1752-1757) with posted as state secretary fro (1767-1769). He wrote his chief work, Treatise on Human Nature, in three books, during his first residence in France (1734-1737), but the work made no impression upon the public; press with rise and fall. He afterwards worked it over, in more popular form, and published three assays corresponding to the three parts of the original Treatise; But his fame during his lifetime rested upon his achievements as a historian rather than on his philosophical works.

During his second sojourn at Paris, as a member of the English Embassy, he met Rousseau, Diderot, Holdback, Turgot, and Alembert, and induce Rousseau to visit England. He died in 1776.

Knowledge of the External World

According to knowledge of the external world, the Hume declares that the importance of thinking is alone is not to be trusted implicitly; we must correct their evidence by reason. We trust our sense by a natural instinct and accept an external universe without reasoning, almost before the use of reason. We assume it to exist even if every sensible creature were annihilated. The slightest philosophical reflection, however, suffices to destroy the instinctive opinion of all men. So there is no reality in the mind but there is only emotions and there is no any image about the reasons of any objects because the object are not equal in some way. Experience is silent here, for we have before the mind only perceptions. We observe a relation of cause and effect between two perceptions, but we can never observe it between perceptions and objects; hence we cannot proceed by causal inference from perceptions to objects. We observe a relation of cause and effect between two perceptions, but we can never observe it between perceptions and objects; hence we cannot proceed by causal inference from perceptions to objects. If we deprive matter of primary as well as of secondary qualities, what remains in only a certain unknown, inexplicable something as the cause of our impressions an entity so devoid of meaning that no skeptic will think it worth his while to dispute its reality. The objects of all our knowledge are impressions and ideas derived from them. There is no evidence that these are caused by external objects, or an unknown substance, or by ourselves, or by god. Impressions and sensations simply appear and reappear in our experience. All we can do then, is to limit
ourselves to the world of experience, to our impressions and ideas. We can compare our ideas, note their relations, and reason about the relations, thus attaining a kind of demonstrative knowledge. We can also observe the order of our sensations; through habit or custom we come to regard one object as connected with another by a relation which we call cause and effect. We must limit our inquiries to such subjects as are best adapted to the narrow capacities of the human understanding. Philosophical decisions are nothing but the reflections of common life, methodized and corrected. Philosophers will never be tempted to go beyond common life, so long as they consider the imperfection of those faculties which they employ, their narrow reach, and their inaccurate operations. We can never hope to attain any satisfactory knowledge with regard to the origin of our impressions or the ultimate constitution of a universe behind our impressions and ideas.

God

We cannot demonstrate the independent existence of a world, although we continue to believe in it: rational cosmology is impossible. Nor can we demonstrate the existence of a soul-substance and the immortality of the soul: rational psychology is impossible.

Finally, we cannot demonstrate anything have connected with God’s nature and with controlling system all of the world. Human reason is too weak, too blind, and limited in its scope to solve such problems as these: rational theology is impossible. In this way some of the philosophers have agreed for this argument that the world has been controlled by the supreme authority. This authority has dealt with unbreakable stage. Its action-motion has been regularized in the world. Because there are various mountains, rivers and every type of creatures including a human being.

Hence all of the nature’s routine has been running by unseen existence, which can we have called The God. We are far beyond the reach of our faculties when we carry our speculations into two eternities, before and after the present state of things; into the creation and formation of the universe, the existence and properties of spirits, the power and operations of one universal spirit existing without beginning and without end, omnipotent, omniscient, immutable, infinite, and incomprehensible. The question is not concerning the being of god, but his nature. No truth is so certain as the being of God; it is the basis of all our hopes, the surest foundation of morality, the firmest support of society. Nothing exists without a cause and the original cause of this universe whatever it be we call God, and piously ascribe of this divine being nor suppose that his
perfections have any analogy or likeness to the perfections of a human creature. Hume directs his attacks particularly against the argument from design the so-called teleological proof, which attempts to infer the existence, wisdom and goodness of God from the order, beauty, and goodness of the universe. Unless the cases be exactly similar, we cannot repose perfect confidence in reasoning by analogy here. There is a wide difference between the universe and houses, ships, furniture, and machines, and we are not justified in inferring similar causes from a slight similarity in effects, intelligence is indeed an active cause by which some particular parts of nature are found to produce alterations in other parts. But thought, design or intelligence, such as we discover in men and other animals, is no more than one of the springs and principles of the universe, like heat or cold, attraction or repulsion, and a hundred others which fall under daily observation. We cannot rightly conclude from the part to the whole. But even if we could what peculiar privilege pertains to thought, that we must thus make it the model of the whole universe? Can we imagine that nature incessantly copies herself throughout so immense a universe? If we see a house, we conclude with the greatest certainty that it had an architect or builder because this is precisely that species of effect which we have experienced from that species of cause. But the universe bears no such exact resemblance from that species of cause, with the same certainty, infer a similar cause, or that the analogy is here entire and perfect. The dissimilitude is so striking that the utmost we can here pretend to is a guess, a conjecture a presumption concerning a similar cause. We cannot represent the Deity as similar to the human mind; to do so would be to fall into anthropomorphism. The human mind is in constant change; but change is not compatible with the perfect immutability and simplicity ascribed to God. Besides why not stop at the material word? To say that the different ideas which compose the reason of the supreme Being fall into order of themselves and by their own nature is no more clarifying than to say that the parts of the material world fall into order of themselves and by own nature. We have experience of matter doing this, and we also have experience of mind doing it. The attempt to infer the nature of God from the nature of the universe must end in disaster. By this anthropomorphic method of reasoning, we cannot ascribe infinity to the divine being, because the effect is to infinite; nor perfection, because the universe is not perfect. Even if it were perfect, it would still remain uncertain whether all the excellencies of the work can justly be ascribed to the workman. Many words might have been botched and bungled, throughout an eternity, ere this system was struck out much labor lost, many fruitless trials made, and a slow
but continued improvement carried on during infinite ages in the art of world-making. Besides, there is no proof, from this argument, of the unity of God; perhaps many gods united in making a world. Again men are mortal and renew their species by generation; hence, if we reason by analogy, why then, must we exclude this universal circumstance from these deities? And why not complete our anthropomorphism and ascribe bodies to the Deity or deities? A more probable hypothesis than the anthropomorphic theory, according to Hume, is that which infers that the world is an animal and the Deity the soul of the world, actuating it and actuated by it. The world itself plainly resembles an animal or a vegetable more than it does a watch or a knitting loom. It is more probable, therefore that its cause resemble the cause of the former, which is generation or vegetation. Consequently, we may infer the cause of the world to be something similar to generation or vegetation. These speculations are, it is true, world-fancies, we have no data to establish any system of cosmogony. Our Experience is limited and imperfect, and can afford no possible basis for conjecture concerning the whole of things. But the hypothesis which compares the world to an animal is as probable as the one which compares it with a human contrivance; indeed, the analogy is more striking in the former case than in the latter. Hume also points out that we cannot infer the universe the existence of a being possessing moral attributes lie those of men. The purpose and intention of nature seems to be the preservation and propagation of the species, and not their happiness. Misery exceeds happiness in the world. The fact of pain in the world would prove that God is either not benevolent, not almighty. Physical moral evil do not allow us to infer a good God it may be said that human reason is too weak to understand the purpose the universe; but this does not allow us to infer anything of God’s goodness a man must infer from what he knows, not from what he is ignorant.

We cannot demonstrate a priori that the Deity is a necessarily existet being; there is no being whose non-existence implies a contradiction. We cannot prove his existence as a necessary consequence his nature, because we do not know what that nature is. The material universe may, for all we know have qualities which make its non-existence inconceivable. As to the origin of religion Hume holds that the belief in God is not result of speculation, curiosity, or the pure love of truth, but rests on mar anxious concern for happiness, his dread of future misery, terror of death thirst for revenge, appetite for food, and other necessaries. Polytheism idolatry, and not theism, must have been the first and most ancient religion. In spite of these skeptical reflections, Hume declares that it hardly seer possible that anyone of good understanding should reject the
idea of God when once it is suggested to him. A purpose, an intention, and design, evident in everything, and when our comprehension is so far enlarged to contemplate the first rise of this visible system, we must adopt with the strongest conviction the idea of some intelligent cause or author. The universal propensity to believe in invisible, intelligent power, if not an origin instinct, being at least a general attendant of human nature may be cindered as a kind of mark or stamp which the divine Workman has set up his work. How seriously these remarks are to be taken in view of what has been said before the reader is left to decide for himself.

**Rousseau**

(1712-1778)

Brief acknowledgement

With aspects of education

**Educational Philosophy**

Educational philosophy – Rousseau’s theory of education is in favor of the surrounding development of a child with his natural growth and education. Instruction should not begin until the desire for knowledge arises. Hence, education must be largely negative, consisting in the removal of unfavorable conditions, task that requires the greatest care. The individuality of the child should be studied and nature assisted in distinguishing between good and bad impulses. It is wise, therefore, to isolate the child from its social environment in order that development may follow its natural course under the guidance of private teachers. Rousseau’s theory exercised great influence on modern education: Basehor, Pestalozzi, and Froebel are among those who have put it to the practical test.

These educational ideas are compatible with Locke’s empirical principles. If the soul is at birth an empty tablet, then man are by natural, and differences between them are the result of external influences, as Helvetius had already thought. Education and the social environment become the most important instruments for the perfection of the human race.

**Influence in Philosophy**

Rousseau’s influence in philosophy- Rousseau exercised a deep influence in Germany, on Kant, Herder, Goethe, and Schaller. Kant bears witness to the change produced in his thought by Rousseau’s influence in the following passage:”
Rousseau was the investigator for philosophical ground. He has felled that the philosophical knowledge is not too much in its stage. So he decided to improve for getting philosophical knowledge to the children. He believed that the ignorance of philosophy at the level of society is too much. So he has been trying to development in philosophical knowledge for the children. For it he has tried and progressed on the philosophical ground with it’s too much influenced for mankind. Therefore Rousseau’s philosophical idea was that nothing is absolutely good in this world or out of it except goodwill. This representation of the state of nature contrasts strikingly with Hobbes’ account of it as a “war of all against all.” Rousseau presumably conceived of this state of nature too, not as an actual era actual era in the history of mankind, but as a hypothetical state “which exists no longer, perhaps never existed, probably never will exist; and of which it is nevertheless necessary to have true ideas, in order to form a proper judgment of our present state.” It is a social and political fiction rather than an historical actuality, the function of which is to enable us to understand one aspect of human nature which is operative at all times. He departs from human nature as it is now constituted, analytically eliminates what is due to social intercourse and institutions, education etc. and thereby isolates the natural and instinctive nature of man. The essential and distinctive feature of the state of nature is the dominant role played by immediate feeling; feeling is what men have is common beneath their diversities produced by intellectual activity, science, art, and the other artificialities of civilization. Emphasis on feeling, as opposed to intellect and its attendant cultural manifestations, is the core of Rousseau’s romantic conception of human nature. Rousseau’s primitivism embodied in the injunction, “return to nature,” is not a demand to return to nature in its naiveté and simplicity. Rousseau firmly believed that man cannot go back to nature in the sense of completely renouncing civilization with its attendant evils. It is rather an injunction to man, within the framework of civilized society, to remake himself by cultivating those feelings and sentiments which promote equality and social justice. His insistence that “man is naturally good, and only by institutions is he made bad,” does not mean that man must abandon social institutions altogether this he cannot do; he can, however remold them is such a way as to realize a just and democratic society. Political philosophy. Rousseau substitutes for representative government direct government by the people. His political theory is the theory of the Swiss republican, as Locke’s which Voltaire followed, was that of the English constitutional monarchist. Among the people, Rousseau included not
only the third estate, or the prosperous bourgeoisie, but the fourth estate, or the laboring and peasant class, to which he himself belonged and for which he demanded equal rights and deliverance from social bondage, as Voltaire had demanded equal political right and liberty of thought and conscience for the middle class. Rousseau takes the Lockian ideal of democracy seriously; if all men are created free and equal and have the same natural rights and capacities, there is no reason why they should be ruled or deprived of their inheritance by a privileged class, be it an aristocracy or an industrial bourgeoisie. It was Rousseau’s ideas that found their way into the Declaration of the rights of man of 1789 and 1793. The return to nature can be accomplished only by the creation of natural social conditions and a natural method of education. Natural society is based on a contract in which the individual surrenders his freedom for the liberty of citizenship, which is limited by the general will, or the moral will of the people. Freedom is obedience to self-imposed law. Sovereignty lies with the people; the general will that is the will of the people in so far as it aims at the common good is the highest law. Rousseau’s doctrine of the general will constitutes in large measure his solution to the problem of the corruption of man by society; his formula for amelioration of social evils requires the conformity of the individual will to the general will of society. The private interests of the individual frequently conflict with the common interest, but the individual finds his true freedom and satisfaction in obedience to that part of his will which he has as a citizen and which is conducive to the welfare of the society to which he belong. In obeying that part of his will which is in conformity with the interests of society, the individual realizes his true freedom.

**Immanuel Kant**

(1724-1804)
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Immanuel Kant was born in Kongsberg, 1724, the son of a saddler, and was reared in religious surroundings, his parents being pietisms. Neatly his entire life as student, teacher, and writer was spent within the boundaries of his native city. At the Collegiums Fredericianum, where he prepared for the university (1732-1740), he was chiefly interested in the Roman classics; at University of Kongsberg he studied physics, mathematic, philosophy, and theology (1740-1746). From 1746 to 1755 he served as tutor in several families residing in the neighborhood of Kongsberg; in 1755
He received an appointment as special Caterer at the University and lectured on mathematics, physics, logic, metaphysics, ethics, physical geography, anthropology, natural theology, and ‘philosophical Encyclopedia’ From 1766 to 1772 he combined with this position the post of assistant librarian of the Royal Library. He died in 1804.

**Ethics**

Kant has described about ethics in his moral philosophy that its foundation depends on the metaphysical systems of morality which referenced by human beings behavior. His fundamental problem is to discover of the best legal and illegal in the life of a man with his ethical events. So there is not confirm the best except the best will throughout in the world. To this Kant added that is the best will when it has been reflecting from the best conscience and ethical rules. So in the practical life any activity does not say ethical when it is full of selfishness but against it that a activity has done without any selfishness. It may call ethical.

So the legal or illegal activities are depends on morality. It is immaterial whether happiness or perfection results, so long as the motive of the agent is good. Kant had learned from Rousseau that nothing is absolutely good in this world or out od it except a good will. To this, Kant added that a will is good when it is determined y respect for the moral law, or the consciousness of duty. An act that is done from inclination, say from self-love or even sympathy, is not moral; to be that it must be done is the face of such impulses, from sheer respect for law. Moreover the rightness or wrongness of an act does not depend on its effects or consequences; it is immaterial whether happiness or perfection results, so long as the motive of the agent is good. Pure respect for the law is the sole motive of genuine morality, the sentimental morality of “the volunteers of duty” was as distasteful to Kant as the ethics of utility. The moral law is a categorical imperative; it commands categorically, unconditionally it does not say; Do this if you would be happy or successful or perfect, but: Do it because it is your duty to it. Kant’s ethics, like its Stoic model, extols duty for duty’s sake. It does not concern itself with particular acts or even with general rules, but lays down a fundamental principle; always act so that you can will the maxim or determining principle of your action to become universal law; act so that you can will that everybody shall follow the principle of your action. This law is the supreme test of what is right and wrong. For example, you cannot will that everybody should make lying promises, for if everybody did nobody would believe anybody, and lying promises would defeat themselves. A rational being cannot really will a contradiction, and it would be a contradiction to will a lying
promise. Nor can such a being will to disregard the welfare of others, for if such conduct became universal, he himself might someday be treated inhumanly. Thus no one can consistently and retinally will that inhumanity be universalized. This law, or categorical imperative, is a universal, necessary law, a priori, inherent in reason itself. Its claim is recognized even by the common man; though he may not be clearly conscious of it, it governs his moral judgments; it is his standard or criterion of right and wrong. Implied in this law, or rather identical with it, is another law; Act so as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other in every case as an end in itself and never merely as a means. Every man conceives his own existence as an end in itself, as having worth, and must therefore regard the existence of every rational creature in the same way. Here we have the humanitarian ideal which was preached by the Stoics and primitive Christianity, and which played such an important role in the ethical and political theories of the eighteenth century. The rational will imposes upon itself universal laws, laws that hold for all and are acceptable to all. If everybody obeyed the law of reason, a society of rational being would result, a kingdom of ends, as Kant calls it, a society organized by rational purposes. The categorical imperative, in other words, implicitly commands a perfect society; it necessarily implies the ideal of a rational realm of spirits. Therefore, every rational being ought to act as if he were by his maxims, his universal principles, a legislating member of a universal kingdom of ends. He is both sovereign and subject; he both lays down and acknowledges the law. By virtue of his moral nature, he is a member of spiritual kingdom; in recognizing the authority of the law over him he recognizes the ideal world as the highest good. A man who is governed by the moral law and not by his impulses, his selfish desires, his appetites, is free. The brute is the play ball of its wants and instincts; through the knowledge of the moral law within him, man can resist his sensuous appetites, all of which aim at selfish pleasure. And because he can suppress his sensual nature he is free; he ought, therefore he can. The moral imperative is the expression of man’s real self, of the very principle of his being. It is his innermost self that expresses itself in the moral law; the moral law is his command in so far as he is rational being. He imposes the law upon himself. And this is his autonomy. The moral imperative the freedom of the will. If it were not for our moral nature, or practical reason, a proof of free will would be out of the question. Our ordinary perceptual and scientific knowledge deals with appearances in the spatio-temporal order, where everything is arranged according to necessary laws; the occurrences in the phenomenal world are, as we have seen, absolutely determined. If this temporal, spatial, and
causal order were that real world freedom would be impossible. But Kant teaches that the world as it appears to our senses is not the real world; hence, freedom is possible. But whether it is actual or not, we should never know if it were not for the moral law which admits us to a timeless, space less universe, to the intelligible world of free being. In other words, the moral consciousness of man, his knowledge of right and wrong, give him an insight into a realm that is different from the world in space and time which is presented to the senses. The moral dimensions of human experience give man access to a world transcending the phenomenal.

**Knowledge of The Ego**

Knowledge of the Ego - The question arises, how do we reach the ego- principle? We can infer it as the ground of experience and of the form of thought, as the unity of theoretical and practical reason. But Schulze had warned against such reasoning as being contrary to the spirit of the Critique, and Fichte himself sometimes sees no more speculative warrant for assuming a spiritual ground than a material ground. He offers several there lines of argument in support of his idealism. One of them is inspired by the main insight of Kant’s ethical philosophy, and ends its way to basic principle through the moral law. Fichte shares Kant’s view of the insufficiency of the intellect: we cannot grasp the living reality by the discursive understanding with its spatial, temporal, causal ways of thinking; Only when we have seen through the nature of ordinary knowing, detected its superficiality and relativity, can we grasp the living behind the surface: freedom, the moral world order, and God. Existence does not follow from the bare concept of the most real being: we cannot spin out of an arbitrary idea the existence of an object corresponding to it. In the cosmological proof, we conclude from the idea of all possible experience the existence of a necessary being. God alone can be conceived as such a being. We have no right, however, to conclude that because we think there must be an absolute Being, such a Being exists. This is really the ontological proof over again. Moreover the argument proceeds from the contingent to a cause. Such an inference has no meaning outside of the phenomenal world, but in the cosmological proof it is used transcend experience, which is forbidden. Kant points out that the argument contains a nest of dialectical assumptions. It may be permissible to assume the existence of God as the cause of all possible effects, in order to assist reason in the search for the unity of cause, but to say that such a being necessarily exists is not the modest language of legitimate hypothesis, but he impudent assurance of apodictic certainty. The abyss between the contingency of the phenomenal world and the absolute necessity of God can never be bridged by
the human reason. The physic-theological argument infers the existence of a supreme being from the nature and arrangement of the actual world. It too fails. The manifoldness, order and beauty of the world, it tells us, entitle us to infer a cause of its origin and continuance. Such a cause must possess a higher degree of perfection than any possible experience of ours. What is to prevent us from conceiving all possible perfection as united in this Supreme cause as one single substance? The proof deserves respect; it is the oldest and clearest, and most in conformity with human reason. It discerns purposes and ends in nature, although our observation without its guidance would not have detected them. Nevertheless, we cannot approve of its pretension to apodictic certainty. It is an argument by analogy, inferring from the similarity between natural products and worked of human art, such as houses, ships, clocks, that a similar causality, namely, understanding and will, lies at the bottom of nature. If we must name a cause, we cannot do better than to follow the analogy of such products of human design, in which alone we know completely both cause and effect. The argument is, at least, not guilty of surrendering a causality which is known, and having recourse to obscure and inadmissible principles of explanation which are not known. It is however not conclusive; it can, best establish a world-architect, who would be much hampered by the resistance of the material with which he has to work; but it cannot establish a world-creator to which everything is subject. The physic-theological proof, in so far as it proceeds from the character of experience to its ultimate cause, is reducible to the cosmological proof, which in turn, is merely the disguised ontological proof. The ontological proof would be the only legitimate proof if, indeed any proof were possible. The logical weaknesses of the ontological argument have been amply shown and with the collapse of this argument the other two fall also.

Outside the field of experience, the principle of causality cannot be employed and has no meaning. All synthetic principles of the understanding are applicable immanently only, that is, in the phenomenal realm; to arrive at knowledge of a Supreme Being, we must them transcendentally, and for this our understanding is not prepared. Even if we should allow the causal leap beyond the limits of experience, we could not reach a concept for a Supreme Being because we never experience the greatest of all possible effects from which to conclude the supreme cause. Transcendental theology has an important negative use, however; it acts as a constant censor of our reason and not only cuts the ground from under claims of deistic of anthropomorphic theology, but undermines atheism as well.
George Bentham
(1748-1832)
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Ethics
Utilitarian Ethics of Bentham-
Utilitarianism as an ethical theory was developed by Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) within the psychological and philosophical framework of British empiricism. Bentham was greatly indebted to the classical British empiricists, especially to Hume, for his empirical method, for his psychological analysis of ethical motivation and for the individualism and nominal’s which pervade his ethical and legal theories. Bentham’s primary interest was the theory of the law, and he developed his utilitarianism to provide an ethical basis for legal theory and practices.
He was essentially a reformer whose chief concern was the formulation of an ethical doctrine which would serve as a guide in the moral conduct of the individual, and as the basis for the legislative improvement of society. We must not expect of him systematic ethical theory of the tape expounded by the great moral philosophers. He had little interest in defining his own ethical position in relation to historical positions in ethics. What little criticism he does offer of earlier theories is very general and seeping, and is directed mainly against asceticism and the ethics of sympathy. The ethics of asceticism he summarily dismisses as an inverted hedonism, “approving of actions insofar as they tend to diminish happiness; disapproving of them Insofar as they tend to augment it. Under the caption of the principle of sympathy and antipathy, Bentham criticizes a variety of ethical doctrines ranging from the moral sense theory to the rationalism of “an eternal and unmistakable rule of right.” The charge which he brings against all forms of intuitionist ethics is that they provide no more than a subjective felling as the basis of ethical judgment and the standard of morality.

The Utility and Its Principle:-
From the side of utility’s principle – it is in opposition to asceticism and intuitionism, Bentham offers his own thoughts of utility have been valid and invalid for any activity by the human being. In its nature the site of pleasantness and unpleasantness are arised by the human being. He hastens to explain that “the utility means is the property”. The property may in any stages as
– progressive steps in various circles, achievements in any sides, legal and illegal steps, physical and mental worries, right and wrong etc. have been considered. So utility does not, according to Bentham admit of direct proof; it is so fundamental as to the basis of proof in the moral and legal fields.

The logical ground of all proof is, contends, itself improvable. The only proof of which it admits is of the indirect sort in which consist of showing that all other ethical principles for example, Hence the thoughts of human being throughout the activities in life are principle of utility. The principle of asceticism and the principle of sympathy unwittingly presuppose the principle of utility. The principle of utility equates the good with happiness or pleasure and evil with pain; hence Bentham’s utilitarianism is a version of hedonism, closer, as we shall see, to the crass hedonism of Aristippus than to the more refined hedonism of Epicurus. He is not only an ethical hedonist by virtue of his employment of the pleasure principle as the standard for conduct as right or wrong, good or evil but is also a psychological hedonist in that he acknowledges desire for pleasure and aversion to pain as the sole motives or springs of human action. “Nature” he states at the beginning of his great work, “has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong. On the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne.” Pain and pleasure govern us in everything we do, say or think, and any attempt to separate ourselves from their control will itself be prompted by them. In his further elaboration of the pleasure principle as it operates in ethics and in the system of law, Bentham enumerates four “sanctions” or sources of pleasure and pain; (1) the physical, (2) the political, (3) the social and (4) the religious. Of these four, the physical is the most important indeed he suggests that the other three sanctions are resolvable into the physical. What then, is the value of the enumeration? Apparently the classification of sanctions is of practical rather than theoretical significance; it affords Bentham a convenient guide in seeking out the kinds of motives or incentives which may be employed to lead man to act morally, and thus promotes the practical interest of inculcating moral action. The several sanctions are theoretically and psychologically one in that they all rely on pleasure and pain as the sole springs of action, but they represent four distinct ways of bringing this motivating force into play.

Georg Wilhelm Hegel
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Georg Wilhelm friend rich Hegel was born in Stuttgart in 1770, studied theology and philosophy at Tubingen (1788-1793), and held private tutorships in Switzerland and in Frankfort from 1794 to 1801 he established himself at Jena, receiving a professorship in 1850, which he was compelled to relinquish after the battle of Jena, in 1806.

After serving as the editor of newspaper in Bamberg (1806-1808) and as director of the Gymnasium at Nuremberg (1808-1816), he was called to the professorship of philosophy at Heidelberg and then to Berlin, where he exercised a great influence and won many adherents. In 1831 he died of the cholera. Works - Phenomenology des Ageists 1807; Logic, 1812 -1816 Encyclopedia deer Philosphischen Wissenschaften, 1817; Grundlinien deer Philosophies des Richs, 1821.

Logic and Metaphysics

Logic and Metaphysics- it is appetent that for Hegel logic is the fundamental science, since it reproduces the divine thought- process as it is in itself. Dialectical thought expresses the innermost essence of the universal mind; in such thinking the universal mind knows itself as is. Here thought and being, subject and object, from and content are one. The forms or categories of thought which logic evolves are identical with the forms of reality: they have both logical and ontological, or metaphysical, or metaphysical value. In the essence of things recognizes its own essence, seeing it as in a mirror. Reason so the same everywhere and everywhere the divine reason is at work: the universe, in so far it is real and eternal, is the expression of the thought of God.

Hence it makes no difference where we being. Whether we begin with logic and study the dialectical process in ourselves or with metaphysics and investigate dialectic in the universe, we shall always reach the same results. In logical thinking, pure thought may be said to study itself, since thinker and thought are one; and in the process, the thinker evolves with his thinking. Logic is the science of pure thought, and the other sciences are applications of logic. The philosophy of nature studies the absolute, or universal reason, “in its otherness,” in its self-objectification or self-alienation; the philosophy of mind shows how reason, after subjugating objective nature, returns to itself and thereby achieves self-consciousness. In all instances of the revelation of
reason, whether in nature or in mind, reason appears in an infinite variety of temporal and transitory forms. These accidental shapes showing on the surface are not the subject matter of philosophy. It is the business of philosophy to understand the reason in things, the essence or substance of nature and mind, the eternal harmony and order, the immanent law and essence of nature, the meaning of human institutions and of history, the eternal element shining through the temporal and accidental, the inner pulse beating in the external shapes. Moreover, this reason in things we can know only conceptually, through dialectical or logical thought, and the only knowledge worthy of the name is a priori or philosophical knowledge. The two fields of metaphysics or “applied logic” are philosophy of nature and philosophy of mind.

**Philosophy of Right**

Philosophy of right- The idea, or universal reason, expresses itself not only in nature and in individuals, but in human institutions and in history, in right or law (property, contract, punishment), in morality or conscience, in custom or ethical observances (family, civic society, state). In these institutions and is history reason realizes itself or becomes actual, i.e. appears in external form; in this sense it is called objective reason.

The reason which has produced human institutions is the same as that which seeks to understand them: the reason which has unconsciously evolved law, custom, and the state becomes conscious of the process in the philosophy of right. It is not the function of such a philosophy to tell us what the State ought to be, but to know it as it is, to exhibit the reason immanent in it; a can only be done by dialectical thinking. It is the function of philosophy to show how rational institutions follow from the very idea or nature of right or justice.

In studying institutions, it is possible to explain them historically, to show to what conditions and circumstances social, economic and political they owe their existence. Logic deals with concepts, it show how, in the necessary evolution of our thinking, one concept spring from stage to stage until we reach the highest stage, the culmination and completion of the process, the epitome of all the others. When we think these concepts, we are in the world of true reality, the eternal, imperishable process of the universe. The system of concepts which we think in logic, forms an organic whole and represents the true essence of things. Logic is not merely a subjective process occurring in our minds. It is a relational structure exemplified in the world-process, in nature and in mind, in the individual mind and in the social mind, in the history of the world and in human institutions. In logic, we envisage reason in its purity, in its nakedness; pure
logical thought is not as yet clothed in the garments of a universe. This is what Hegel means when he states that logic has no actual being, and that it only becomes actualized in the thinking processes of man. We are not concerned, in logic with nature, history, or society, but with a system of truths, a world of ideas, as it is in itself. But we can also study thought in its manifestations; we can see how this skeleton or framework takes on flesh and blood. In nature reason reveals itself in its otherness, in its externality in space and in its succession in time. We cannot truly say that the logical idea passes over into nature; the logical idea it nature, nature is form of the logical idea, it is the idea in spatialized and temporalized form. Nature is reason, it is conceptual, it is the logical concept in its externality or “side-by-sideness.” Hegel calls it petrified or unconscious intelligence. Nature is a stage of transition through which the logical idea passes in its evolution into mind spirit; the idea, which embodies itself or is externalized in nature, returns into itself and becomes mind, or spirit; in mind the idea reveals itself to itself. Mind or spirit, passes through dialectical stages of evolution, revealing itself as subjective mind, objective mind, and absolute mind. Subjective mind expresses itself as soul (mind dependent on nature), consciousness (mind opposed to nature), and spirit (mind reconciled with nature in knowledge). Corresponding to these stages, Hegel has the sciences of anthropology, phenomenology, and psychology. The idea, or universal reason, becomes soul in the animal organism. It embodies itself, creates a body for itself, becomes a particular, individual soul, the function and vocation of which is to exercise its peculiar, individuality; it is an unconscious production. This soul, which has fashioned an organic body for itself become conscious of itself, distinguishes itself from its body; consciousness is an evolution from the very principle of which the body is also expression. The function of consciousness is knowledge. It rises from a purely objective stage, in which it regards the sensible object as the most real and truest thing, to a stage in which reason is conceived as the innermost essence of both self-consciousness and objective reality. Mind or spirit in the highest sense unites both functions: it is productive knowing. We really know only what we create or produce. The objects of the spirit are is own products; hence, its essence, especially that of theoretical spirit, consists in knowing. Spirit or intelligence immersed in its objects is perception. No one can speak or write illuminatingly of an object without living in it spiritually, I. e. without intuiting it in the true sense of the term. Knowledge in its highest from is the pure thinking of conceptual reason. Presentation including memory, imagination, association is intermediate between perception and reason. Reason evolves or
unfolds concepts, I. E. conceives by pure thought the self-development of concepts. The understanding or intellect judges, i.e. separates the elements of the concept; reason concludes, i.e. binds together the elements of the concept. In the development of pure thought, theoretical intelligence reflects upon itself, know itself; it becomes reason by recognizing and acknowledging its own rationality. Intelligence or reason is the sole ground of its development; hence, the result of its self-knowledge is the knowledge that its essence is self-determination or will, or practical spirit. Will appears as a particular subject or natural individual striving for the satisfaction of his needs or deliverance from his ills. The will immersed in its impulses in unfree; but when the will acts in accordance with rational and self-conscious purposes, it achieves the only freedom of which man is capable the freedom of rational self-determination.

**Art, Religion and Philosophy**

Art, Religion, and Philosophy- In none of the preceding stages of the development of mind, however, does the universal mind come to know itself as it is, or reach the highest plane of self-consciousness and freedom. In none of them can it be said that thought and being, subject and object, are truly one, or that all the oppositions are fully reconciled. The supreme stage in the evolution of the logical Idea is the Absolute Mind, whose sole purpose and work consist in making manifest to itself its own nature, and which is, therefore, free and unlimited spirit. Every particular subject as a truly knowing subject is such an absolute subject. The absolute mind likewise passes through three stages, revealing itself in the art, the religion, and the philosophy of the human mind.

The absolute mind expresses its essence or truth in the form of intuition in life in all action-motion, ethical and moral thinking and conception or the pure logical concept in philosophy. The mind perceiving its inner essence in perfect freedom is art. The mind imaging it reverently is religion, the mind conceiving and knowing it in thought is philosophy. “philosophy too has no other object than God and is, therefore, essentially rational theology, as well as an enduring worship of God in the service of truth.” Each of the three forms realizes itself in the dialectical process of evolution and has its history; the history of art, the history of religion, and the history of philosophy. In the history of philosophy every great system has its necessary place and represents a necessary stage of logical development. Each system provokes an opposing one; the contradiction is reconciled in a higher synthesis, which in turn, gives rise to new conflicts, and the dialect continues until it reaches its culmination in Hegel himself. The Hegelian philosophy
so its author believes represents the final synthesis in which the Absolute Mind becomes conscious of itself; it recognizes the content of its being in the historical development through which it has passed. Objective reason is realized in a society of free individuals in which each wills the laws and customs of his people. In such a society the individual subordinates his subjective conscience to universal reason; in custom or the ethical observances of his people he finds his universal and true self expressed; he recognizes in the laws his own will and in himself a particularized expression of the laws. The evolution of the ethical spirit into a community of self conscious individuals is the result of the evolution of active reason. After many experiences in society, the individual learns that in willing a universal cause he is willing his own will, and is thus free. The real and the ideal are one here; individual reason accepts universal reason as its own; the individual abandons his subjectivity and subordinates his individual reason to the universal reason, which expresses itself in the consciousness of a people, in the national mind this is institutional morality. The perfect State, which realizes perfect freedom, is the goal and purpose of universal history; progress means the development of the consciousness of freedom. The various peoples and great historical personalities are the instruments by which the universal spirit realizes its ends; every great people has a mission to perform in the divine evolution and can be understood only in the light of the total development of world history. When it has accomplished the purpose of its existence, it is supplanted by more vigorous. The conquest of one nation by another is a confession that the idea which the defeated nation stands is inferior to that of the victorious people; in this very special sense might makes right, physical power and rational justice coincide. War in so far as it is a war of ideas, is justified by Hegel on the assumption that the stronger cause will defeat the weaker and that the progress of humanity is furthered by physical and moral conflict. World history represents an ideological struggle in which the dialectically superior nation triumphs. Providence, or universal reason, makes use of the passions and private interests of individuals to realize universal ends; this is the strategy of the idea; great men are not decisive in history, they are the executives of the reason. In his philosophy history Hegel tries to show how the universal spirit realizes the purposes prescribed by the dialectical evolution of its essence.

Jhon Stuart Mill
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J. S. Mill was the famous philosopher. His father’s name was J. Mill.

J. Mill was secretary of the East India Company and he wrote many subjects as – philosophy, economics, politics, and sociology. He had began the intellectual training of his son during the latter’s infancy, and gave it his careful personal attention. He introduced him to the philosophy of the eighteenth century, and Hartley’s psychology and Bentham’s ethics all of which made a great impression on the boy.

Hartley’s doctrine of the association of ideas became as it had been to his father the guiding principle of Mill’s psychology and kindred studies; while Bentham’s principle of utility, as he himself says, gave unity to his conception of things and a definite shape to his aspirations. In 1823, after a few years spent in travel and in the study of law, Mill entered the service of the East India Company, where he remained until its abolition by Parliament in 1858. In 1865 he was elected to Parliament as a Liberal and served for three years, but his greatest influence on the political life of his country was exercised through his writings.

The external world and the self

John Stuart Mill declares that the existences of things are present and not things in themselves. On the inmost nature of the thinking principle, as well as on the inmost nature of matter, we are and must always remain in the dark. As physical objects manifest themselves to me only through the sensation of which I regard the external objects as the causes, so the thinking principle, or mind, in my own nature makes itself known to me only sensations, the effects of an unknown external cause, how do we come to believe in things independent of us? Mill gives a psychological explanation of our belief, based on memory, expectation, and the laws of association. When I saw the table with a white paper then I shut my eyes or go into another room; I no longer see the paper, but I member it and expect or believe I shall see it the same conditions recur. I from the nation of something permanent, enduring; the so-called external thing is simply the possibility that certain sensations will recur in the same order in which they have occurred. The external world is “a permanent possibility of sensation.” We come to believe that the permanent possibilities are the true realities, and the passing sensations merely the accidents or representations of the possibilities. The belief, then, in external objects is the belief
that sensations may recur. This belief in not an original belief or innate notion, but the result of our experience, an acquired belief, the product of the association of ideas. Mill is not trying to prove that objects are external to us; he is simply trying to account for the fact that, although we experience nothing but a succession of ideas, we are yet able to form the picture of a persisting world of objects outside of consciousness.

I from the notion of something permanent, enduring; the so-called external thing is simply the possibility that certain sensations will recur in the same order in which they have occurred. We find also, in mill’s philosophy, a doctrine of the thing-in-itself—an unknown something or external cause to which we refer our sensations. In spite of his phenomenalism and idealism. Mill cannot entirely relinquish the transcendent substance, or cause of sensations. The world of knowledge is a phenomenal world, but there is, besides, a noumenal world an unknown and unknowable world of things-in-themselves. This doctrine poses a problem which mill does not seriously consider; the problem of the possibility of such a world on his own premises. He speaks of the thing-in-itself as substance and cause, without even inquiring into the possibility of such a view on his definition of substance and cause. If by substance we mean a complex of sensations, and by cause the invariable phenomenal antecedent, how can we speak of something outside of the sensation-series as substance and cause? Mill conception of mind, or the ego, is somewhat vacillating. With Hume and James Mill, he calls mind a series of feeling. He tries to explain our belief in the constancy or permanency of the self as he explained our belief in an external world: it is the belief in a permanent possibility of feelings, and this accompanies our actual feeling. But he sees difficulties in the associationistic conception of mind as a mere succession of feeling and is frank enough to confess them. Many inconsistencies in Mill’s thought such as those pertaining to the thing-in-self and the ego are due to his faithful adherence to the English association-psychology, which he inherited from his father, along with his tacit acceptance, or at least appreciation, of many of the doctrines of the rationalistic thinkers of his time. We shall encounter a similar vacillation in his utilitarian ethical theories.

Ethics

Ethics – In his ethical theories Mill follows, in the main, the traditional English hedonistic school, the most important representatives of which are Locke, Hutcheson, Hume and J.
Bentham (1748-1832). Mill regarded the reading of Dumont’s Trait de legislation, an exposition of Bentham’s principal speculation’s, as in the life of Mill. It is the most issue in the intelligence level of J. S. Mill.

In his Utilitarianism, he aggresses with Bentham that happiness, or the greatest good of the greatest number, is the sum mum bonus and the criterion of morality. He differs from his master, however, on several important points. According to Bentham, the value of pleasure is to be measured by their intelligence, which periodically, surely, unsurely, properly, improperly, clearly, unclearly, ethically, unethically suffer by the generation.

So there is the same to be made in quality; because all of the things are the same in his philosophy. Mill, on the other hand, teaches that pleasures also differ in quality, that those which go with the exercise of intellectual capacities are higher, better than sensuous pleasures, and that persons who have experienced both prefer the higher pleasures, “No intelligent person would consent to be a fool; no instructed person would be an ignoramus”; no person of felling or conscience would consent to be selfish or base. You would not exchange your lot for that of a fool, dunce, or rascal, even if you were convinced that a fool, dunce or rascal is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.” The fool and the pig may think otherwise, but that is because “they only know their side of the question,” the fool Bentham and Mill also agree that we ought to strive for the greatest happiness of the greatest number; but Bentham justifies this on the ground of self-interest, while Mill bases it on the social feelings of mankind the desire for unity with our fellow-creatures. He tells us that utilitarianism requires a man to be as strictly impartial between his own happiness and that of others as if he were a disinterested and benevolent spectator. “In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. To do as one would be done by, and to love one’s neighbor as oneself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality.” Indeed, the greatest happiness principle is a mere form of words without rational signification, unless one person’s happiness on the assumption that it is equal in degree and that proper allowance is made for kind is of exactly as much importance as another’s; Bentham’s dictum, “Everybody to count for one, nobody for more than one,” may be considered an explanatory commentary on the principle of utility.
Mill’s utilitarianism, like many of his other theories, vacillates between opposing views; in addition to the empirical association-psychology with its hedonism, egoism, and determinism, we find leanings towards intuitionism, perfectionism, altruism, and free will. The very inconsistencies of the theory, however, made it attractive to many minds, and there is much in it with which the opposing schools may agree. As Green pointed out, Mill’s version of utilitarianism was of the greatest significance in practice; it substituted a critical and intelligent conformity to conventional moral precepts for a blind and unquestioning one. The theory of the greatest happiness of the greatest number has tended to improve human conduct and character. It has helped men to expand their ideas in a manner beneficial to a wider range of persons; and it has done this, we may add, not because of its hedonistic elements, but because of the emphasis which it placed on universalism; for, after all, what the utilitarian’s were aiming at was the realization of a better social life, in which each man should count for one and no one for more than one. Mill in particular became the philosophical spokesman of liberalism in England, and fought the intellectual battles of democracy. In his world on Liberty and the subjection of Women he insisted on the fullest possible individual rights because he regarded social well-being as inevitably bound up with individual well-being. He pointed out “the importance, to man and society, of a large variety in types of character, and of giving full freedom to human nature to expand itself in innumerable and conflicting directions,” and he regarded the repression of women as a greater loss to the community than to women themselves. In the first edition of his political economy he favored economic individualism, but in time ideal of ultimate improvement went far beyond Democracy” and brought him close to socialism.

While we repudiated with the greatest energy that tyranny of society over the individual which most Socialistic systems are supposed to involve, we yet looked forward to a time when society will no longer be divided into the idle and the industrious; when the rule that they ego do not work shall not eat, will be applied not to paupers only, but impartially to all; when the division of the produce of labor instead of depending, as in so great a degree it now does, on the accident of birth will be made by concert, on an acknowledged principle of justice; and when it will no longer either be, or be thought to be impossible for human begin to exert themselves strenuously in procuring benefits which are not to be exclusively their own, but to be shared with the society they belong to. The social problem of the future, we considered to be, how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action, with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an
equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labor. He had an abiding faith in the possibilities of human nature. “Education, habit and the cultivation of the sentiments, will make a common man dig or weave for his country, as readily as fight for his country.”

**Herbert Spencer**

(1820- )
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Herbert Spencer was born in 1820 at Derby, England, the descendant of a family of teachers. He seems to have inherited his intellectual gifts from his father, who is described as a man of fine culture and independence of thought, and whose example in teaching his pupils to think instead of to memorize, influenced Spencer’s views on education. Owing to the boy’s delicate health, his father did not push him in his work, and we hear that he was inattentive and lazy, stubborn and disobedient in school. He made better progress outside the classroom, under the guidance of his father, who taught him to draw nature, encouraged his desire to make collections, and introduced him to physical and chemical experiments.

Spencer afterwards (1833-1836) received instruction from his uncle, Thomas Spencer, a clergyman of the Established church, a man of public spirit and democratic ideals, who was to prepare him for Cambridge; but Spencer refused to go to a place where things were taught in which he was not interested.

**The External World**

It is not true that we are originally conscious only of sensations, and that from them we infer the existence of external objects. Idealism is a disease of language; it lives only in our words, not in our thoughts. Reason, in so far it undermines the assertions of perception, destroys its own authority. Realism is influential to the persons by rule of conscience, which affected by conditions. It is inconceivable that there should be no object when I feel it and see it. We are compelled to think an extra mental reality, and we are compelled to think it as force, as the objective correlate o the subjective feel of force or feeling of muscular tension, Which we experience in ourselves and which is the universal symbol of the unknowable objective existence or the persisting reality.
This unknown reality is also symbolized in our ideas of space, time, matter, and motion. This transfigured realism, as Spencer calls it, takes the place of crude realism. It holds that the things represented in our consciousness are not images, copies, or pictures, of the objective reality, but symbols which have as little in common with the realities they represent as letters have in common with the psychic states for which they stand. But that there is something beyond consciousness is an inevitable conclusion; to think otherwise is to think of change taking place without an antecedent. “There is some ontological order whence arises the phenomenal order we know as space; there is some ontological order whence arises the phenomenal order we know as time; and there is some ontological nexus whence arises the phenomenal relation we know as difference. Such knowledge of the external world is greatly limited, but it is only knowledge which is of use to us. We do not need to know the outer agencies themselves, but only their persistent relations, and this knowledge we have. An ever-present sense of real existence is the very basis of our intelligence. There ever remains with us a sense of that which exists persistently and independently of the special conditions of our knowledge. We cannot from a conception of this absolute existence; every notion which we frame of it is utterly inconsistent with itself. From the impossibility of getting rid of the consciousness of an actuality; lying behind appearances results our indestructible belief in that actuality.

**Ethics**

In the preface to the Data of Ethics, Spencer declares all the preceding parts of his task as synthetic philosophers to be subsidiary to his principles of morality. His purpose had been, ever since the appearance of his first work. The Proper Sphere of right and wrong in conduct at large. In order to understand the meaning or moral conduct, he tells us, we must comprehend conduct as a whole, The conduct of all living creatures and the evolution of conduct, and we must examine it in its physical, biological, psychological, and social aspects; in other words, study it in the light of the results of the other sciences.

Such a study will lead us to define conduct either as acts adjusted to ends or the adjustment of acts to ends, and will show us that the most highly evolved and, therefore, ethically best conduct is such as makes life richer and longer for the individual, for his offspring and for those among who he lives. The limit of evolution is reached in a permanently peaceful society, in which every member achieves his ends without preventing others from achieving theirs and in which members give mutual help in the pursuit or ends. Whatever facilitates the adjustments of each
member of a society increases the totality of the adjustments made, and serves to render the lives of all more complete. We call acts good or bad which sub serve or hinder life, on the supposition that life brings more happiness than misery. The good is universally the pleasurable. Actions are completely right only when, besides being conducive to future happiness, they are immediately pleasurable. A large part of human conduct is not absolutely right, but only relatively right, because it entails some pain. The ideal code of absolute ethics formulates the behavior of the completely adapted man in the completely evolved society. Such an absolute code will enable us to interpret the phenomena of real societies which in their transitional states, are full of miseries due to non-adaption. This code also provides the basis for approximately true conclusions respecting the nature of the abnormalities of actual societies, and the courses of action which tend most in the direction of the normal. Spencer insists that the well-being of the units and the social groups, and not the welfare of society as a whole is a means to the welfare of the units hence whatever threatens this integrity will injure the units. In the early stage of social evolution, egoism is strong and altruism weak; this explains why the relative moral code emphasizes those restraints on conduct which are entailed by the presence of fellow-men. The moral code prohibits acts of aggression and impose restraints on the individual in the interest of cooperation, and enjoins spontaneous efforts to further welfare. The root of both justice and beneficence is sympathy. Since the ideal is the greatest amount of individual perfection and happiness, egoism inevitably precedes altruism; each creature enjoys the benefits and must be prepared to endue the evils consequent upon his own nature, in herited or acquired. But altruism, too is essential to the development of life and the increase of happiness, and self-sacrifice is no less primordial then self-preservation. The egoistic satisfactions of each unit in a society depend on such altruistic actions as being just, seeing justice done, upholding and improving the agencies for the administration of justice and improving others physically, intellectually, and morally. Pure egoism and pure altruism are equally illegitimate. With increasing social discipline, sympathetic pleasures will come to be pursued spontaneously and will be found advantageous to each and all. Eventually, a utopian equilibrium will be achieved in which every member of society will be eager to surrender his egoistic claims, while others, by virtue of their altruism, will not permit him to do so. Spencer offers an evolutional hedonism, which combines the hedonistic teaching of traditional English utilitarianism with the emphasis upon survival and adaptation of the new theory of evolution. This combined ethical theory is possible because, in his opinion, the most
highly evolved conduct yields the greatest amount of happiness. He also distinguishes his rational utilitarianism from the empirical utilitarianism of his predecessors; his system of ethics is rational in that he deduces the rules of morality from the fundamental principles supplied by the various sciences. The ethical ideal, is the production of perfect and happy individuals, the survival of the fittest individuals and the spread of the best adapted varieties. This end can only be realized when each individual receives the benefits and the evils of his own nature and of his consequent conduct. But since group-life is essential to the restriction that it shall not in any large measure impede the like conduct of others. In the case of defensive war, individuals may be further restricted, even to the extent of having to sacrifice their lives. Justice, therefore, demands that each mature man be free to do what he will, provided he infringe not on the equal freedom of any other man. Rights, truly so-called, are corollaries of the law of equal freedom; every man has the right to act up to a certain limit, but not beyond it. From these premises Spencer argues against the modern socialist state. All embracing state functions, he holds, characterize a low social type; and progress to a higher social type is marked by the relinquishing of functions. The incorporated body of citizens has to maintain the conditions under which each may gain the fullest possible life compatible with the fullest lives of his fellow-citizens. The state must prevent internal aggression and protect its members from foreign invasion; when it goes beyond that, it transgresses justice. Extension of state functions has always proved disastrous, and only legislation which has been guided by considerations of equity has proved successful. Moreover, the various non-governmental agencies work best under the stress of competition. Competition impels them to make improvements, to utilize the best available techniques, and to secure the best men for public service. The social and economic needs of men are best served in this way. Finally, state interference has an evil effect on the moral character of the individual. The nature which we have inherited from an uncivilized past, and which is still very imperfectly fitted to the partially civilized present, will, if allowed to do so, slowly adjust itself to the requirements of a fully civilized future. The discipline of social life which has accomplished so much in these few thousand years, will, in the course of time, work without state control and interference. There is ample evidence to show that artificial molding is incapable of accomplishing as much as natural molding. Spencer is bitterly opposed to socialism in all its forms. He approves mutual cooperation; indeed, he believes that a voluntary cooperation characteristic of industrialism will in the end prevail. He is committed to the laissez faire theory in the social, economic and
political spheres, and believes that the general happiness can be realized only by letting individuals work out their own salvation, without undue interference by the state.

**To Sum up- Conclusion**

To sum up, we can conclude that according to history of western ancient and modern philosophy suffers, just as it is for the general historian. The detachment and temporal perspective requisite to the historical enterprise are unattainable, and the historian cannot be confident that his decisions regarding the inclusion and exclusion of contemporary figures and the apportionment of space to contemporary movements will seem justified even for the next decade. He cannot, however, avoid exercising the historian’s prerogative of deciding which tendencies and figures of the present are like to find a place in future histories of philosophy.

Professor thinly was remarkably successful in appraising the contemporary state of philosophy in 1914, and it is hoped that the present revision of his work achieves an equally adequate appraisal of the philosophy of the present a door the future.