CHAPTER –V
Conclusion and Suggestion

Recommendation, summary, limitations and scope

Recommendation,

According to this chapter some of the point vise particulars are given before as –towards can say that philosophies of life involving differences in emphasis in regard to different value-bearing forms of life.

The present writer’s approach to religion is humanistic. This approach involves the following assumption.

Like all other values, moral, aesthetic and intellectual, religious values are intrinsic to nature. Their consciousness arises out the perception and appreciation of the lives of religious persons. The lives of such persons are characterized by greater contentment, tranquility and peace on the one hand, and more active kindliness and friendliness towards fellow humans on the other.

The religious attitude and values proceed rather they derive from the scriptures. It is the presence of this attitude in man that makes him responsive to the call of prophets and scriptures. In this respect religious attitude and values are analogous to moral values. The Greeks developed a high sense of moral values and ideals without having in possession of any scriptures.

Moral values being less controversial them religious values if instructive to study how our sense of moral values grows and develops. In the first instance the moral philosophers and social thinkers of a community attempt to systematize and express the moral attitudes and perceptions prevailing in the society; by so doing they constitute themselves into the elite functioning as law-givers and regulators of moral life. Secondly, the moral sense of a community develops and grows under the impact of the geniuses in the moral line. These geniuses stress and accentuate the nobler attitudes and values with which the people are already familiar, though in a vague and inarticulate form. Moral attitudes an perceptions in a society also change and develop through interaction with other societies.

I suggest that our attitude towards religious values should be analogous to that towards moral values. The greatest obstacle to the adoption of this attitude is the fact that the followers of different religions, particularly the higher religions, believe each to be in possession of infallible scriptures. This prejudice, it may be noted, is exclusive to religion. Religious prophets are
supposed to be bearers of superhuman inspiration and the teachings of the scriptures are considered to be complete and ultimate truth by the votaries of different religions. This attitude constitutes an insuperable obstacle to the growth of liberalism in religious thought and to interreligious understanding. If the truths taught by different religions are divergent, it is obvious that they cannot all be true together and in the literal sense. It is difficult indeed to explain what truth means in the context of different values. In what sense may the Dhammapada or the “sermon on the mount” claim to be true? Beliefs about god and minor goods, indeed, if interpreted literally, admit of being characterized as true of false; that hardly applies to moral, aesthetic and even religious valued. These values may claim a sort of validity in the sense that they are relevant of the life and happiness of man.

According to the Indian conception men and women different in temperament, taste and intellectual power; accordingly, different types of religious discipline suit them. The scientific word-view has made people unwilling to accept religious dogmas particularly those relation to the factual world. The modern tendency is to look upon such teaching as in some sense mythological or allegorical. As regards values an spiritual discipline the teaching of different scriptures may be complementary rather than confliction; they give expression to various facets of the spiritual; dimension of man’s life.

The rational attitude, sanctioned by enlightened common sense and supported by the cultural history of man, is to look upon the scriptures as vital records of the spiritual insights of the religious geniuses belonging to different ages and cultures. Every such record was intended to benefit the whole of mankind for all time to come, but each of them was particularly suited the needs of the people to whom it was given. The modern man should have the courage and wisdom to declare himself to be the heir of all the cultural treasures of the world, including the religious scriptures. He should make use of this treasure with discrimination, as an instrument for enriching and ennobling the individual and social life of man in the modern age real and fruitful understanding among religious, it is submitted, can come only if the leaders of thought in different religious camps adopt a truly scientific and liberal attitude towards their own and other religions. Recently, there has been a good deal of talk of dialogue among religions. It is doubtful, however, if such a dialogue can succeed in promoting true understanding and harmony among religions unless the adherents of different religions are willing to shed of their unscientific and uncritical bias in favor of certain scriptures and dogmas.
I believe that new geniuses continue to appear the sphere of religion no less than in others cultural fields. The new geniuses may differ from the previous ones in the content of their beliefs as well as in their modes of life. In the present day over-populated world it is difficult to come across forests where hermit and anchorites may be permitted to live in secluded abodes. Moreover, the moral sense of the modern man tends to attach greater value to the service of man than to communion with supernatural beings or powers in solitude. It is noteworthy that saints of the medieval type have almost saintly persons produced by modern west, albert, shcweitxer, was revered more because of the services he rendered to suffering humanity in Africa than for the worship he might have offered to god in his home or the church. Similar remarks would apply to mahatma Gandhi. In addition to being a devoted servant of the lower strata of humanity, Schweitzer was a savant and a thinker of high caliber and not a man of simple faith. Likewise Gandhi claimed the liberty to interpret scriptures in his own way, and with a sure instinct for what was likely to appeal to the modern mind, tended to equate god with truth or to look upon truth as constituting the very essence of godhead.

As a religious genius responding to the needs and predilections of his own age, Gandhi indentified religion with service of the lowly and the weak among the humans.

**Summary:-**

Early Greek thinkers and their criticism of religion

Early Greek thinkers were free thinkers. They tried to explain things according to natural causes like earth, water, fire and air. They were not very respectful about their supernatural gods. They criticized their religions on account of

1. Anthropomorphism of gods and goddesses.
2. Also because of their immoral conduct.
3. Also on account of polytheism.

Xenophanes (570-480 b.c.) rejected polytheism in favour of monotheism and the Orphic theory of the transmigration of the soul. Heraclitus (525-475 b.c.) rejected the gods as taught by Hesiod. Democritus (460-360 b.c.) traced the worship of gods due to fear. Anaxagoras, Protagors, Socrates and Aristotle were deemed anti-religious. The Epicureans denied the concern of gods of men and the religious belief in post-morten existence. Let us elaborate the points raised here.

Xenophanes protested against polytheism and the immorality of gods and goddesses, as was taught by homer and Hesiod. He accused the religious worshippers as anthropomorphic thinkers.
If oxen and horses could worship and paint their gods, then they would do so as oxen and horses. The Ethiopians make their gods black and snub-nosed; the Thracians say theirs have blue eyes and red hair.

Most probably Xenophanes conceived his god monotheistically as a world-god his religion might have been pantheistic.

Heraclitus did not accept Homeric and Hesiodic gods and goddesses. Such deities, according to him, were due to ignorance.

Athenians regarded the sun and moon as divinites. Even Plato and Aristotle did not cease from thinking so. Anaxagoras held that the sun was constituted of red-hot stones and the moon of earth. Hence, he be-deified the sun and moon.

Protagoras was really skeptical about the existence of gods. He considered the subject-matter of gods as obscure and no sure knowledge could be claimed about divine existence. However, he recommended the acceptance of popular religious beliefs as a measure of prudence.

The Epicureans taught that there are gods like human beings, but they are not concerned about human beings. They eat, drink and enjoy themselves. Besides, the Epicureans being atomists, denied the possibility of post-mortem existence of human beings. Men come into being by the suitable combination of atoms and die because of their dissolution. Hence, there is no question of survival of human beings in their next life. Their aphorism is:

*When we are, death is not yet; and where death comes, there we are not.*

In Greek thinking, ‘knowledge is perception’ was held by the atomists and the sophists. Protagoras and Gorgias are important for holding this theory. In the same way Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are the chief critics of the theory that knowledge is perception.

According to Democritus, knowledge is due to the motion of atoms perception and thought, both are due to the collision of atoms. In perception the atomic motion is coarse and rough. In thought this motion is fine and gentle. Hence, perception and thought do not differ in kind, but only in degree. Hence, thought and perception are of one kind. Therefore, one can say that knowledge is perception. But what kind of motion is perception? In perception there is the motion from external objects to the sense-organs of the percipient. Hence, perception is due to the joint action of external objects and perceiving sense-organs of the percipient. First, perception is not of the external object, nor of the percipient. But it is what appears to the perceiving subject, and, for him alone, at the moment is appears. As such each man is the measure of what appears to him
true at the moment of its occurrence. This is known as the doctrine of homo measure. Man is the measure of all things, of what is, that is, of what is not, that it is not. No two persons perceive alike, not even the same person at different moments of time. Hence, perception is momentary and relative. This interpretation of homo measure leads to skepticism and nihilism in the writings of gorgian. Gorgias maintains three statements.

There is nothing.

Even if there be anything, it cannot be known.

Whatever is know, cannot be communicated.

By ‘a thing’ is meant a plurality of things, moved and moving one another. But zeno has already shown that plurality and motion are illusory. Hence there is nothing which can be perceived.

Again, whatever we perceive is not the external object in itself, nor is it due to the perceiving subject. Hence, we do not know what the perceived object is. Further, when we speak or communicate, then use some predicate about a subject. For example,

‘This table is black.’

But ‘table’ and ‘black’ are not the same thing. Hence whatever we say about the perceived table, then we say something about it what it is not.

Hence, there is nihilism, for there is nothing to know. Whatever we know is not the real thing, but its momentary perception. Finally, we cannot really communicate our knowledge. Hence, there is complete perception.

For Socrates and plato, knowledge means what is universal and valid, that is, consistent and free from contradiction. But knowledge cannot be perception according to the definition of knowledge. Perception is momentary and relative to different persons. What is sweet in health is not so in sickness and fever. But knowledge is always of something for someone. But as elaborated by gorgias, there is nothing to perceive and there is no knower who remains the same for all moments of time.

The doctrine of ‘knowledge is perception’ blurs the distinction between truth and falsity. If what a mad man imagines, and, what a new born child sees and what a brute perceives and what a healthy man senses be equally true, then quite obviously there can be no distinction between what is true and what is false.

Further, if we open one eye and close the other, then we know with one eye and do not know through the other eye. Hence, the same man knows and does not know at the same time.
Finally, what appears to one be true, then what appears to the opponent of the sophist as false becomes false. Hence, the teaching of homo mensure appears false to others. So it is false. Indirectly here there is the ‘liar’s paradox’ which looms large in the philosophy of Russell. It all opinions and appearances be equally true, then it would lead to self-contradicting statements. It objects exist at one moment and cease to be at the next, then it means that everything is and is not. If a thing is perishing, there must be something which perishes. Against the sophists, Aristotle observes that no sense contradicts itself at the same moment about the same object. Further, the apparent is always apparent to someone, at the time when, to the sense, under the conditions in which it appears.

‘Evil’ becomes a problem when some sort of theism is maintained. If god be infinitely omnipotent and good, then why should be any evil at all. As plato and Aristotle did not have explicit theism in their philosophy, so this problem was not very serious for them. For plato, there was the intractable matter which accounts for evil in the universe. For Aristotle, moral evil is due to the overpowering of the intellect by appetites and passion. But this is a human problem when a man fails to have a settled habit of will in controlling passions through the regulative power of reason. The first serious problem arises with stoicism.

The stoics believed in god who is the word-reason endowed with intellect and will. Thus god is the creator of the world. So the question is; why has god created evil, when he is the reason of the world? he is also to be taken as good and benevolent; then why is there evil at all? There are natural evils and also moral falls. The stoics give the following answer.

First, the stoics deny that there is any evil at all. Only form a partial viewpoint, a thing may appear evil, but form the view of the whole thing, there is no evil at all. Natural evils, in the form of earthquakes and cyclones, disease and old age, have served as a challenge for men to understand and conquer them. Without such evils man would not have made any advance at all. Secondly, evil is a foil to the good. Even a shadow in the moon, enhances the beauty of the full moon. In any work of art, dark points are as necessary as the beautiful parts. Even moral excellence is not possible with the conquest of trials and temptations.

As a general observation theism, the stoic solution is healthy, but the problem gets deeper in the Christian theism of st. Augustine and st. Thomas.

St. Augustine admits that god is omnipotent and infinitely beneficent. Then why is there evil at all? St. Augustine’s solution and philosophy is wholly theological. According to him, god has
established the church which teaches the way to find rest and happiness in god. But can man by his own efforts follow the way to secure his ultimate good? No. because in Adam all have sinned, and, only through the grace of god, men will regain their lost free will. With the restored free will men can overcome their worldly nature.

The solution of st. Augustine concerning the original sin is wholly unacceptable to the moderners. Again, the loss of free will to the vast majority of unchristian men in their unrepentant state is too narrow and a sectarian view. Finally, the view of st. Augustine is wholly theological and of not much concern for philosophy. In contrast the view of st. Thomas is of far greater importance.

St. Augustine was a Platonist, but he rejected the platonic explanation of evil due to matter. For st. Augustine, everything has been created by god, even matter. So if evil is due to matter, then god, becomes directly responsible for evil. Hence, for st. Augustine, evil is not really positive but privative, for in due course, thorough the grace of god it (evil) disappears. But pain is not less painful and less miserable by calling it ‘privative’. As long as it lasts, it continues to be evil. Erigena (c. 810-77) does not see this point.

Jhon scotus Erigena adopts the platonics philosophy of pantheism. According to four phases of the universe, the world emanates from god and ultimately returns to him. So all is god, and god is all. Hence, evil also is god. Erigena contents himself by calling evil as privative and not positive. But mere verbal solution does not take away the real pain. However, this pantheistic solution teaches the resignation of man to the inevitable, as was taught and practiced by spinoza and Sigmund freud.

According to st. Thomas, god is good and he had created this world to communicate his goodness to it. Of course, the goodness of god means his omnipotence, omniscience and benevolence. Naturally, why this kind of god has created evil? St. Thomas denies that a good god can create evil. Man is responsible. St. Thomas, gives the following explanation of evil.

First, for st. Thomas, evil is not a positive but a privative entry. Hence, god is not responsible for the mere absence of good. But st. Thomas fails to recognize that even a privative evil is evil. If a painter paints a woman without the eyes, then is it not a significant omission? Is it not an ugly thing in the painting? Hence, the doctrine of privative evil is no explanation at all.

2. Secondly, st. Thomas observes that natural evils are inevitable in a world of hierarchical order, where the lower has to serve the higher.
3. Besides, the world is just like a work of art, and, in such a work some imperfection is necessary to enhance the excellence of the whole e.g. the presence of a villain in a tragedy. Hence in working out a good universe on the whole, some evil has to be permitted, even when god does not will it. This point is more relevant in relation to moral evil.

4. For St. Thomas, moral evil is due to the perversity of human will. God in creating man has given him the greatest gift of free will. But free choice has no meaning unless the possibility of choosing wrong be also allowed. However god’s purpose in granting free will is that man should perfect his will by voluntarily surrendering it to the will of god.

Our will are ours, so that by surrendering it to the will of god, human wills may become deeper and perfect. But few become holy by submitting themselves to god. Their achievement far outweighs the failure of many who fall into moral lapses. Thus, god does not will, nor does he create moral evil, but he has to permit moral evil in the hope of the emergence of holy wills.

The problem relating to the relationship between philosophy and theology has arisen in medieval philosophy. The relationship was first hinted at by St. Augustine and afterwards was detailed by St. Thomas and was refined by scotus and Occam.

For St. Augustine, reason and faith, understanding and belief are supplementary. But belief is more important than understanding. His formula was creds ut intelligam (I believe that I may understand).

Some things we do not believe unless we understand them, others we do not understand unless we believe.

Thus, for St. Augustine, reason and faith may co-operate with one another. This was elaborated by St. Thomas and others.

For St. Thomas, reason and faith supplement one another and they are in no way opposed. But they are distinguishable.

Philosophy comes under the domain of natural light of reason. Whereas, theology dealing with Christian faith rests on revelation.

Philosophy, being constituted by human reason, starts its enquiry with created things which are the effects due to god as their cause. In contrast, the theologian has his starting-point in revealed truths and he deduces the world of things form revealed truths.

Philosophy (reason) and theology (faith) do not oppose one another. The objections against revealed truths and their defence are carried out by philosophy. On the other hand, philosophical
knowledge of earthly things is supplemented by the deeper knowledge of higher spiritual things. For example, philosophy can tell us how to reach happiness, but theology tells us how to expect blessedness in the vision of god. Philosophy is the domain of wise men, but theology is pursued by the saints.

For St. Thomas, the creatorship of god, the doctrine of trinity, incarnation of Jesus, the doctrine of original sin, last judgment and such articles of faith come under theology. They are fully understood only by the grace of god. These theological teachings are not contrary to reason. Further, theology based on revelation is higher than philosophy.

The synthesis of philosophy and theology worked out by St. Thomas was short-lived. Roger Bacon (c. 1214-94) separated science and philosophy from theology, even though he regarded theology should not interfere with the investigation of nature by science and philosophy. Further, scotus (1274-1308) separated philosophy from theology. For him, philosophy confined to reason, is incapable of knowing and understanding the articles of faith. But he also upheld the superiority of theology over philosophy. For scotus philosophy cannot establish that god is a living god, not the mystery of creation. Both are certain within their own domain of faith and revelation. But the certainty of philosophy is theoretical, and that of theology is practical (i.e. with regard to one’s conduct). But the separation of philosophy and theology made them opposed to one another, and, this paved the way of conflict between science and religion. Occam even criticized the attempt of reason to establish the existence of god. Thus, philosophy and theology really came in conflict and the synthesis between them of Thomist philosophy was destroyed.

If we date the beginning of Greek philosophy with Thales (624-550 b.c.) and Anaximander (611-547 b.c.), then they can be declared as free thinkers. They tried to explain natural phenomena with the help of natural causes. They did not take the help of supernatural gods. Hence Greek philosophy is called scientific in spirit. But man can hardly do without religion. Hence, there was also a strong under-current of religion in Greek life and thought.

There were two kinds of religion in the 6th century b.c, first, there were Olympian gods who were concerned with human beings, but were pictured with human passions and weaknesses. This kind of Olympian gods pictured by homer was mixed with Hesiodic gods. Hesiod is supposed to have flourished about eighth century b.c. Hesiod provided his religious mythology with cosmogony and theology. For the Greek, Homeric and Hesiodic gods were quite popular, but along with the anthropomorphic gods, there was the mystery cult of Dionysus. The Dionysian
religion practiced rituals through which the initiated sought unity with their god of worship. This mystery ritual is the basis of Christian sacrament. Later on, this Dionysian cult of mystery was reformed by Orpheus. Orphism influenced Pythagoras and through him Socrates, Plato and Plotinus. The essentials of orphism have marked kinship with Indian thought. Orphism rests its case on revelation, contained in some sacred book. We know nothing of this book. But Indian thought very frequently refers to the sacred books called the Vedas. Orphism also maintains that man in his pristine existence was glorious, but now in this world, he is in a fallen state. This is also maintained in Indian thought specially, in Jainism, Nyaya and Vedanta. Orphism advises purificatory rites and ascetic practices as a means of release from the cycle of rebirths. This is also in common with Indian thought, specially Jainism, Buddhism and Vedanta. The above-mentioned point means that orphism maintains the doctrine of the wheel of rebirths and perhaps also of transmigration of the soul into animals. Indian thought strongly favours the doctrine of rebirth and also the majority of thinkers belief in transmigration. Plato and Plotinus believe in efficacy of contemplation (on the good, Plato) as a means of becoming good and even release from the wheel or bondage of rebirths. This doctrine of contemplation (specially Dhyana, Samadhi and nididhyasana) leads to release from the cycle of rebirths in Indian thought. Plotinus was greatly influenced by Indian sages whom he met in Persia. Naturally, Plotinus maintains even the ontology of advaitism. Orphians were vegetarians. This is also in harmony with the dominant Indian thought. However, Greek and Indian thought are expected to be independent and parallel developments of thought. In due course, the Greek thought favoured science and mysticism ceased to the popular cult in the west. In contrast, religious thought occupied the major segment in Indian specylation. Though it was never bereft of logic and science. In Greek and medieval philosophy, the doctrine of universals has been variously held. The most important doctrine is of Plato. According to plat, universals (or ideas or forms) exist independently of particulars or any mind whatsoever (whether divine or individual mind). They are real in themselves and are eternal entities. This doctrine of universals are as objective as
individual things are. He preferred to call them ‘forms’. For example, cowness is as objective to
the observer as the individual cows are. But where did he differ from plato? Aristotle held that
universals do not exist apart from the individual things, e.g. redness does not exist apart form the
red roses. Take away the red things, and, no redness will be found summary of some important
topics.

Anywhere. It is doubtful that Aristotle held that universals are found in human minds. However,
st, Thomas held:
Universals exist in divine mind eternally.
Universals exist objectively in particular things.
They exist in human minds as abstracted common and essential attributs. But the third important
doctrine, called conceptualism holds that universals the attributes of particular things. For
example, cowness is a concept which is fromed by observing a number of cows and by
abstracting from them the essential and common attributes found in them. Thus, a universal is a
concept formed by abstracting the common and essential attributed found in particular,
universals do not exist. Thus conceptualism is very much akin to the view of Aristotle.
The fourth theory is of Roscelin (1050-1120) known as nominalism which denies that universals
have any existence apart from any individual objects, or, that they are ojective like individual
things. Hence, nominalism refutes both plato, Aristotle and conceptualism. Nominalism is
supposed to have been first profounded by Roscelin, but it was powerfully defended by Occam
(1280-1347). For nominalism, universals are mere names. Universals are not in invididuals (as
Aristotle supposed) nor in any mind whatsoever as conceptualism supposes. Of individual things,
is an absurdity for nominalism.
The different views about universals have very great hearing on Christian theology. Christian
theology initially adopted Platonism, i.e. Platonic realism, according to which ideas are eternally
real. Now God is eternally real, and, therefore, the idea of a perfect being is also eternally real.
For this reason, St. Anselm deduced the actual existence of God from the Idea of a perfect being
called God. Similary, trinity. For nominalism ‘trinity’ is only a word and father-son-Holy Ghost
are three separate persons. This is known as tritheim of triadlism. Hence, nominalism denies the
cosubstantiality of God and Jesus. This remains opposed to tradnitional Christian theology even
now.
Secondly, Platonic realism holds that ideas are rational. The world is constituted of ideas. So the world is rational. Hence, faith can be reasoned out. The doctrine of original sin is based on the teaching of one common substantiality of man, because the idea of man is real, substantial and eternal. Hence in one man Adam, all men have sinned. Adam disobeyed God and so through his disobedience the once common humanity, which runs through all men, has sinned. Hence the reality of original sin follows from the one substantiality of all men. Similarly, through the grace of God.

Finally, there is one church universal which particular churches try to follow, copy or in which they all participate. This one church universal is Roman Catholic Church which alone is empowered to save all mankind. Hence, the sole authority of Roman Catholic Church came to be established.

For nominalism there is no Platonic realism. Universals do not exist in individual things, nor in any mind. Universals are mere names, verbal sounds. Hence, according to nominalism. There is no trinity and really means tritheism.

Similarly, there is no universal man. Individual men alone exist. Hence, there is no co-substantiality of all men. Hence, there is no original sin, for by the sin of one man Adam, other men cannot be called sinners. Similarly by the redemptive death of one man called Jesus, all believers cannot be said to have been redeemed. Only individual believers can be redeemed by the grace of God.

As particulars alone are real, so there can be no one Universal Roman Catholic Church. Thus universals and their denials have a good deal importance for Christianity.

Towards summary we can say—according to the present writer all the values pursued by man are comprehensible under the terms culture and civilization. It follows from this that the aim of education is to equip the individual with the understanding, and to inculcate in him the attitudes, habits and dispositions, that would enable him to play a worthy role in the preservation, growth and advancement of man’s culture and civilization. The total territory of that life, the continually growing and developing intellectual life of man no less than his aesthetic, moral and religious life.

To philosophy again is assigned the task of investigating the larger principles which determine the onward march or retardation of that life. One of the principles of the growth of man’s conscious spiritual life seems to be critical tendencies in his cultural self. To a discerning student
of the history of philosophy our own age would appear to be predominantly critical, particularly with respect to moral and religious life the ruling philosophies of our time concentrate their attention on the analyses of thought and language; they seldom concern themselves with the normative problems relating to moral and religious life. Important personalities of our time belong mostly to the realms to science and politics; such personages a Gandhi and Albert Schweitzer are no more than exception in the present-day world.

We may now draw come conclusions as regard the proper approach to and attitude towards our heritage in philosophical thought. Our first conclusion is that for adequate equipment and preparation for philosophizing it is not merely desirable but necessary and essential to acquaint ourselves with major developments in the history of philosophy.

Three reasons may be given in support of this conclusion.

The whole range and variety of a particular department of spiritual experience available to man is unfolded only in the course of its historical growth and development. A person who has studied Valmiki and Kalidasa, Homer and Dante, Shakespeare, Dostoevesky and Tolstoy is likely to have a better acquaintance with the extent and variety of esthetic experience embodied in literature than one who is familiar only with such modern authors as T.S. eliot and James Joyce. In this connection another important point may be noted. Certain types of emotional-aesthetic experience are more thoroughly realized by artists belonging to one age than by those belonging to one age than by those belonging to another age.

Thus the sort of moral conflict depicted by Bhavabhuti in Uttararamacharitam and Shakespeare in king Lear is not likely to be represented with equal intensity by any artist in contemporary world or in future. The reason is that the pattern of conflict world or in future. The reason is that the pattern of conflict characteristic of one age is in some respects too unique and individual to be repeated on another age. Analogously some aspects of moral and religious life may be more intensely realized in one age than in another. Thus the moral and or religious consciousness of our time may in some respects be different in its emphasis on one or other constituent element than the consciousness that prevailed during, say the Upanishad rimes or the time of the Buddha. It follows from this that we can visualize or imagine certain forms of aesthetic, moral or religious response to day only on the basis of their representation in ancient literature.

This is not yet to say that the experience has ceased to be meaningful and valid for us to day. A modern lover’s feeling towards his beloved may be considerably different from those of the
Yaksha depicted by Kalidasa in the Meghadutam; and yet the fact that I am able to thoroughly enjoy reading that poem, shows that the sentiments delineated in it are not inaccessible to the modern man.

The philosophical questions that engage, or should engage us today have gradually grown in complexity and significance. The first-order problems of philosophy have something in them that makes them perennially interesting to us. This is the reason why the descriptions of religious wisdom and of perfect life presented in such inspired works and the all Indian religious book all thoughts of rishi munies and philosophers with Mahayana Sutras continue to fascinate us. And the perplexing questions about the nature of beauty, justice, knowledge, etc. Raised by Socrates and plato, to puzzie us. Only through the study of the development of a problem and of the attempts at its solution can realize the full weight and fascination of it.

It may be plausibly asserted that the answering of question or the soling of problems is not the only exclusive aim of philosophical thought. One of its aims, to be sure, is quickening of our inner conscious life, which is secured by the exposure of our psyche to the complexities and the expanse of an particular domain of spiritual life or experience. Man achieves fullness of life not merely by operating his sense and even his intellect; he secures richness of experience and response by throwing himself imaginatively into patterns of lived experience represented in symbols by creative personalities in the different fields. This sort of enrichment of life cannot at all be achieved by those who would shut themselves off from the realm of spiritual history.

**Limitation:-**

For the side of limitation here e may note the type resemblance that obtains between art and literature on the one hand and philosophy on the other in respect of their continuing appeal in different age. Though the life represented in ancient literature, e.g., cannot be the actual life of the modern man, still it interests us as potentiality realizable by the acts of our imagination, which is a unique instrument at our disposal contributing to the richness of our affective and cognitive responses.

Another factor in ancient literature, which is forever enjoyable, is the ingenuity displayed and the structural beauty attained by the artist or author in his work. Similarly, and old philosophical treatise affords us pleasure partly by the expansion and sharpening of our vision with respect to the significant aspects of the spiritual experience explored by it; and partly by the inventiveness and resourcefulness displayed by its author in the analysis and interpretation of the experience in
question. In addition, a philosophical author delights us by the brilliance and ease with which he succeeds in discrediting the rival vies and defending his own position particularly if that rival position happens to be one which is still championed, either as a main doctrine or as an auxiliary tenet, by one some contemporary thinkers.

**Scope for future:**

Towards scope for future we may now more precisely indicate the criteria that should govern there degree of attention to be paid and value to be attached to past philosophical works and their authors. We should approach these, first, with the aim of our acquaintance being deepened and our vision expanded with respect to the extent and complexities of the domain of spiritual experience investigated by a particular philosopher. Secondly, we may study and author or a work for the light he or it throws on the mechanism and or limitations of thought itself. The mutual criticisms by the philosophers should interest us only insofar as they sub serve the above two purposes.

Truly revolutionary changes in philosophy take place only when man’s stock of spiritual or cultural experience suffers additions in consequence either of the appearance of new exploring geniuses or of the offering of new critical analyses of and the asking of new questions regarding the already available experience by new critical thinkers. Such a revolution occurred in Indian philosophy when some Mahayana thinkers discovered or uncovered the fundamental identity of samara and Nirvana, thereby transforming the hypothetical category of moksha into the concept of jivanmukti verifiable in lived religious experience. Similarly, the rise of the physical and other sciences has been responsible for the introduction of revolutionary changes in logic and theory of knowledge in our own times.

While the scholar-philosopher and the philosopher of the second or third rank, who seeks to cross that’s and dot the I’s in the doctrines of this or that among his favorite philosophers, occupies himself seriously with the relative merits of the definitions of various postulation concepts such as supernatural power, spirit existence, nature, universal reasons to evolution, noumenon and phenomenon, absolute and relative truth, paramasiva and sakti, etc.- categories and concepts that have absolutely no meaning in terms of the spiritual or cultural experience that he himself has had-a truly earnest and critical student of philosophy and history of philosophy approaches the Masters chiefly with the purpose of being introduced to the aspects of experience that constituted the stating-point for them.
Such a student would judge the relevance of different problems mainly in the light of such revelations received from several important thinkers concerned with a particular department of experience. Thus the first important fruit of the perusal of the thinkers of classical stature in a particular field should be rich, sharpened awareness of the significant aspect and possibilities of a realm of experience; a second consequence would be a more or less systematic acquaintance with the problems of analysis and evaluation to that region. Such awareness and acquaintance constitute the proper equipment for the person who desires the pleasure and privilege of fruitful participation in that great adventure of the human spirit called philosophic thought.

To sum up for this work plan we can do declare that the Indian and western philosophical views have been dealing the various educational aspects from ancient time to modern time.

**Conclusion:** - At last according to the study of Indian (Ancient + Modern) and western (Ancient + Modern) philosophy with philosophical news on various aspects of education:- We can conclude, then, that the educator should lead his papilla gradually to see and appreciate the values that make human community civilized and those that contribute to the enrichment and refinement of the individual person. Here we may see the ways in which a philosopher of education may differ in emphasis from purely moral and religious philosophers.

While the latter may rest content with analyzing and advocating some particular values, the philosopher of education should of necessity pay attention to all the values sought to be realized through various types of education. Different individuals, in virtue of their heterogeneous tastes, temperaments and intellectual powers, are suited to acquire different types of skill and to pursue drive goals and values.

It may also be borne in mind that the preservation and transmission of valuable heritage in skills and ideas is no less important than the invention of new techniques and the discovery of new knowledge.

It is clear that such an appreciation of the parts played in the progress of human civilization by scientific enquiry on the one hand and socio-political criticism on other cannot be acquired by a person without some knowledge of man’s history Not much critical sense will presumably be required to appreciate the fact of progress in man’s control over the physical environment made possible by scientific knowledge; however, greater effort on the part of the educator may be
needed to bring home to the pupil the fact of institutional progress where such progress has been achieved.

Such progress, indeed, cannot be appreciated by the pupil at unless he succeeds in imbibing or developing a certain sense of values. Only when a person has a properly developed sense of values can he be expected to have a sense of involvement and commitment in respect of the values realizes through institutional life. Even the scientist, primary concern is the realm of positive facts rather than that of the values should be made to realize the significance of democratic institutions that encourage and support free inquire.

According to philosophical thoughts of Indian philosophers we can know that all of the world philosophers have been regarding the traditional theory with its development from hundred years. Though we have consider that the contemporary Indian philosophers have been developing the ideas from the situation of empirical thoughts to this time. They have tried to develop the philosophical values of the traditional elements with the scientific attitudes in the world including the eastern and western ideas which have related to each other.

Towards the philosophical thinking of contemporary Indian philosophy we can do its canalization of human aspiration because all of the process of human authority to find the satisfaction in philosophical knowledge. Hence all of the Indian thinkers have described the conscience of human being as:

R.N. Tagore describes about in the consciousness of a man is the basically aspect of education because it is too most important. About it his opinion is as normal but the philosophical sense, it is the kind of aspiration.

Therefore, this thinker’s recommend that all the aspects of education have cleared its expression. In its expression, spiritual thinking is the most in expression because the spiritualism is the best stage with aspirations for the condition of a man’s satisfaction.

According to Greek literature we may view these changing social and political situation has performed with the conscience Greek philosophers. They have described the all systems of Greek philosophy in which the traditional position has been reflecting from the institutions of Greek where the necessity for reformation is.

As we know that the Greek philosophical literature before the sixth century B.C. has improved the existence of spirit with the development political ideas. For this Homer declared their social
conditions. So Greek philosophy has been suffering from various merits and demerits in ethical and religious

In ethical situation 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 has two major aspects:

In its first aspect, it is the fact in the epees of Homeric the existence of Olympus god was the supreme authority the authority has dealer all of the justifications for human being.

(2) A site of second aspect in Greek religion, which become prominent in the religious reveal 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 until the culmination of Greek civilization in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C, and this development is intricately related to that of philosophy.

Therefore, The culture self of mankind finds expression and creative satisfaction in the production and enjoyment of works of art and thought on the hand and in the exercise of virtue and compassion, including the fight against injustice, on the other a part from promoting the virtues and dispositions helpful to civilized living education should aim at imparting spiritual culture to and developing interest in finer, non utilitarian values in the pupils.

It should not be supposed that aesthetic and intellectual, moral and religious culture is merely a luxury, which does not contribute the fulfillment of any real needs of men.

Having once evolved out of the stage of animal existence by virtue of the invention of language and the exercise of his reason and imagination man cannot feel satisfied without coming to terms with the demands of his new nature. He cannot help brooding over suffering and death, nor can he help asking questions about his own destiny.

Man needs philosophy and religion as also poetry and love. Culture may be described as that wealth of awareness, those modes of perception and feeling, those attitudes and dispositions that contribute to the richness, refinement and strength of man’s spirit without making any visible additions to his external possession.

Man seeks to relate himself to the world insofar as it affects his bio-social existence and well-being; he also yearns to enter into relationship with those aspects of and universe that fascinate his intellectual and emotional an He cannot help contemplating the universe and his being in it
in the mood of wondering, curiosity and sensitive questioning nor can he preserve his sanity and maintain his integrity and wholeness without attaining a measure of metaphysical wisdom and religious detachment. While wisdom consists in being reconciled to the actualities and possibilities of life in the universe, detachment implies limited or vanishing concern towards that which is merely personal and perishable. Is such concern or unconcern inconsistent with a truly active and fruitful life, by the side of educational philosophy and philosophical education on various aspects of education.

Thus, Now we can say that: -

A man is mortal
The soul is immortal
A man and human being are controlled by the soul.
Everything has their existence only for the time being.
A world’s activities are controlled by the Nature.
A nature done his work without pomp and show.

Whole ‘Brahmand’ is controlled by “The Super Natural power”. (The God)

**Suggestions:-**

According to Suggestions:-

It is the most important that the study of Indian and western philosophical education and educational Philosophy with philosophical aspects of education must comes before+ other studies.

Hence, we can say that there is no any subject’s knowledge as for as philosophical knowledge about the world’s nature for human being.

At last we pray to the God and goddess maa-Sarswati and Others etc.

We want to go in reality but not unreality.
We want to go in lightening but not darkening.
We want to go in immortality but not mortality.
Thus at last we can say again that the existence of god is supreme all over.