Chapter -1
Introduction

Preamble

Outlines of Indian and western philosophy

Philosophy in the traditional sense stands for a metaphysical world view. Most of the metaphysical schemes produced by the ancient and the medieval philosophers have been associated with definite logics-epistemological doctrines; this is true of both Indian and European systems of philosophy. In addition, European systems of thought from Plato and Aristotle onwards have also been connected with, or have comprehended as corollaries, ethical and sociopolitical doctrines.

Plato, in his Republic, also outlines a philosophy of education consistent with his metaphysical and epistemological assumptions. In India, policies and programmers for education were outlined chiefly by the authors of the dharma satraps, such as Manu and Yajnavalkya. These policies and programmers were based mostly on the social philosophy of Varnasrama-dharma. It is noteworthy that this philosophy or ideology was never seriously questioned by the leading philosophers of India.

In India the course of cultural development during the last hundred and fifty years has been altogether different; the now emerging cultural chaos and unrest is also different in important respects from the cultural crisis being experienced in the West. Further, greater confusion seems to prevail in our socio-economic and political conduct which

Compared unfavorably with the orderly functioning of the western societies, particularly the democratic societies.

The renaissance experienced by Europe during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a movement in the direction of secularism and humanism; these tendencies of the western cultural consciousness continued to be strengthened by the growing forces of science and technology.

The increasing production of wealth and the growing efficiency of social, political and economic organizations in western countries also contributed to the growth and development of secular consciousness and ideals.

A site of philosophy gives as various solutions for philosophical problems of nature’s existence in the world. There for the development of human ideas have been becoming from ancient to
modern time in actuality towards theory of philosophy as developed its study form time to time by many thinkers. All of the thinkers and ideas depends on the situation by critical events of the nature because the nature’s activity reflected in authors ideas in philosophical ground all of philosophical world view depends upon philosophical factors as moral, religious, social at the time present, past and future by man’s speculation to show how the mental attitude arises in every philosophical stages.

Philosophical systems are not the products of purely intellectual activity occurring in a personal, historical and cultural vacuum; they are instead the achievements of individual philosophical geniuses which reflect not only the temperaments and personalities of their authors but likewise the cultural, historical, and philosophical milieu in which they lived. Every system is the point if convergence of innumerable influences which determine both the doctrine importance and the structural organization of that system. Some of these influences are purely intellectual and philosophical, as is the case when a philosopher consciously or unconsciously incorporates into his philosophy conceptions and doctrines transmitted to him by his philosophical predecessors and modifies them for the sake of logical consistency or to conform to prevailing scientific theories or to satisfy the demands of moral, religious and aesthetic experience.

Towards the various stages the thinkers describes all of part of history of philosophy in a large scale as critical stage, interpretation stage, So all of students have been taking impress in there thus. The historian should assume so far as he can do explain his thought as the supporting guard against injecting his individual principles have been cleared in philosophical situation because the historian has developed their philosophical thoughts. By the side of philosopher and his conception of what constitutes progress and decline even in the amount of space devoted to different thinkers. All this is unavoidable each philosopher may be tell owns ideas without any hesitation in his philosophical thoughts which by any philosopher should not comment on his activities as comparison, discussion, literary systems for pupils with in time from ancient to modern thought in eastern and western. By the system of philosophy a philosopher considered to understanding the world’s and nature’s events. All of the events effected by unseen power too that power controlled by the super natural power called the god, which has been given all judgments. By the side of judgment on events depends upon his methods as this critical-historical method: (1) the attempt should be made for consideration to the ideas. So philosophical
historian should for the time being enter sympathetically into the doctrinal insights of each system, and seek to grasp the system as a structural whole.

The attempt should be made to formulate the logically basic assumptions of the system—not merely those which are explicitly promulgated by the philosopher, and which are often relatively unimportant, but more especially the implicit or tacit presuppositions of the system. The discernment of the tacit assumptions of a philosophy is no mere routine performance; nut is an exacting task requiring philosophical discernment and penetration. Assistances in this task are frequently gained from a study of later philosophers in the same movement or tradition. For example, Hume succeeded in making explicit the basic assumptions of empiricism which only implicit or at best vaguely adumbrated in the empiricism of Locke, and, again, Leibniz discerned more clearly than his predecessor, Descartes, the basic tenets of rationalism.

Each system should be subjected to rigorous philosophical criticism, first, of an internal sort calculated to reveal fundamental inconsistencies either between the different assumptions of the system, whether implicit, or between the assumptions and the alleged implications of these assumption and secondly, of an external sort which discloses the limitations and inadequacies of a given system when it is judged by the standards of a richer and more profound philosophy or by reference to phases of human knowledge and experience to which it fails to do justice. Such criticism neither should nor, however, be allowed to intrude into and interfere with the exposition of the system: the system should be understood before it is subjected to criticism either of an internal or external sort. Philosophy in one of its very important aspects is criticism of past systems.

According to the valuation of the study point we can say that every man or philosopher interested to solve the problem and events of nature and existence. A study of philosophy tells us about world’s events with human’s ethical, religious, political, social, economical stages throw out man’s behavioral circle. In its situation a man can develops his moral thinking with his theoretical and practical life in which a man has been depended on his philosophical thinking.

The study of past theories is further an indispensable aid in working our one’s life within the word events. This is because philosophy, to a far greater extent than other forms of creative activity, presupposes a thorough historical orientation.

The scientist can successfully pursue his original researches, provided he has at his disposal only an essential grasp of the present state of knowledge in his chosen field of investigation; a creative
artist having a very limited acquaintance with the general history of art may, nevertheless, achieve greatness in his art; but a man who has a philosophical mind deals his work efficiency by self conscience in his daily routine has when properly understood, is a great repository of the philosophical insights of the past which provides material indispensable to the constructive philosopher.

But thought the creative philosopher derives much from a study of the history of his subject, philosophy would soon become a barren and futile pursuit were each generation of philosophers to derive its materials and its data solely from the study of the history of philosophy.

**According to Base and foundation of the study**

A man has being the pink point throughout education in the world, as per Indian and western culture including Indian and western Philosophical views in various types of education and educational aspects. From ancient time Philosophical views have developed by spiritual existence and experience of Indian and western Sages and seers in regularly strive hard in philosophical issues called **Darsans or Philosophy**.

Darsans or Philosophy:-

Philosophy divided in **two** types as-

- Indian Philosophy
- Western Philosophy

**Part-A**

Indian Philosophy

Indian Philosophy mostly depends on the Vedas as per

1) Rig-Veda,
2) Yajurveda,
3) Samaveda,
4) Atharveda,

1). **Ancient Philosophy**: -

1. Ancient Philosophy:-
   - I. Vedic Philosophy
   - II. Non-Vedic Philosophy

2). **Modern Philosophy**
A-I- Vedic Philosophy
(Based on Vedas)

Six system of Vedic Philosophy

- The Shankhya - Kapila
- The Yoga Darsans - Patanjali
- The Vaishesika Darsans - Kanada
- The Nyaya Darsans - Maharishi Gautama
- The Mimamsa Darshan - Jaimini
- The Vedanta Darshan - Badrayana

The Vedanta Darsans: - The Vedanta Darsans are the Cream of the Vedas.

The Vedanta or the Upanishad Sutra - Analysis:-

Up - Near by
Ni - Devotedly
Sad - To sit down

The Vedanta Darsans: - There are one hundred and eight (108) but valid ten or eleven Upanishads. (Ramanujacharya, Madhvacharya, Sakarracharya)

- Mahabharata- Gita Darsans: - Means the Lord; s song.
  A. Ramanujacharya
  B. Madhvacharya

A-II – Non-Vedic Philosophy-as-
(Charvaka Darsans)
Charvaka’s Theory is:-
Eat Drink and be merry
Drink Ghee, yet debt.
While life is, you’re live joyously.

A-III Jainism philosophy
(Mahavira Swami)

A-IV Buddhism Philosophy
(Mahatma Gautama Buddha)

A-V Contemporary or Modern Philosophy
Some of the modern philosophers, as –
Ravindra Nath Tagore - (1861-1941)
Swami Vivekananda - (1863-1902)
Mahatma Gandhi - (1869-1948)
Aurobindo - (1872-)
Krishna Chandra Bhattacharya - (1875-)
Mohammad Iqbal - (1876-)
Dr. S. Radhakrishnan - (1888-1975)

A-VI Philosophy, religion and culture
(N.K. Davaraja)

**Part –B**

Western philosophy
Western Philosophy, Some thousand years ago, there are philosophy views have developed from the primary spiritual power suffered from various philosophy view-points in education in Greece. By the side of western Greek Darsans, many philosophers and educationists may call that Greek Darsans is a natural philosophy. Whose have developed by- ancient and modern philosophers, as:-

Ancient Philosophy
Modern Philosophy

**B-I Ancient Philosophy**
(Based on Greece)

`Greek Philosophy-

Some philosophers are, as-
Thales - (524-554,548B.c.)
Anaximander -
Anaximander - (588,524B.c.)
Pythagoras -
Empedocles - (495,435B.c.)
Anaxagoras -
Protagoras - (490B.c.)
Socrates - (469-399B.c.)
Plato - (428,427-347B.c.)
Aristotle - (384-322B.c.)

**B-II Contemporary philosophy**

Some philosophers, as-
Strawson - Britain
Singer - Australia
Ravish - America
Stoics -
Plotinus -

**B-III Medieval philosophy**

Some philosophers are, as-
St. Augustine.
Dun Scouts
St. Thomas
Anselm
Whitehead
Jewish

**B-IV Modern Philosophy**

Some Philosophers are-
Herbert Cherbury -
Francis Bacon - (1561-1626)
Thomas Hobbes - (1588-1679)
Rene Descartes - (1595-1650)
Benedict Spinozoa - (1632-1677)
John Locke - (1632-1753)
Gottfried Willhelm Leibniz - (1646-1716)
Gorge Berkeley - (1685-1753)
David Hume - (1711-1776)
Definition of the Study

According of definition of the concern topic there are various definitions by many Indian and western philosophers. Some of the definitions are given below as per particulars-

According to Indian Philosopher

**Vedas**

According to Vedas: - Philosophy is –“Love of learning.”

Philosophy is the study of Vedas: - the Vedas are the purest collection of the Aryan mind.

The originality of Indian Philosophy may be easily reflected in Vedas.

Indian Philosophy as an authentic collection.

**Upanishads**

Philosophy is the study of Upanishads: - The Upanishads are correctly top-head of Indian Philosophy.

According to Bloomfield It is necessary that Hindu thoughts have mentioned in the Upanishads.

According to DR. S Radhakrishnan the systems of Philosophy Declares that

Rest one of the religious literary principals of the Upanishads

According to R.D. Ranade the constitute of philosophy remain various thoughts of Upanishads, In which a life and its progress is equal to the sea, as the various thunders have been throated in the sea as well as the various action-motion have been completed in the life of human being. So all of these reflections in the ocean of human life.

**Gita**
According to the Gita, Philosophy is the study of the Gita:

The Gita is the milk milked out of the Upanishad. Cows and is particular influenced by the Katha and the Isha.”

’Brahms-sutra”

Bhagavad Gita

According to Bhagavad-Gita:-

Philosophy is the study of Bhagavad-Gita:- Bhagavad-Gita is ‘’The lord’s Song.’’

According to B.G. Tilak Philosophy’s study is a most luminous and priceless guessed which gives to afflicted souls and makes as master of spiritual wisdom?

According to Mahatma Gandhi Philosophy’s study sees a unique synthesis of the best ideals with good thoughts of a man’s religious stage.

According to Mahatma Gandhi Philosophy’s study is the mirror of the GITA. The Gita does not know what is workless stage? The Gita deals the high ideals with joy and peaceful thinking.

According to Mahatma Gandhi Philosophy’s study deals with metaphysics, religion and ethics and has rightly called the concept of humanity’.

According to Anne Besant Philosophy’s study tells us that it is meant to Lift the as parent from the lower level of renunciation, where objects desires are dead and where the yoga dwelt in clam and ceaseless contemplation, while his ode and mind are actively employed in dies charging the duties that actively employed in discharging the duties that tall to his hot in life.

According to Pr. M. Hiriyanna Philosophy’s study tells us that the GITA teaching stands not for renunciation of action, but stands for renunciation in action.

According to western Philosophers

According to Socrates Philosophy consists two words, as PHILOS and SOPHIA? Hence the etymological meaning of the term is the friendship or love of wisdom. As such a philosopher may be called wise man, this title is too pretentious.

According to Socrates Philosophy makes a philosopher as a seeker after wisdom. Even when so defined the term philosophy does not become any more precise. The important thing is to note that philosophy seeks wisdom not knowledge, and not the empirical knowledge.

According to Socrates Philosophy is the aim to develop the ideas of love, truth and beautiful thinking and universal judgments in, what is knowledge? What is truth? What is the good? What is the religion? What is the customs? What is the moral-s? What is the conception of God?
According to Plato Philosophy furnisher us an occasion for reminding us of the ideal in Heaven. According to Plato Philosophy tell us that intellect to an independent source of knowledge, this supplies us with self-evident innate.

According to Plato Philosophy provided that knowledge is constituted by innate ideas alone. Knowledge so gained is universal and necessary.

According to Aristotle Philosophy tells us that thunder, rainy clouds storms e, lightning, the sun, the moon, the stars have been appearing in wonderful sites reflect over the events controlled by ‘The God’.

According to Aristotle Philosophy’s study tells us that sense experience is not totally disregarded. It serves an occasion for the exercise of intellect. Thus sense experience can clarify but does not constitute knowledge.

According to Aristotle Philosophy’s study describes that 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 constituting knowledge.

According to Whitehead Philosophy is the descriptive system all of the generalities which apply to all the details of experience in knowledge.

According to G. Bentham Philosophy holds in similarly that to philosophies is to seek an attitude towards the universe as a whole.

According to G. Bentham Philosophy are both an intellectual pursuit and an attitude to the reality as a whole.

According to G. Bentham Philosophy as a resolute and persistent attempt to understand and appreciate the universe as a whole.

According to David Hume Philosophy is the highly valuable opinion for empiricism holds that the work of connecting the separate thinking about by the association of ideas and by imagination.

According to J.S. Mill Philosophy and its study contention has not found support by a majority of philosophers, holds that intellectual operations and fully explicable by sense experience.

According to Wordsworth Philosophy’s study advocates that-

The eye cannot choose but see, we cannot do the ear be still,

‘Our bodies’ feel where they are being against or with.

According to Immanuel Kant
Philosophy is the study of:-
What do you know?
What will you do?
What is your hope? Etc.

According to Immanuel Kant Philosophy’s study provided that 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.

**Importance of study**

In such position Philosophy is a study of God, Goddess, Soul, Supernatural Power, with existence of all over as Ethical, logical, moral, Religious Level, Moksha, karma and Nature’s theory etc For the sake of, a deep study is necessary.

The old proverb is strictly true that-
“Nature done his work without Pomp and show”

The purely historical or genetic type of interpretation of the Philosophy frequently involves the disentangling of a great complexity of biographical, social, political, and cultural influences. The personal or temperamental factor is of supreme importance in philosophy, since a system of philosophy is the product of the creative thinking of an individual mind and is seldom, if ever, the achievement of any group consciousness; a system of philosophy is perhaps more an individual and personal achievement and less a social product than is a scientific theory or a technological discovery. The biography of a Newton or an Einstein throws little essential light on the understanding of the laws of gravitation or the relativity theory, but the pantheistic naturalism of a philosophy or the Voluntaristic idealism of a Schopenhauer lose much of their significance if divorced from the personalities of their authors.

A system of philosophy reflects the personality of its author, and its meaning can only be fully appreciated in this personal context. The importance of the study of philosophy should be apparent to everyone. Wise men have understood the events of nature with the response where the human being held up many steps of civilization. A philosophical study do help the man to know about his proper sense with extranets throws the ethical, religious, political, legal and economic levels for the past time by spreading main ideas which have been followed. In reality developed in fine stage for philosophical thinking, passions which covers from the simple to deep ideas in the human mind, it reviews the philosophical thinking from bottom to top in the
human mind. The study of past theories is, further, an indispensable aid for teachers and students in their educational world. This is because philosophy, to a far greater extent than other forms of creative activity, presupposes a thorough historical orientation.

Towards Indian philosophy the word of philosophy means love of learning. By this mean a human being knows about himself and themselves in the world with his life style in dailyroutine because a man has affected by Indian philosophical thoughts and their philosophy.

Towards western philosophy the word of philosophy means love of truthfulness. There is essentially forming an intellectual love of truth.

Too Indian philosophy follows the existence of spirit with the need of truth.

All of these depend on darshanas.

Because darshanas depends on vision and vision depends on reality.

Reality depends on actual truth.

Truth depends on spirit.

There for all the affected by Indian philosophical religious stage. This stage explain three kinds of pains as

Adhyatmika, physical and mental worries affected by natural and intra-organic events.

Adhibhautika, physical and mental worries affected by natural and extra-organic events.

Adhidaivika, physical and mental worries affected by unseen power events with feeling high goodness finished and shravana to hear truth, manana skill development with description with nididhyasana particularly feeling in the schools of Indian philosophy because Indian philosophy reflected in Vedas. So the Vedas produced by Aryan mind. So our philosophical knowledge unaffected by external affairs from the past to this time.

Therefore all of the educational datas suffers from Vedic culture but absence of chronological data the complete indifference of the ancient Indians towards personal histories the archaic character of the Vedic Sanskrit, the break in tradition, and the biased orthodox chlouring of interpretation, which instead of a 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.

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 of 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 precede rather than 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 been in possession of any scriptures. Moral values being less controversial than religious values it is 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 motet 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 and 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 truths by the votaries of different religions. This attitude constitutes an insuperable obstacle to the growth of liberalism in religious thought and to inter-religious understanding. Religion has been and continues to be an important force affecting human behavior both at individual and at collective levels. In the earlier stages of civilization religions acted as a civilizing agent, by inducing the individual to rise above his biological and economic needs and to look forward to the realization of a higher transcendent goal. Religion has
taught man to be contented with his indifferent lot on earth, and to love his fellow-being instead of seeking constantly to exploit or subdue them. Laying emphasis on the transient character of worldly goods and pleasures, religion has sought to hold before man’s imagination the vision of life eternal consisting in the transcendence of religion has been at the root of the careers of some of the greatest teachers and benefactors of mankind. While man has always abhorred persons who are self-seeking and unjust and admired those who are self-sacrificing, and courageous asters in the cause of justice, they have extended reverence and even worship to the religious heroes who have renounced completely the claim to all earthly possessions, rewards and honors.

Unfortunately, history also bears witness to another, darker side of religion. While individuals living under the impulsion of religious motives and ideals tend at the lowest level, to be god-fearing, up-right and just, and, at their best to grow into saints and holy man with the sole vocation of being helpful to their fellow-being, the behavior of organized religious communities frequently Falls short of the ideals professed by their religion. It is a well-known phenomenon that the behavior of even a well-meaning individual undergoes a change for the worse when he joins a crowd. Except on the occasions when the members of a religious community gather for worshipping their God, the behavior of those communities is hardly different form that of organizations pursuing diverse economic and political goals.

The term confusion connotes a condition of disorder; cultural confusion is a state or condition of the communal or national mind. Inasmuch as the concept of culture has reference to the perception and pursuit of values, cultural confusion implies absence of order or intelligible connection in the perceptions and responses relating to value phenomena. These latter phenomena, in our view, constitute the peculiar field or subject matter of philosophy. Hence cultural confusion may be equated with the failure of the national mind to create a philosophy that would bacon n its why to effective response and action relating to different values. Man is essentially a value-conscious and value-pursuing being. He constantly breaths lives and moves in a field of value; both physical and the social environment values and disvalues. Heat and cold, rain and drought, no less than moral and aesthetic approbation and disapprobation affection and apathy, regard and contempt affect human beings as consumers, appreciators and cherishers of various values.
A state of cultural confusion exists when the acts of appreciation and cherishing as well as those of disparagement, disregard and neglect, fail to priced smoothly due to uncertainty, doubt or suspicion concerning the true and the worth-while in the actor’s minds. The point of his definition or description of cultural confusion may be illustrated by a simple example. A father in medieval Europe and also in medieval Arabia and perhaps India knew definitely that it was desirable and proper to inculcate in his children a firm confidence to the supernatural power with at over physical universe no less than of the human world. It is by no means easy for the modern man, conversant with the findings and trends in the physical sciences and with the far-reaching change in the organization of society brought about by technology on the one hand and by socio-political upheavals engendered by revolutionary, utopian ideologies on the other, to be so thoroughly convinced of the theological dogmas under reference.

**Significance of The Study**

From the site of significance of the study—we think that without a Philosophical views and a sound Education of philosophy, a student will not be gain complete knowledge about Reconstruction of moral Education in human society and will not be remain in high ideal. A man and child regard to know that how many problems, for getting philosophical education and how many solutions to wards these philosophical and educational aspects. The main historical mission of the middle Ages was to transmit and to develop the classical Christian culture. The task was performed by the Church, of which the people were the spiritual wards. It was inevitable, however, that the children should grow into manhood and the days of tutelage end. This time had now arrived, and a new phase in the history of philosophy began. It must not be supposed, however, that there was a sudden break such breaks rarely occurs in history. The new period was simply the outcome of a long process of evolution, and carried over from the past many of its characteristics. Scholasticism itself had been the result of a yearning for rational insight, of a desire to understand and find reasons for the ne faith. It represented the same spirit of reflection and inquiry which had led to the connection of great metaphysical systems in the golden age of Greek thought. It is true that the goal of its search was fixed by faith and that philosophy served as its handmaiden; but within its circumscribed bounds human reason had a fairly free swing. As we think the aim of philosophy to solve the all problems about supernatural power which controlled of the world.
With this the development of human thoughts are increasing from ancient time to modern time but the study of philosophical theories tells us that the thoughts of ancient and modern are connected to one another which more or less dependent on the civilization because all of the systems of thoughts are related to the related personality of the philosophers. The study of philosophy tells us that all of the views about the world have been settled in proper way automatically as-morality, religions etc from past to present and for future. This is to show that how the mental attitude called philosophy arises how the various questions and how can we get answers at each stages Philosophical systems are not the products of purely intellectual activity occurring in personal, historical and cultural vacuum; they are instead the achievements of individual philosophical geniuses which reflect not only the temperaments and personalities of their authors but likewise the cultural, historical, and philosophical milieu in which they lived.

Every system is the point of convergence of innumerable influences which determine both the doctrinal import and the structural organization of that system. Some of these influences are purely intellectual and philosophical, as is the case when a philosopher consciously or incorporates into his philosophy conceptions and doctrines transmitted to him by his philosophical predecessors and modifies them for the sake of logical consistency or to conform to prevailing scientific theories or to satisfy the demands of moral, religious and aesthetic experiencing account of Vivekananda’s doctrine of creation has to refer to the doctrine of Maya. Vivekananda, in a sense, is a neo-sedatest, 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 Maya is not exactly similar to that Maya is a power of the creator; he also thinks that Maya the principle of change, a sakti that makes creation possible But in advaita Vedanta, Maya is the power that creation illusion, it is that divine sakti 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’s philosophy Maya, is conceived just as a fact about the nature of the word, it seeks to express the essential characters of the word as it exists. Vivekananda explains the nature of this fact in a very clear manner when he says, “Maya does not explains the theory of the world but it gives general ideas about fact, existence, being, evil, good, events of all life etc.

It tells us that
Where is good, there is evil.
Where is evil, there is good.
Where is life, there is death.
Where is light, there is dark.
Where is day, there is night.

So the finite aspect of men’s nature Tagore means that Aspect of man which can be explained in terms of natural and environmental factors. In other words, it can be said that the psychotically individual is the finite man. In order to give an idea of the nature of the finite man Tagore lays emphasis on three aspects of men’s finite nature. Firstly, he says that in his finite existence man shares some of the qualities and characteristics of the animal word. He is also determined, to some extent, by the stimuli coming from the environment.

He has some instinctive and mechanical ways of action and behavior, like other animals, he is also conscious of his self, and many of his actions are guided by the motives of self-satisfaction or self-preservation. Like animals he also quarrels with other for the satisfaction of his needs and desires. These dispositions and activities are expressions of the finite aspect of his nature. Secondly, even in his finite existence man possesses certain characters that distinguish him from other living beings for example, all hid senses are keenly developed and are under the control of the self.

He can withdraw them, place them at any point and can train them to work in a particular manner. Moreover, the possession of mind is a unique privilege of man. On account of this his reactions to environmental factors become very different from those of other aspects of nature. The animals, for example, have to affected by the power of nature as rain flood, fire, storm etc, man, on the other hand, just by dint of his physical capacities, evolves methods for meeting the challenge of these forces. So, even in his finite nature man is evidently superior to other aspects of existence. That is why animals can be tamed by man.

Tagore says, the trunk of elephant, the paws of tiger expressed by their expression form the men’s arm now the finite nature of men itself gives evidence of the spiritual potentialities of men. A survey of Gandhi’s social ideas makes it clear that Gandhi aims at the establishment of a society in which peace and happiness will reign supreme. He feels that this would be possible only when men and women realize their status and suites in society it is a fact the women today are trying to compete with man in every walk of life by imitating the ways of men. Gandhi is
also aware that men are not prepared to give up their sense of mastery over women. This appears to Gandhi as unfortunate. He feels that an ideal of society duties and functions are distributed not only among the different varnish, but also among men and women. Both men and women have the same soul, and therefore are equal.

The work assigned to one is not inferior to the work assigned to the other. Man, by nature, is physically strong, and therefore he puts in hard labor to support and protect the family. Women, by nature, are equally important and necessary; this must be realized by both men and women.

An analysis of Sri Aurobindo’s conception of men, 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 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 Ajnana or Avidya, some of these of these thinkers have attributed this to the principle of Maya which according to them is the power of the reality to produce comic illusion. But almost all of them agree in believing that ignorance is the opposite—the antithesis of knowledge and the ignorance is bondage—the cause of suffering and that the aim of spiritual activity is to free man from the state of ignorance and to lift him up to the state of knowledge.

Though the life represented in ancient literature, e.g., cannot be the actual life of the modern men, 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 significant aspects of the spiritual experience explored by it; and partly by the inventiveness and resource fullness 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.

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 limitation 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 or and the asking of new question 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 Samsara 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 change 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 the its 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 spirit, angel, super natural power and the power of nature for evolution, Nome non 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 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 import fruit of the perusal thinkers of classical stature in as particular field should be rich, sharpened awareness of the significant aspects and possibilities of a realm of
experience; a second consequence would be more or less systematic acquaintance with the problems of analysis and evaluation related 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.

**Need of the study**

A need of the study for education purpose, researches have submitted in comparative status by many research fellows from time to time and various educational projects and thesis also smutted in the research institutions universities, Deemed universities but has not submitted any research issue, project, thesis etc. on this topic in any university. As we know that as an animal man needs food and shelter and he also seeks protection against enemies. He seeks and acquires power, involves himself in various struggles and competitions, and is seldom inclined to abuse power and authority. However, as an imaginative being he is impelled to look beyond the needs of the present and the needs of his animal self. .......

At all levels of existence he is driven by his imaginative and expansive impulses, to project images of better, nobler and more significant forms of the self’ s existence or being. Having imagined the higher and the nobler he feels an irresistible urge to reach and realize the same. Man it has been said does not live by bread alone. History has known not a few heroes and heroines who did not care even to preserve their life, preferring death to dishonor and the sacrifice of their cherished ideals. Nor would it be true to assert that the pursuit of values other than those relating to preservation and effective survival of individual life is characteristic only of exceptional persons for human being in philosophical education in complete life.

The concept of the word of philosophy is-faith in learning because by philosophical knowledge is human being signifies their self existence in life. Always a men’s live in his life with his metaphysical life rutin in the world according to western philosophical knowledge we can say that western philosophy impressed on the word truthfulness, as well Indian philosophy impressed on the word spirit, spirit impressed on the word truth too because truthfulness must be reflect in practical life. So practical life depends on men’s real vision, real vision declares the human being’s darshan, it declares in philosophy that philosophical knowledge tells us that a human being’s life depends on his religion.

By the side of religious thinking there are three types of grief’s as Adhyatmika it is affected by nature and it nraorgans.
Adhidaivika it is affected by super natural power and extra organs.
Adhibhautika it is affected by natural and organs.

So it is real that all of these aspects of education have been taught in Indian philosophical institutions. According to Vedic literature we can say that the literature produced by Aryans. Indian philosophical literature affected by Vedas and unaffected by any literature

With Absence of chronological data the complete indifference of the ancient Indians towards personal histories the archaic character of the Vedic Sanskrit, the break in tradition, and the biased orthodox coloring of interpretation, which instead of a 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 however, the contention of logical empiricists against metaphysics is based on a mistaken view about its nature. Human beings have to live and for doing so they have to think. Philosophy at least in its metaphysical undertakings arises from reflection on the problems of living. In its sense philosophy is a biological process lifted up on the plane of reflection. One has to have an idea about what one is going to be. Father the story of an individual is inextricably woven into the texture of society and the physical environment.

Naturally one has to put question of ‘wither’, and ‘whence’ and ‘why’ concerning man and the universe. It is the holistic tendency in man as a biopsychic creature which will not allow him rest until he finds some moorings at least for some time for himself and for his fellowman. As men have been differently brought up, and as they differ from one another in their mental constitution, so their philosophies too would be equally varied. We may, therefore, jot down the following point concerning the nature of philosophy.

This construction would vary from age to and even with persons belonging to the same age. The relativity of metaphysical values depends on the psychological type to which the metaphysician belongs, on this

Repressed and suppressed impulses and on the statements of science, logic and commonsense peculiar to his times.

The problem of metaphysical meaning is not one which can be cognitively settled. Any view of the universe which contributes to the expansiveness, enhancement and psychological health of the thinker is highly meaningful to him. Ultimately the meaning of metaphysical proposition has its cash value in the promotion of the holistic tendency of the process of self-realization of an metaphysician.
However, metaphysical proposition is cognitively supported and at times the argumentative aspect comes in heavily, but the end it remains in the service of the holistic tendency in men. In comparison with metaphysics, religious constructions fearless cognitively supported but are superior in being more completely total and holistic.

The language of metaphysics, not being primarily cognitive has to be reaffirmed and changed into metaphors, paradoxes and symbols in order to convey and arouse the sense of being whole. Concept, only in appearance is cognitive in metaphysics. The grammar of metaphysical language is geared to the purpose of evoking and inducing the sense of totality.

The lack of cognitive meaningfulness in no argument against metaphysics. The urge for metaphysical activity is deeply rooted in man and cannot be eradicated without doing violence to man as a bio—psychological creature.

The creative philosopher must enrich traditional conceptions and insights derived from the history of philosophy with new concepts suggested by Science, art, literature, politics moral and other phases of contemporary culture. The philosopher since he has at his disposal no distinctive set of “philosophical data” comparable to scientific data afforded the scientist by the employment the experimental method derived his materials on the one hand from other contemporary disciplines, and on the other from the concerning literature.

Presently the background of philosophical knowledge is not past achievements of philosophers, but the indispensable materials for future philosophical enquiry. Will be success for getting knowledge.

Primary and secondary sources. The sources of our study will be: (1) primary sources: the work of the philosophers themselves or the fragments of their writings, when only the latter are extant. (2) In the absence of either of these we have to depend for our knowledge of their teaching on the most trustworthy and accurate accounts of them by other. Among the sources which will help us here are expositions of the lives and doctrines of particular philosophers, general and special treatises on the history of philosophy criticisms of certain teachings and references to them in various books.

Such secondary sources are indispensable where the primary source have disappeared and may even be of philosophy sources are available.
The historian of philosophy will also appeal to whatever fields of research give him an understanding of the spirit of the times under examination: to the history of all human activities such as science, literature, art, morals education politic, and religious.

Scope and period of the study- according to scope and periods we can say that a complete history of philosophy reflected in human beings philosophical knowledge in it peoples thoughts produced. Some of the peoples have known their philosophical knowledge with metaphysics as the Hindus, Egyptians, and Chinese etc.

Towards the philosophical study of western countries we can read clearly that philosophy as began from ancient Greeks. From there culture and civilization have been spread out.

By the side of periods we have classified as –

**Ancient philosophy.**

**Medieval philosophy.**

**Modern philosophy.**

For the scope of Maya it is not clear because either borrowed by Shankara’s form Buddhism or it produced by Shankara’s mind. Both these views are wrong. The principals of Maya’s theory in the Upanishads by Shankara’s ideas. According to constructive survey of upnishadic philosophy Prof. R.D. Ranade has rightly pointed out the origin of this doctrine in the Upanishads.

He gives the following points –

According to Isha the truth bright as a golden rays because its rays coming from the mind.

By katha’s views a wise man controlled by his wisdom. Some of the persons followed him.

Mundaka’s theory of ignorance is in it man’s mind and heart have not developed.

According to Chhandogya knowledge is good and ignorance is not good.

Brhadaranyakas, is thinking is that reality is being and unreality is not being.

From prashna’s views a man does not know the Brahman because he suffered falsehood.

Brhadaranyakas says that a man attested by Maya because the Maya makes a man blind in his life.

Chhandogya tells us that atman suffers in every insect’s.

Shvetashvatara describes god as a say in who Creates this world by his power.

The means of causation is a real changes gradually conception of prakarti in the world because infinite circle as avoided. All of the nature’s activities has been affecting to the generation from the side of root causes. All principles cover by universal power which called prakarti. For an
imperceptible thing which posted by its production stage, we can say that is auman except it intelligenceless and consciousness situation that is sakti. Production for causes connected many subjects but prakrti is freeness stage, can say it that is destruction.

The extreme subtleness of prakrti makes it manifest ad imperceptible; we infer its existence through its products. Motion is inherent in it the form of rajas. As the source of the inanimate world. It is unconscious. The circle of object depends on prakrti for its manifestation for this world of objects while dissolution is the returning of this world to prakrti. Sankhya’s believes that consciousnesses not a path of the world as Vedanta and Mahayana believe that a legal way cannot change in to the world on the other hand, the materiel atoms of the physical elements too cannot valid cause for the world as nyaya charvaka, vaishesika, Jainism and hinayana Buddhism, and minamsa wrongly believe, because they cannot explain the subtle products of matter like intellect, mind and ego (these are different from pure consciousness which belongs to purusa alone, and are regarded here as internal organs), unintelligent, unmaifest, uncaused, ever-active, imperceptible, eternal and one prakrti is the main way of the world object remains in its bosom.

According to shankhya their various proofs for prakrti as follows –

There are particularly things in the world are fixed these are dependant by universality as-

Finite to in finite.
Limited to unlimited
Temporary to permanent
Eternal to external

Universality and prakrti are connected.

All of things in the world are suffered by natural action-motion.
Hence these are suffering from pleasantness and sorowness by three gunas.
There are various affects are active by causes for implicit and manifestation, explicit and evolution affected by world causes because world causes affected by prakrti.
In the same situation affects differ from the causes.
Though affected depends on causes so causes is affective from implicit so affects impressed by causes in the world.
For the point if universe unity for a cause its depend on prakrti.
Therefore prakrti dells his activities by three gunas-as- sattva, rajas and tames in the world being subtle and Imperceptible their existence is in furred from their effects pleasure pain and Indifference respectively.

Although they are called gunas, yet they are not ordinary qualities or attributes like the nyaya-vaishesika gunas. They themselves possess qualities like lightness, activity, heaviness etc. They are extremely fine and ever –changing elements. They make up prakrti which is nothing apart from them. They are not the qualities which prakrti, the substance, possessess; on the other hand they themselves constituents or the elements of prakrti. They are called gunas because they are the elements of prakrti which alone is called substantive; or because they are subservient to the end of the purusa, or because they are intertwined, like three strands, to make up the rope of prakrti which binds the purusa. Sattva literally means real or existent and is responsible for the manifestation of objects in consciousness. It is called goodness and pleasantness. There is glorious stage in which reflective light and brightness in term of peacefully stage has developed for it rajas which literary word meaning full motion. There is grief, uncivilized activities suffers by any one for chalk and stimulating. Its color red. Tames, which literary means darkness, is the same site.

In it illegal activities and negligence steps have increased as against to sattva gunas. It is all as opposed to rajas as it arrests activity. There is darkness situation. So there are three gunas are never separate from prakrti. Yoga Patanjali yoga called rajyoga. Yoga means a centralization of chitto. Chitta suffers through meditation or Concentration which is also called yoga (yoga samadhih). Chitta means the three internal organs of sankhya-buddhi or intellect, ahankara or ego and mamas or mind. Chitta is the same as antahkarana.

It is mahat or buddhi which includes ahankara and manes. Chitta is the first evolutes of prakrti and has the predominance of sattva. It goes silent though closed with purusa. It suffers to the purusa with consciousness. It related to the object with his form which can say that is vriti. So the way of consciousness with being, finest and nearest to purusa. A purusa has influenced by vriti and its conscious which connected with form and object is called jnana. A consciousness of the purusa is free towards the prakrti. So there is not clear its reflection in the chitta and appears to be undergoing change and modification. Chitta, therefore, is the physical medium for them manifestation of them spirit. Just as in a red-hot iron ball, form less fire appears spherical and cold iron appears hot, similarly on account of its reflection in them chitta, purusa appears
changing and chitta appears conscious. Just as the moon appears as moving when seen reflected
in the moving waves, and wave appears luminous similarly purusa appears as undergoing
modification and chitta appears as conscious due to purusa’s reflection in it.
When the purusa realizes that all of the activities have deals by prakrti which affected by chitta
and its result reflected on the ground. This situation of chitta calls yoga in its original perfection.
The modification of the chitta are five types as –(1)
Right sense, pramana.
Wrong sense, viparyaya.
Verbal sense, or imagination, vikalpa.
Absence of cognition or sleep, nidra.
Memory, smrti
right cognition it is three types as-
pratyaksa knowledge with collection some objects and comes in to contact with the internal
mental stage.
Anuman knowledge in it the chitta suffers by nature.
Verbal knowledge words of speech are authentic.
(2) Viparyaya is positively wrong knowledge like that farope-snake. Vikalpa is mere verbal
cognition like that of a hare’s horn. Nidra is called absence of cognition, yet it site in mind to
sleep whenever a man does not know anything and therefore there must be some mental
modification to support this absence of knowledge. Smrti is the recollection of prememories
actually the senses of purusa.
(3) The purusa and his chitta are correlated. So it reflects its egoism. In which give is suffers in
all activities for bodies pleasantness and sorrowsness conditions time to time suffering klesha to
which it is subject.
These are:
Unknown sites.
The site of ego.
The site of its joint plus.
The site of its suffering.
The site of its morality.
The bondage of the self is due to its wrong identification with the mental modification through proper discrimination between purusa and prakrti and the consequent cessation of the mental modification. It is the aim of yoga to bring about this result.

There are five levels of mental life (chittabhumi). The position of life depends on gunas. The bottom stage means mind of is restless because restless due to the excess of rajas and it tossed about like a shuttlecock between different sense of objects. The next we call torpid. The site of mind is tames suffers unknown as sleep of mind. The next stage called viksipta or distracted. Here sattva predominates but rajas all so assert it at times. The next stage centralization of mind has suffered by these three gunas. The brain becomes concentrated or the object of meditation. The fifth and the highest level are called Niruddha or restricted. Here the mental modification are arrested, though their latent impressions remain. The first three levels are not at all conducive to Yogic life. Only the last two are reasonable.

Karmayoga is not opposed to jnana yoga. In fact the former is possible only when the latter is attained. When a karma in completely formation. Towards the prakrti of three gunas as-

(1) sattva
(2) rajas
(3) tamas.

As wordswoth says:
‘the eye cannot choose but see,
We cannot bid the ear be still,
Or bodies feel where’re they are
Against or wit 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 senses 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 negation of actions, but Niskama Karma. The giving up is not of action self, but of interest, desire, fruit, attachment regarding action. Desire binds a man; he should therefore act in such a way when action does not bind.

The Gita synthesizes both pravrtti and Nivrtti. As proof m. Hiriyanna says: ‘the Gita-teaching stands not for renunciation of action, but for renunciation in action. It is emphatically stated that
samnyasa does not mean only karma yoga but depends on action; it means the giving up the fruit of all work. Actions are sphere, fruits are not our concern. We should never be attached to the fruits of actions and at the same time we should never be inactive and without knowledge action of karma impossible. So only a true jnana can perform niskama karma.

Therefore the Gita says: only fools and not wise people speak of jnana and karma as different and oppose; really one.

**Problem**

The problem of then arises, A comparative study of Indian and western philosophical views on various aspects of education, What right have we to apply these forms of the mind to things? What is the ground of their objective validity? They have a purely mental origin and yet they are employed in experience. We read the categories, which are independent of experience in the sense of not being derived from experience, into experience, into the world of objects. How is that possible, what right have we do it? Jurists call the proof of rights and claims in a legal process, the dedication. What we need here is a dedication or proof or justification a transcendental dedication of the categories. Kant’s proof consists in showing that without them intelligible experience would be impossible. There could be no knowledge, no connected world of experience, without such original a priori concepts of thought, without a unified and unifying consciousness or self-consciousness, or the synthetic unity of apperception, as Kant calls it, which operates with these categories. Understanding is judgment, the act of bringing together in one self-consciousness the many perceived objects. Without a rational mind that perceives in certain ways and judges or thinks in certain ways the is so constituted that it must perceive and judge as it does, there could be no universal and necessary knowledge of objects of experience. Knowledge is the application of pure concepts of the understanding, or categories, to objects furnished us by the senses and perceived as spatial and temporal. Categories serve to make experience possible; that is their sole justification. So simple an act as the perception of the freezing of water, for example, would be impossible unless the mind apprehended two states as related in time and connected them in a single act of thought. The same synthetic unity of apperception which is necessary in order that we may have judgment is necessary in order that we may have perception in order that we may apprehend. The same spontaneous acts of apprehension, reproduction, and recognition that operate in our thinking operate in sense experience; is made possible by the categories; the phenomenal order, or nature as we perceive
it, depends on the forms of our intelligence, not vice versa, as the empiricists hold. This is what Kant means when he says that the understanding prescribes its laws to nature; this is the “Copernican revolution” which he effected in philosophy.

Since then the mind prescribes its laws to nature, it follows that we can know a priori the universal forms of nature. We can know that the perceived world will always be connected in certain intelligible ways, that our experiences will always be of things in fixed spatial and temporal order of things related as substance, and accident, cause and effect, and as reciprocally influencing one another. We cannot therefore, go wrong in applying the categories to the world of sense. But let it not be forgotten that they can be legitimately employed only in the field of actual or possible experience, only in the phenomenal world; their use is not valid outside this sphere; we cannot transcend experience nor have conceptual knowledge of the supersensuous, of things-in-themselves. It also follows from this theory that we cannot know a priori the matter or contents of experience, what particular sensations colors, sounds, weight etc. will be given; all we can say is that whatever they may be, the mind will organize them according to its necessary rules.

But how can categories, which are intellectual, be applied to percepts, to sensible phenomena? Pure concepts and sense percepts are absolutely dissimilar, or heterogeneous, according to Kant; how then, can we get them together? There must be a third something a mediating entity between the pure concepts and the sense perceptions, something that is pure i. e. without anything empirical, and at the same time, sensuous. This something Kant calls the transcendental schema.

The employment of such a schema is the schematism of the understanding. The time-form fills the requirements laid down: it is both pure and sensuous. All our ideas are subject to the time form that is, all our experiences are ordered by us in time; they take place in time. Hence, if the intellect is to influence sensibility at all, if it is to relate sense experiences or connect them, it must make use of the time-form. It tries to image its concepts, its categories, its uniform ways of connecting and relating, by means of the pure time-form, that is, to imagine them in certain time-relations. For example it successively adds one to one, or considers time as series of homogeneous moments, thus getting number. This operation of numbering adding one to one, is the schema of the category or quantity; the schema is the category expressed in the from of time. One moment of time expresses singularity; several moments express particularity; all, or the totality of moments, universality. The category of quantity is expressed in the schema of time-
series. The intellect also imagines sensations occurring in time, a content in time, something in time, or it imagines nothing in time. This is its way of picturing to itself the category of quality; the concept of quality is expressed in the schema of time-content. The intellect looks upon the real in time, the content, as something that remains when everything else changes. This is the way it imagines the category of substance. It considers the real as something upon which something else invariably follows in time; this is its way of making perceivable the category of causality. Or it regards the qualities of one substance and the qualities of another as invariably appearing together in time; this is its way of imaging the category of reciprocal action. The categories of substance causality, and reciprocal action are expressed in the schema of time-order. Or it thinks of something as existing at any time at a definite time at all times. The categories of possibility, actuality, and necessity are expressed in the schema of time-comprehension.

The culmination of Kant’s transcendental procedure is his doctrine of the transcendental unity of apperception. This unity of self-consciousness is presupposed by the categories as the categories are presupposed by experience; or rather it is directly of the categories and the deduction of the transcendental unity of apperception are accomplished together; or rather, they constitute one and the same deduction. This is a consequence of the intimate relation obtaining between the categories and the unity of apperception. The latter is not something behind the categories which impresses them upon the manifold of experience, as a man with a set of rubber stamps imprints them successively on the sheet on the sheet of paper before him; rather is it the unity in and of the categories. The transcendental unity of apperception is the functional unity which manifest itself identically and yet with a difference in each of the categories. The categories are all forms of a unitary synthesis it is this which accounts for their interrelatedness but each is an unique kind of synthesis. The synthesis of qualities in the unity of a substance is very different from the synthesis of events in the unity of a causal nexus, yet both belong to a single primitive synthesis which by differentiation becomes the several categorical syntheses.

The transcendental unity of apperception is a sine qua non of experience because it is presupposed by the categories, which in turn are presupposed by experience. Kant in his statement of the argument at times seems to proceed directly from experience of the transcendentally unity of apperception as the condition of its possibility, rather than indirectly by way of the categories; but the deduction of the transcendental unity of apperception is mediated
by the deduction of the categories which precedes it, and thus the retrogressive argument proceeds from experience to the categories and thence to the transcendental unity of apperception. The latter principle, because it is integral to the categories, is indispensable to the possibility of experience and is therefore like them a priori.

The transcendental unity of apperception occupies an unique position in the sphere of the transcendental, in that it is the final term in the retrogressive series; experience and the categories presuppose it, but does not presuppose anything else. The transcendental unity of apperception accordingly occupies a position in Kant’s system analogous to that of substance in systems which define substance as the ultimate subject of prediction or as the independent and self-sufficient it is the ultimate a priori, the last term in the transcendental regress. The backward movement from experience to its logical preconditions having been carried to its culmination, Kant, in the third and final step of the transcendental argument, reverses the direction of his thought and moves forward from the a priori forms to the a priori truths which they validate.

As has been pointed out, we cannot transcend our experience or have a priori knowledge of the supersensible, of things-in-themselves, of things as they are apart from the way they affect consciousness. Knowledge involves perception, but things-in-themselves cannot be perceived by the senses; in sense perception we know only the way things appear to consciousness, not what they are in themselves. Nor can they be perceived or intuited by the intellect; we do not possess intellectual intuition, we cannot see things face to face at one glance, in the mind’s eye, as it were; the intellect is discursive, not intuitive. If we apply categories to such a thing-in-itself, we cannot justify their claim to validity; we cannot prove, for example, that behind every existing thing there is a substance in an intelligible world. We can, however think such a thing-in-itself, speak of it as something to which none of the predicates of sense perception applies, say that it is not is space not change, and so on. Not a single category, however, can be applied to it, because we have no means of knowledge whether anything corresponding to it exists. We should never know whether anything existed corresponding to category of substance if perception did not furnish us with a case in which the category is applied. In the case of the thing-in-itself, however, perception can afford no evidence of the application of the category. The things-in-itself is essentially unknowable, but the concept of a thing-in-itself is not self-contradictory, for we surely cannot maintain that the phenomenal order is the only possible one. We can have sensible knowledge only of sensible things, not of things-in-themselves; the senses cannot presume to
know everything the intellect thinks. The concept of the thing-in-itself, or noumenon, as something not knowable by the senses, but as something capable of being know by intellectual intuition, is at least thinkable. It is a limiting concept; it says to the knowing mind: here is your limit, you phenomena; the non-phenomenal, the noumenal, the intelligible is beyond you.

I know things not as they are in themselves but only as they appear to me. Similarly, I do not know myself as I am, but only as I appear to myself. I am conscious of my existence, of my activity, of my spontaneity. But consciousness of oneself is not knowledge of one’s self. To know is to have percepts. I do not perceive my self, my ego, nor do I possess an intellectual intuition through the time-form, as a succession of states. But though I cannot know the ego in the sense of perceiving it, I can think it. Indeed, Kant’s whole theory of knowledge is based on the supposition of such an ego; the synthetic unity of apperception is nothing but the self-conscious self. There can be no knowledge without a self-conscious, unifying self: but this self itself cannot be know in the sense of being perceived directly. It is evident, therefore that we cannot have universal and necessary or a priori knowledge of anything non-perceivable. Hence, we cannot have a metaphysics that transcends experience, a metaphysics of things-in-themselves, a metaphysics that can offer us genuine knowledge of a non phenomenal world in which reside free will, immortality, and God. But we can have an a priori science of the phenomenal order, for the reasons already adduced. Mathematics owes its necessity to the forms of space and time geometry being based on a priori space perception, arithmetic on the concept of number, which expresses a priori time perception. Natural science rests on the categories: we speak of substance and accident, cause and affect, interaction, etc. Hume and the empiricists are wrong in depriving substance and causality of their universality and necessity. We can have universal and necessary knowledge of mathematics and of the principles of physics, but it is knowledge of phenomena only, and knowledge only of the form and arrangement of phenomena. We cannot know things-in-themselves-in this Hume is right. Things-in-themselves, however exists; indeed, exist they must otherwise sensation is unexplainable. Corresponding to phenomena there must be something that appears, something extra mentem, something that affects our senses and supplies the matter of our knowledge. Kant does not for a moment doubt the existence of such a thing-in-itself. In the second edition of the critique in his “Refutation of Idealism,” he even proceeds to prove its existence. But after his strong insistence that it exists and that it is the ground of our sensations, he is compelled by the nature of his system to make is a very elusive and hazy factor.
It becomes a limiting concept, a kind of check to the pretensions of our knowledge: we cannot, know the supersensible by means of the senses. Then again, we are told that we cannot know it, for we are not entitled to apply the categories to it; if we attempt to do so, these categories have no objective validity. Yet we can think it is the sense of entertaining it as a possibility and as a limiting concept. The status of the thing-in-itself is anomalous and constitutes a problem which has to be worked out; and to this Kant himself gave further attention and to it his successors addressed themselves with zeal, if not always with success, as we shall see.

The aim of Kant was to show, first against the “skeptic” Hume that we can have a priori knowledge in mathematics and physics; second, against the Leibniz-Wolffian “dogmatists,” that we cannot have knowledge of the supersensible in metaphysics, that metaphysics in this sense is a pseudoscience. His rejection of metaphysics is not, however, absolute and unqualified. There are several senses in which he regards metaphysics as possible: as a study of the theory of knowledge; as absolute knowledge of the forms and laws of nature; as absolute knowledge of the laws or forms of the will, i.e. as moral philosophy as knowledge of the spiritual world, based on the moral law; as a hypothesis of the universe having a certain degree of probability. Let us consider, in some detail, the grounds on which he rejects “dogmatic” or speculative metaphysics of the kind advanced by his rationalistic predecessors. The understanding can know only what can be experienced; but reason strives to go beyond the confines of the understanding, and attempts to conceive the supersensible, that for which we have no objects in perception, that which is merely thought. The reason, when it enters the supersensible world, confuses percepts with mere thought, and in this way falls into all kinds of ambiguities, equivocations false inferences, and contradictions. That is what happens in the metaphysics of the transcendent.

Question which have a meaning when asked with respect to our world of experience have none when we transcend phenomena. Categories like cause and effect, substance and accident, which are perfectly legitimate when applied to the phenomenal order, have no meaning when transferred to a noumenal world. Metaphysics too often forgets this, and, confusing phenomena with noumena, applies to the transcendent reality the concepts which are valid only in our world of sense. In this way it falls into error and illusion, which as distinguished from ordinary sensory illusion, Kant calls transcendental illusion. He calls the principles which are applied within the confines of possible experience immanent principles, those which transcend these limits transcendent principles, or concepts of reason, or ideas. It is an inevitable illusion of reason to
mistake our subjective principles, which apply to sensations, for objective principles, and to apply them to things-in-themselves. It is the business of transcendental dialectic to discover the illusion of such transcendent judgments and to prevent such illusion from deceiving us. It cannot however, destroy the illusion, for the illusion is natural and inevitable; we may see through it and avoid being deceived by it, but we cannot entirely rid ourselves of it.

**Scope**

A careful examination of the arguments of metaphysics will reveal many logical fallacies, equivocations, non sequiturs and contradictions. As we have seen, the understanding is the name given to the faculty of the mind, or reason in general, which connects our experiences in uniform ways, according to rules or principles, thereby furnishing us with valid judgments. These judgments are validated by comprehensive a priori concepts the categories. Reason as a faculty of subsuming the rules of the understanding under higher principles, is engaged in this speculative enterprise; it aims at a unification of the judgments of the understanding. But such higher principles are merely subjective laws of economy for the understanding, striving to reduce the use of concepts to the smallest possible number. This supreme reason does not prescribe laws to objects, nor does it explain our knowledge of them; its function is solely to guide and direct our inquiries, to provide ideals of completeness which our knowledge never fully realizes. Thus, reason strives to bring all mental processes under a general head, or idea of a soul in rational psychology; all physical events under the idea of nature in rational cosmology; all occurrences in general under the idea of a God in rational theology. The notion of God would, therefore be the highest idea, the unity, the one absolute Whole comprehending everything else. Such ideas, however, are transcendent, beyond experience: they can never be empirically fulfilled or exemplified. Thus, we can never represent the idea of an absolute Totality in the form of an image; it is a problem without a solution. Yet these idea have their value and use as guides to the understanding; they lead it onward in its pursuit of knowledge; they are, in Kant’s language, regulative rather than constitutive.

Thus it is legitimate to conclude that there can be no knowledge unless there is a subject, self, or knower, unless thoughts come together in a single consciousness the self that thinks the subject of a judgment is the same self that thinks the predicate. But we have no right to infer that this knower is a self-existent, simple, indecomposable self identical soul-substance, one that remains the same in all change. In reasoning thus, rational psychology draws conclusions not warranted
by the premises; it uses the terms self, subject and soul in different senses, and is guilty of a fallacy which Kant calls a paralogism. We cannot prove, theoretically, the existence of free will and an immortal soul. Still, although rational psychology does not add anything to our knowledge it prevents us from adopting either a soulless materialism or a groundless spiritualism. Reason thus gives us a hint to turn from fruitless speculations and to put our self-knowledge to moral use. The moral law teaches man to esteem the mere consciousness of righteousness more than anything else in the world, and to render himself fit to become the citizen of a better world, which exists in his idea only.

Reason also tries to reduce the objective conditions of all our phenomena to an ultimate and supreme condition, or an unconditioned. We from the idea of nature as a whole, the idea of a universe, and either conceive this as the principle on which all phenomena depend, or seek the unconditioned among the phenomena themselves. In either case we form cosmological ideas, and involve ourselves in all kinds of antitheses, which Kant calls antinomies: sophistical propositions which can neither hope for confirmation no need fear refutation from experience. The thesis is free from contradiction and is rooted in the necessity of reason, but, unfortunately, the antithesis can produce equally cogent and necessary grounds for its support.

There are four such antinomies in which both the thesis and the antithesis can be proved. It can proved that the world has a beginning in time, and that it has no beginning in time, or is eternal; that it is limited in space, and that it is unlimited in space; that bodies are infinitely divisible, and that they are not infinitely divisible, that they are made of simple parts, or atoms, which cannot be further divided; that there is freedom in the world and that everything in the world takes place according to the laws of nature; that there exists an absolutely necessary being, either as part of the world or as cause of it; and that there is no such Being, wither within the world or outside it as the cause of it. In preferring one side to the other, the disputants do not consult the logical test of truth, but only their own interest. Every right-thinking man has a certain practical preference for the thesis, or dogmatism, if he knows his true interests. That the world has a beginning, that my thinking self is simple and imperishable, that is it free and not subject to the compulsion of nature, that the whole order of things which constitutes the world, springs from an original being whence everything receives its unity and purposeful connection these are so many supports of ethics and religion. The antithesis, or empiricism, robs us, or seems to rob us, of all these supports. If there is no original Being, if the world is without a beginning and without a Creator,
if our will is not free and our soul is divisible and perishable like matter, our moral ideals and principles lose all validity and fall with the transcendental ideas which from their the oretic support.

There is also a speculative interest involved. For if we assume the transcendental ideas in the thesis, we can conceive a priori the whole chain of conditions and the derivation of the conditioned by beginning with the unconditioned. The antithesis does not accomplish this. Yet, if the empiricist were satisfied with merely suppressing intellectual presumption and rashness, his principle would be entirely legitimate, and would serve to teach moderation in claims to absolute knowledge. But the empiricist not only rejects the claims of the dogmatist; he also puts forward a counter-dogmatism of his own. He deprives the intellect of its legitimate aspirations, and at the same time, destroys the theoretical basis of our practical interests. The real contribution of empiricism is to destroy the presumptuous claims and pompous titles of science and rational insight, and to reiterate that true speculative knowledge can never have any other object than experience. But empiricism itself becomes dogmatic in boldly denying what goes beyond the sphere of intuitive knowledge, and thereby does irreparable injury to the practical interests of reason.

Kant solves the difficulties involved in the antinomies by pointing out that the antithesis holds for the phenomenal world, and the thesis for the noumenal world. Our sense-perceived spatial-temporal world has no first beginning in time and no extreme limit in space. We never experience absolute limits; we can never stop anywhere in the regress us of time or in the progressus of space. But there may be a non-spatial world in which absolutely simple beings exist, a world of spiritual entities. It does not follow that because a limit is impossible in the one world, it is also impossible in the other. For all we know, the true world may have had a beginning, it may have been created by god, and be limited. Still, we have no right to search for spiritual beings in space and for spatial things in the supersensible realm.

In the same way, the causal antimony is solved. In the phenomenal series, everything is conditioned by something like it, every effect has a phenomenal cause; no breach is possible in the causal nexus. It is our business to go right on the chain ad infinitum. Still, it is conceivable that there is something outside the phenomenal series on which the phenomenally conditioned depends. It is settled by the nature of our intelligence that we shall never find a free cause in the sense world, hence we cannot derive the idea of freedom from experience. It is transcendental
idea, because reason creates it independently of experience. It is easy to see, however, that if all causality in the world of sense were merely natural causality, every event would be necessarily determined by some other event, and every act would be a necessary natural effect of some phenomenon in nature. The denial of transcendental freedom of spontaneity, would destroy practical or moral freedom. Practical freedom presuppose that although something did not happen, it ought to have happened; Hence, that its phenomenal cause was not absolutely determining, that our will should have produced it independently of its natural causes and even contrary to their power and influence. If transcendental freedom is possible, practical freedom is possible: the will may be independent of the coercion of sensuous impulses, not necessitated as is the will of the brute.

In such a way freedom and natural necessity could be reconciled. We can regard the phenomena as caused by the thing-in-itself, the noumenal cause, which is not perceived, but whose phenomenal appearances are perceived and arranged in an unbroken causal series. One and the same phenomenon, looked at as part of the phenomenal world in space and time, would then be a link in a causal chain; looked at as the activity of the non-perceived thing-in-itself, it would be the act of a free cause, which, by itself, originates its effects in the world of sense. On the one side, the event would be an effect of nature only; on the other, an effect of freedom. In other worlds, this effect is a phenomenon and must have an empirical cause, but this empirical cause itself can be the effect of a non-empirical cause, or intelligible or free cause, without breaking in the least its connection with natural causes. Applying this insight to man, we have the following interpretation of human action and conduct. Looked at through the spectacles of sense and understanding, man is a part of nature; in this aspect he has an empirical character, he is a link in a chain of causes and effects. But in reality man is an intelligible or spiritual being. To such a being the sense forms do not apply; such a being can originate acts. That man is cognizant of this power is attested by the fact that he holds himself responsible for his decisions and actions. Whenever we think of an act as a phenomenon, it must have a cause; as such it cannot be regarded as spontaneously initiated. This interpretation cannot, however, be extended to the reason; we cannot say that the state in which reason determined the will was preceded by another state, and so on, for reason is not a phenomenon, and is not subject to the conditions of sensibility, such as time, space, causality. We cannot interpret its causality in the natural way, that is, expect a cause for everything it does. Reason or the intelligible or man as he is in himself,
is the permanent condition of all his voluntary acts. A man’s character, considered in its empirical aspect, is only the sensuous schema of his character considered in its super sensuous aspect. The empirical is thus the way in which we image man or phenomenalize him. Whether his position is tenable or not, Kant’s meaning is quite clear. Every voluntary act is the direct expression of man’s intelligible character, of pure reason; hence, man is a free agent, he is not a link in the chain of natural causes. Yet the act itself, when viewed as a phenomenon, is absolutely determined. Man in his intelligible aspect is a free agent, he originates acts; but when these acts are perceived by a mind they are woven into a web of causation and are the effects of particular impulses, ideas, education, natural dispassion, and so on. But the real cause of the act is reason; the action is imputed to man’s intelligible character and as such is not affected at all by the influences of the world of the senses. In the Critique of pure reason however Kant does not aim to establish the reality of freedom; he simply wishes to point out that reason creates the idea, that it initiates, absolutely, a causal series and, at the same time prescribes laws of causality to the understanding, and thereby involves itself in an antinomy. He thus seeks to prove that the determinism of nature does not altogether preclude the idea of free causality.

The antinomy of necessary being and contingent being Kant solves in this way. The intellect refuses to regard anything within the phenomenal series as absolutely free and independent; everything is contingent, that is, depends on something else. But this is not to deny that the whole series may depend on some intelligible being, which is free, independent of all empirical conditions, and itself the ground of the possibility of all these phenomena. We can regard the whole world of sense as the expression of some intelligible being. Which is the substance, the necessary being without which nothing can exist, and which itself needs nothing else in order to exist. The intellect is not entitled to say that because the intelligible is useless in explaining phenomena, it is therefore impossible. Perhaps there is no such being but it does not follow from what we have found to be true of the understanding, that it is impossible. When we are speaking of phenomena, we must speaking terms of sense; but that is not necessarily the only way of looking at things. We can conceive of another order of existence, fo an order of things-in-themselves, of non-sensuous things which, although they do not appear to the senses, are capable of being thought. We must assume transcendent objects on which phenomena depend, but we know nothing of such objects; all we can do is to form some kind of notion of them. Conceive them by analogy with the ways in which we use the concepts of experience.
- Objectives Of The Study:-

Introduction

Towards the philosophical education. Its hints by the values of naturalistic and the etc are clear some of the philosophers gives the idea for philosophical education that by various objectives a man can develop integrated personality. As we think that the objectives of philosophical education have been connection the children mind to solve the account of the different attempts which have been made solve the problem of existence, of the world and nature.

For the side of the development of men’s ideas from ancient time to modern time. Not for only actual declaration but the development of high ideas. With this a study of their relatives to each other. Which all the philosophers have mentioned. So the philosophical ideas concerned with the generation views with the individual thinking of philosophers. So the efficiency affective conceptions and places on the time. By the background of philosophy are may say that it has been recommended by philosophers for many word views as intellectuality, morality, sociality, politically, with religiously states in forever.

Therefore the basically situation for education to the child with aim of education is first, to train the growing child in the art of civilized living and behavior, and second, to help the individual to acquire a cultured personality. All the values created by man may be subsumed under two general concepts, civilization and culture. While civilization stands for the extension of negative, i.e. freedom from wants and unjust authority, culture signifies the activities which contribute to the expansion and enrichment of the human personality.

Both civilization and culture being the concerns of man, and the activities called culture being largely dependent on the security afforded by civilized conditions of existence, The education must equip the pupil to play his part in the preservation and growth of both civilization and culture. Education is different from mere training or conditioning. Monkeys and elephants can be trained or conditioned to make definite response to given stimuli, but they cannot be education like conscious human beings. For philosophical education, some of the following objectives are given below- as-

Self Realization:-

A self solution in the source of humanity reflects.

By philosophical education.
To know about himself by philosophical education.
To know personally traits by this education.
All of the philosophical education is based on self-confidence.

**Intellectual development:-**

Education as a mean of intellectual development:-
Development of imagination.
Development of Creativeness.
Development of Free thinking.
Development of Constant Curiosity.
Development of activeness of child’s mind.
So all of the development for children depends on their philosophical education.

**Physical development:-**

Form this stage it becomes the development of children’s body must be necessary because, as we know that a sound mind to in a sound body, for this yoga, Games, Sports etc., or by physically exercise.

**Humanity and its love:-**

By this, a child may learn to each other the conception of faithfulness.
To develop the concept of trust in international understanding and universal brotherhood for human being.
The importance of personality traits depends on the children’s behavior to the humanity.
All of the peoples are corrected to each other.
Correlation between man and God:-
Form this a man suffers many action-motions.
Which he noted as god gifts.
A co-relation of man to god in universal.
In it a man’s spirit is immortal but the site of a man’s body is mortal.
A man correlated with god an nature.
Development of freeness:-
In the philosophical education freeness is essential aspect for children’s progress.
A children’s development to the philosophical mind depends on his free ship.
This is the surely condition that the all round progress of the child reflects in free mind.
In this way, we can say- that philosophical knowledge depende on freeness of children’s mind.

**Objectives-Co-relation:-**

All of the Indian and western Philosophical theory, as:-the existence of god nature and man correlated.
Where is the man and nature is correlated.
There is a peaceful world with the boas of god.
Viii. Faith for Mother tongue-as:-
The instructions had been given in mother-tone.
Without mother tongue we cannot do any expression.
Mother tongue is the source expression.
Children’s philosophical education is understandable by mother tongue.

**IX. Development of morality:-**

By morality steps the philosophical children held up the every step to development in his education at thought.
A man’s personality depends on his moral education which reflects in his behavior.

**Spiritual development:-**

A man will be free to know self-consciousness and the existence of spirit.
Spiritual power too development in the Philosophical Education thoughts.
Spiritual education is more important rather than that of other education.
It is necessary for an integral development of spiritual. Confidence because spirit is super authority.

**Development of social status:-**

Philosophy declares that Brahma is the most authority. His existence is permanent in social level.
From this education, for a particular personality develops with all of the social character and its being.
In the sense of all of the man affected by being.
Therefore, we can say that’’
A man’s help equal to the god.
Therefore-
XII. - Religious development:-

To inate the precious thoughts and high ideals about all of the religions.
In the religious sense, the supreme soul manifests throw man and other creatures.
All of the religions are equal for gaining philosophical education and educational philosophy.

**Conclusion**

We can conclude that to help the individual to acquire a cultured personality and the best philosophical thinking have been spared out in the position of morality intellectuality from this time to future.
Hence, we may thing the basic objectives of philosophical Education and educational philosophy are, as-
To train the growing child in the art civilized living and behavior.
To help the individual to acquire a cultural personality.
The children’s philosophical altitude will have increased which have reflected in education for next time.
The students and men may develop their deeply thinking for high ideals.
Everyone may develop their philosophical knowledge about the, Nature, sprit, God, Goddess, yoga Religion etc in whole life.
To sum up we can say that philosophy in traditional sense stand for a ethical metaphysical etc word views produced by the Indian and western philosophers
They have been associated with definite logic epistemological doctrines, this is true of both Indian and western philosophy in philosophical education and educational philosophy. There is the metaphysical object in general view where intellectual stage will success. So that all of success in real and true stages.
Hence, the demand for consistency of vision with the propositions of science, logic and commonsense is necessary. But this demand for efficient craftsmanship in philosophical construction, the core of which lies in vision which evokes the best in philosophers, which enhances his life a thought for creative enterprise and which aims at inducing in other and in them for holding fast the golden key which opens the gate to eternity. After reading the works of a philosopher the evaluative question should be: ‘oh reader! Have you felt uplifted, have you
found the pearl of great price, have you been shaken from the very depth of your being?’ even skeptical writings stir us for the rouse from our slumbers and complacency.

There, we shall treat the history of modern philosophy as a series of vision. Whatever may be the value of cognitive enterprise and of the analytic Achievements, they all remain subsidiary to the vision of the philosopher. Philosophy so understood is not lyrical poetry, but is an intellectual poetry that is, in which poetry an intellectual needs are sought to suitably matched. Seeing that there is no agreement about any statement in philosophy and seeing that there is no steady advance in the content of philosophical study, many critics have hazarded uncharitable remarks against it. At times it is pointed out that philosophers search for a black date in a dark room where it is not. Again critics admit that people may think of many things which have never been dreamed of by philosophers to be under heaven and earth but like Lichtenberg, they add that philosophers dream about many things which are neither in heaven nor on earth.

Whatever many be the difficulty about the exact formulation of the theory of verifiability, at last it aims at distinguishing factual from non-cognitive proposition. If metaphysical proposition be taken certainly the jokes of the critic are justified. But we have already held that philosophy is not a scientific enterprise. As such it does not describe anything under heaven and earth. Metaphysical entities like god not immortal soul, are neither to be found in heaven nor on earth. They are symbols of human aspirations.

Of course, a great deal of confusion has arisen concerning the cognitive nature of metaphysical propositions. The reason is that the vision of philosophers has always been supported by science and logic. A great many times, they vary of scientific thinking have been grasping power with their action in philosophy. All of philosophers with the grammar of language is itself a consequence of reflecting on the language of science. Similarly, a great deal of advance has been made in logic now linguistics and logic are certainly cognitive and they do come under philosophy. Hence the confusion has arisen concerning the cognitive status of metaphysics. However, it would be better to hold that metaphysics is an intellectual poetry, whose language has to produce, induce and the sustain conviction. Hence, metaphysical contention dose include logic and the syntactic but their plea remains subsidiary to philosophical vision. Again, since metaphysical entities cannot be cognitively established, therefore, they are dubbed as ‘meaningless’ or ‘nonsense’.
About Indian and western philosophical views we may attempt a definition of the self which is worth knowing, and which may be fitly described as the object of philosophical knowledge. The self whose nature philosophy attempts to understand is not a static being subsisting or existing since eternity in a state of changeless perfection; on the contrary, it is a growing and developing coterminous with the significant or value-bearing consciousness of man at a particular point in his spiritual history. This self consists of the universally sharable consciousness and is continually taking ever richer and newer forms in the formulated discoveries and principles of the sciences, in the exquisite creations of master artists and poets. Critics and philosophers, and in the deeds of the saints and heroes symbolizing the greatness and nobility of the human spirit. These varied forms of significant awareness or value, ever growing in richness and complexity, constitute the ever-expanding impersonal, cultural self of humanity, which is the proper object of philosophical investigation and knowledge. Philosophy, as we have observed elsewhere, is an attempt to analyze, interpret and evaluate the value-bearing forms of man’s consciousness and behavior, insofar as those forms are universally visible. Philosophy does not study everything that constitutes mine or you, only those aspects of me, my behavior and consciousness, which have value or significance for the whole of mankind. Such values expressing his self are embodied by man in his artistic and reflective works, in the disposition of saintliness and holiness which soothes and fascinates all who come in contact with him. Philosophy then is the study of values. However it does not study the utilitarian values i.e. the values that count of us only as means. Philosophy studies what may be called the ultimate values, which are realized and reflected in the life and personality of man. By reflective analysis and interpretation of values philosophy renders articulate the processes of the creation and enjoyment of those values. The activity of philosophical reflection is essentially critical; it bears to values in general the same relationship as criticism does to art. Thus understood philosophy will appear to be an activity which contributes to the refinement of man’s taste of his sense of values and the qualitative growth of the human spirit. In the important sense explained here, philosophy may fitly be described as self-knowledge; it is also the highest, the most interesting and illuminating find of knowledge of knowledge that the human being can aspire to attain.