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Throughout the history of Indian thought, the ideal of a world behind the ordinary world of human strivings, more real and more tangible, which is the true home of the spirit, has been haunting the Indian race. The survey of Indian thought, as of all thought, impresses one with the mystery and the immensity of existence as well as the beauty and the persistence of the human effort to understand it. ¹

The Upanisads speak with a double voice in describing the nature of ultimate reality. They sometimes make it the absolute which can not be characterized by the phenomenal categories; at other times they identify it with the supreme person whom we are to adore and worship. As a result of this, we have two views about the nature of the world. In some passages, the world is regarded as an accident of Brahman and in others as organic to God. There are two tendencies running through the Upanisads, one which regards the absolute as pure being and makes the world an accidental appearance. (Vivarta) of it, and the other which looks upon the absolute as a concrete person of whom the world is the necessary expression. The former view is nearer Sāmkara’s and the latter nearer Rāmānuja’s. In that case Radhakrishnan mentioned that – “it is difficult to decide whether it is the

¹ IP, (Vol -II), P. 767
Advaita or no-dualism of Samkara or the modified position of Rāmānuja that is the final teaching of the parent gospel.²

Indian philosophy maintains that there is an unity among the nine systems. Thinker of Indian Philosophy recognises that the principles of his predecessors are stones built into the spiritual fabric, and if they are introduced, one’s own’s culture is defamed. A progressive people with a rich tradition cannot afford to neglect it, though it may contain elements which are not edifying. The thinkers try hard to explain, allegorise, alter and purify the traditional lore. Since men’s emotions are centered round it. The later Indian thinkers justify the different philosophical interpretations of the universe advanced by the earlier ones, and regard them as varying approximations to the truth as a whole. The different views are not looked upon as unrelated adventures of the human mind into the realm of the unknown or a collection of philosophical curiosities. They are regarded as the expression of a single mind, which has built up the great temple, though it is divided into numerous walls and vestibules, passages and pillars.³

Logic and science, philosophy and religion are organically related. In this case the Nyaya points out that no stable philosophy can be built except on the foundations of logic. According to Vaiśeṣika all fruitful philosophy must take into account the constitution of physical nature. Reality appears not

² IP, (Vol -I) P. 675
³ IP, (Vol-II), P. 769
only in science and in human life but in religious experience which is the subject-matter of the yoga system. The Purva Mimāṃsā and the Vedānta lay stress on ethics and religion. The relation between nature and mind is the supreme problem of philosophy which the Vedānta take up. The nyāya-vaiśeṣika realism, the sāṁkhya yoga dualism and the Vedānta monism do not differ as true and false but as more or less true. Every system of thought developed in India offered its own theory of knowledge, interpretation of nature and mind, ethics and religion.⁴

It is clear from the foregoing discussion that the six systems of Indian Philosophy offer some valuable creationistic theories. All these theories conform to the view that the creation process starts through the space and time and explains that the world is organic whole and it is in the process of creation. The descriptions of the creation process is not similar in all systems. Some are based on most scientific principles and some are theistic and some are very pragmatic for human life.

It has already been mentioned in the Sāṁkhya system that prakṛti is both the material and the efficient cause of the world. It is active and ever changing. But blind and unintelligent. How can such a blind principle evolve an orderly world and direct it towards any rational end; and it is said that the three gunus are in the state of equilibrium in and why this equilibrium is disturbed? Again purusa or (self) is inactive and unchanging, but how can the

⁴ IP, (Vol-II) PP. 769-770
inactive and unchanging self at all come in contact with and influence Prakṛti or matter. Similarly so many questions arise in this system and the Saṃkhya philosophers tries to solve these by their own interpretations.

Saṃkhya advocates the theory of Satkāryavāda. According to this theory effect is pre-exist in its material cause Saṃkhya philosophers have particularly connected with the problem of creation. According to them, that which does not exist cannot come into existence and that which is existent can not be absent.

In Saṃkhya philosophy we notice that the mere presence of the self can be the cause of changes in Prakṛti; but not in the self itself, is not clearly explained, Nor, again is it quite clear how an unintelligent material principle like the intellect can reflect pure consciousness and thereby become conscious and intelligent. The physical analogies given in the Saṃkhya are not sufficiently illuminating. From the speculative stand point there seem to be certain gaps in the Saṃkhya philosophy but from the practical point of view it is fruitful. So far as the practical end of attaining freedom from suffering is concerned, this system is as good as any other and enables the religious aspirant to realize the highest good of his life.⁵

In the yoga system it is observed that the self realization has a solid foundation in the Saṃkhya metaphysics which proves the reality of the self as a metaphysical and eternal principle of consciousness. The society for

⁵ AIIP, P. 288
physical research and the modern school of Psycho-analysis have of late contributed much towards our knowledge about the dark regions of the psychical life hidden from the ordinary view. The yoga goes further in the same direction when it formulates certain practical methods of purification and self control for the realization of the true self of man. Both from a theoretical and a practical standpoint, it occupies a better position than the Śaṅkhya in so far as it admits the existence of God and relies mostly on actual experiences to carry conviction to its followers.

The Nyāya Philosophy applies the method of logical criticism to solve the problem of life and reality. Adṛṣṭa is the stock of merit and demerit accruing from our good and bad actions. So, our fate is determined by our own actions. The Nyāya conception of God as the architect of the world, its efficient but not material cause, has an obvious reference to human analogy and reduces God to the position of a human artificer who makes things out of given material. There is indeed the suggestion that the world of things and beings is related to God as one’s body is to one’s self. The Nyaya view is a natural and necessary stage in the evolution of thought, but is by no means final. The mechanical explanation of reality, which traces it back to its elements, eliminates the fact of development.⁶

In the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, it is included that the problem of two different substances in the form of cause and effect occupying the same space...
is solved by Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika by taking resort to Samavāya relation, though their substratum is different. Thus the whole series of cause-effect from atoms onwards to the ultimate effect occupy the same space. The Vaiśeṣika idea of God as wholly transcendent to and separate from man and the world, is not favourable for a deeply religious view of life and the genuine religious consciousness of communion with God. The Vaiśeṣika division objects into seven classes and of these into many other sub-classes is a logical classification of them based on their distinctive characters and ultimate differences. The atomic theory of the Vaiśeṣika is an improvement on the ordinary view of the world as constituted by the physical elements of earth, water, air fire. It is also an advance on the materialistic theory that all things including life, mind and consciousness are transformation and mechanical products of material atoms. The Vaiśeṣika harmonizes the atomic theory with the moral and spiritual outlook of life and the theistic faith in God as the creator and moral governor of the world. 7

The Śrīmāṁśāka view of causation is borrowed from Nyāya-vaiśeṣika. Their differences with Nyāya – Vaiśeṣika are insignificant except in the cause of potency. According to Naiyāyikas the causal power is not distinct from the nature of the substance. The theory of non-existent effect (asatkārya vāda) is accepted by the Śrīmāṁśāka thinkers.

7 AIIP, P. 248
The *Mimāṃsākas* reject the proofs for the existence of God. Maxmuller, holds that if God were supposed to be the creator, he would be liable to the charges of cruelty, partiality etc. But from the commonsense belief; God is not responsible for any bad action so it is not tenable. Again Mimamsa loses the living faith in deities which is found in the Vedas. While the Vedic hymns are inspired by the living presence of the deity in the place of worship, the *Mimāṃsākas* wonders how the deity can be simultaneously present in different places where he is invoked.⁸ Max Muller Contends the reality but do not accept the reality of creation and it is unfair to call them atheistic because they do not conform to the customary belief of God. In this regards Advaita Vedānta and Spinoza also held the same conclusion. The *Mimāṃsā* assumes human freedom other wise the human individuals can not be held responsible for their acts. The Vedas are the revelation for their acts. The Vedas are the revelation of the mind of God. While the sacrificial works may be the special causes of bliss, God is the general cause. This view is also in consistency with the avowed purpose of Kumārila to reinterprete, the *Mimāṃsā* doctrine so as to bring it into agreement with the non-naturalistic tendencies of the time.⁹ In the Vedānta, it has been said that the world exists in Brahman in a potential state just as a tree exists in its seed. But this simile is possible only on a phenomenal plane. In the real sense this simile is not

---

⁸ Vide Parkararna – Pancika, P. 186
⁹ IP (Vol.-II), P. 428
possible. We find that a seed becomes a fruit by losing its seed form (But in the case of the world arising from the seed Brahman). Though the fruit is existent in the seed (the seed) Brahman does not give up its original form.\textsuperscript{10} The sprout is not found in the seed in the form of sprout. Waterever exists in the seed is of the nature of seed alone.\textsuperscript{11} Guadapāda, in his \textit{Māndukyakārika}, has discussed the problem of causation in detail and has shown that there is actually nothing like origination, it is mere illusion. Actually, “No Jiva is born; there is no cause for it, this is the supreme truth, nothing whatever is born.”\textsuperscript{12}

Sāmkara maintains Brahmakaraṇa-vāda as he recognizes that Brahman is the cause of the world. But his theory is called Brahma-Vivarta-vāda because it takes the world to be only a phenomenal appearance of Brahman. According to Sāmkara the world is neither a real creation by Brahman nor a real modification of Brahman. Sarvajnatma Muni Points out that pariṇāma-vāda logically leads to vivartavāda which is only a step ahead of it. Sāmkara holds that whenever we talk of creation, we do not mean real creation, we mean only phenomenal appearance of Brahman due to Avidyā and this creation – appearance is real only as long as Avidyā lasts. When

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} YV, 18,24
\item \textsuperscript{11} VI,1, b, 195, 14
\item \textsuperscript{12} Mandukya-Karika, III,48, IV, 71
\end{itemize}
Avidyā is removed by right knowledge, God, the ruler, soul, the enjoyer and the world, the enjoyed – all are merged in the highest Brahman.\textsuperscript{13}

Again the pratibimba theory of causation in the Vedānta philosophy is also mentioned here. This theory maintains the relation of reflection between the Jiva and Brahman. From this theory it is known that Brahman is revealed in two aspects, First, it is one Brahman which is reflected differently in different Antahkarana due to different Avidyā, and Secondly that the clearness of the reflection of the Brahman will be proportionate of the clearness of the Antahkarana.

There is a defect in the theory of reflection. If this theory is accepted, the liberation of Jiva would mean its destruction, because when the mirror of Avidyā is destroyed, its reflection should also disappear. Hence, to save the existence of the Jiva some Advaita Philosophers have established Avachhedavadā.\textsuperscript{14}

In the Rāmānuja’s Visistadvaita Philosophy it is found that creation and distraction are only relative and signify different states of the same causal substance, namely Brahman.\textsuperscript{15}

Again he holds that soul and matter have a two fold existence, a causal existence and an effect existence. From the point of casual existence the souls are unmaterialized and nature is in equal. But at the time of creation, the

\textsuperscript{13} ACSIP, P. 263
\textsuperscript{14} IP, P. 195
\textsuperscript{15} R.B.G. XIII, 2, IX, 7
souls, under the influence of their karma, disturb the equilibrium of the three gunas, and prakṛti works out the fruits of their karma under divine God. It is to enable the souls to enjoy the experiences for which their act have entitled them that creation is brought about. God creates the world to suit the karma of the souls. In this sense God's creative act is not absolute.16

It is also mentioned from our earlier discussions that the Nāstika Schools of philosophy reject the idea of God and they do not believe that God is the creator of this universe. In this case Carvāka mentions that Nature or svabhava is the cause of the world. Through the naturalism and accidentalism Carvāka explains the whole causal process of this universe. The Śvetasvatara upaniṣad holds that svabhāva or nature is the cause of this world.

Like the Epicureans of Greece, the Carvākas in India have been more hated than understood for their materialistic attitude. It is said that the Carvāka saved Indian philosophy from dogmatism. Every system of Indian thought tried to meet the Carvāka objections and made the Carvāka a touchstone of its theories. The contribution of Carvāka epistemology is not insignificant. The Carvāka also holds that mind appeared in this world through accidental process. Gautama, in his Nyāya-Sūtra, also refers to the Carvāka doctrine of causation according to which effect is produced without any cause, because we see the sharpness of a thorn, etc to be so.17

17 N.S, IV, 122
Jainism presents, along with Buddhism, a religion without belief in God. Jain concludes that neither perception nor inference can prove the existence of God. Again it is said that the qualities attributed to God are not reasonable. The Jainas worship the liberated souls possessing God-like qualities instead of God. Satkāryavāda and Asatkāryavāda both theories are found in Jain philosophy. According to the Jain view of causation cause and effect are partly identical and partly distinct, so effect is partly existent (satasti) and partly non-existent (satnasti). But this view is not free from criticism. At the same time a thing can not be asti and nasti. Things are relatively true, but not absolute. Jains are opposed to Saṁkhya, Nyāya vaīśeṣika and Buddha’s theory of causation. The Karma of the past life of a soul, its past thought, speech and activity generates in it certain blind cravings and passions that seek satisfaction. These cravings in a soul attract to it particular sorts of matter, particles and organize them into the body unconsciously desired. The soul with its passions is, therefore, regarded by the Jaina as the organizer of the body, the efficient cause of it, whereas matter is said to be its material cause.18

In the Buddhist Philosophy, there are two types of causality, one is the ultimate and other is empirical. It corresponds to two kinds of realities, one ultimate and pure, that of point instants and the other mixed with an image

18 AIIP, P. 101
constructed by our imagination. Buddhists hold that an effect is not the result of the single cause, but of many causes working together.\textsuperscript{19}

A philosophy of dynamism was formulated by Buddha 2500 years ago, a philosophy which is being recreated for us by the discoveries of modern science and the adventures of modern thought. Buddha formulated a philosophy of change. He reduces substances, souls, monads, forces movements and processes, and adopts a dynamic conception of reality.\textsuperscript{20} Life is nothing but a series of manifestations of becomings and extinctions.\textsuperscript{21}

It is a stream of becoming (flux).\textsuperscript{22}

All schools of Buddhism agree that there is nothing human or devine that is permanent. Buddha gives us a discourse on fire. To indicate the ceaseless flux of becoming called the world.\textsuperscript{23}

Identity of objects is only another name for continuity of becoming to account for the continuity of the world in the absence of a permanent substratum, Buddha announces the law of causation and makes it the basis of continuity. The law of universal causation, with its corollary of the eternal continuity of becoming, is the chief contribution of Buddhism to Indian thought. The theory of causation in Buddha's Philosophy is known as pratityasamutpada. This theory explains that how sorrows and sufferings are

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item BL, (Vol-I) P. 127
\item IP, (Vol-I), P. 367
\item Patubhavo-Uppado.
\item Heraclitus : Fragments, 46 and 84
\item IP, (Vol-I), P. 368
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
related to human life, what is the origin of these, and how sorrows and sufferings extinct from human life, all these problems are discussed by this causal principle. It is taught by Buddha by moral Principles.

The doctrine of causation of misery was doubtless in Buddhism. It was inspired by opposition to the pessimism of the Ajivakas under Makhali Gosala, who insisted that purity and depravity arose without cause or condition. The fate of man depended neither on their own nor others' action of effort. No human power was efficient, and that all things with life were without in herent force, Ajita also held that there was no fruit of good or evil deeds nor result of the deeds of others or previous life. Such doctrine were, it is plain, destructive of any, orderly conception of existence, and the Buddha's message of deliverance is based on the conviction that misery exists because it is produced and will continue to exist until its process of production can be stopped.24

According to the Buddhists, the universe is not homocentric. It is instead a co-creation of all beings. Moreover everyone of us is self-created and self' creation. As long as all beings have common purposes, it is but natural that there be groups of similar types of being. Buddhism does not believe in the doctrine that all have come out of one cause, but holds that

24 BPI, P. 118
everything inevitably comes out of more than one cause; in other words, all is mutually relative, a product of interdependence. 25

In the course of the comparison with the Buddhist theory of causation, Dr. D.N. Shastri points out that the implication of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of causation leads to the Buddhist theory of Pratītya Samutpāda Vāda and Ksanika Vāda. But there is a basic difference but won the two theories. In the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of causation atoms are Permanent in the substances and being produced, in time and space. But this process is not found in the Buddhist causation. Similarly, Jaina theory of causation shows that the causal process is natural but Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika do not accept this view. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika admit God as a conscious agency behind all kinds of changes, but Jaina never admit God as a conscious agency.

There is a slight difference between Parināma-vāda and vivarta vāda. It is noticed in the later Advaita School. Vidyaranya has admitted vivarta in the causes of transformation of gold into ornaments or clay into jar, and parinama in the case of milk turning into curd. Some novel definitions of parinama and vivarta, as given by appaya diksta have been explained, Sarvajnatma-muni also concludes that parinama to be former stage to got at vivarta-vāda.

Theravāda or Pratīcchasumutpāda, a theory of causation is a particular form, which is applicable on wheel of twelve parts-representing the phenomenal life. It is found only in early Buddhism.

25 EBP, P. 23
Though Indian philosophy presents several theories regarding the problem of creation yet all these theories are not equally accepted. The theory of satkāryavāda holds that the effects exists in its cause. It has two forms namely parinamavada and vivarta vada. Śāṅkhya-yoga and Vedicānta are the chief supporters of this theory. On the other hand, asatkāryavada holds that the effect is a new creation, it does not pre-exist in its cause. Buddha, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika accept this view. Similarly, Čārvāka, Jaina and Mīmāṃsā differently explain their views on creation. In case of the world appearance, there are two aspects, one is creationistic aspect and another is the evolutionistic aspect. If we support creationistic aspect then we must deny the evolutionistic aspect because the two are opposed to each other. From the cosmological point of view, the theory of Satkāryavada is more important than the other. Philosophers explain the world appearance through the causal theory of satkāryavada but from the pragmatic aspect the theory of asatkāryavāda is accepted by the people. Asatkārya vāda holds that the effect is a new creation. It is also known as arambhavāda. The supporters of the theory accept a scientific attitude to explain the phenomena of the world. The present age of transition is as full of interest as of anxiety. Scientists and philosophers want to invent some new techniques which are useful for human being.

In the light of observations and discussions forwarded by different eminent Philosophers of India and also the views made by several scholars
with their combined wisdom, experience and erudition regarding the theories of causation, a balanced scientific approach may also be made to explain the theories of causation – i.e. the existence of living and non-living matters in this universe.

According to the modern scientists fifteen to twenty billion years ago, the universe arose as a catalytic eruption of hot, energy rich subatomic particles. Within seconds, the simplest elements (hydrogen and helium) were formed. As the universe expanded and cooled, material condensed under the influence of gravity to form stars. Some stars became enormous and then exploded as supernovae, releasing the energy needed to fuse simpler atomic nuclei into more complex elements. Thus were produced, over billions of years, the earth itself and the chemical elements found on the earth today. About four billion years ago, life arose – simple microorganisms with the ability to extract energy from organic compounds or from sunlight, which they used to make a vast array of more complex bio-molecules from the simple elements and compounds on the earth’s surface.

Living organisms are composed of lifeless molecules. When these molecules are isolated and examined individually, they conform to all the physical and chemical laws that describe the behaviour of inanimate matter. Yet living organisms possess extraordinary attributes not exhibited by any random collection of molecules.
The living organisms differ from the inanimate objects in their degree of chemical complexity and organization. By contrast, inanimate matter—clay, sand, rocks, seawater—usually consist of mixtures of relatively simple chemical compounds. Secondly, living organisms extract, transform and use energy from their environment, usually in the form of chemical nutrients or sunlight.

Another attribute of living organisms is the capacity for precise self-replication and self-assembly, a property that is the quintessence of the living state. Although the ability to self-replicate has no true analog in the non-living world, there is an instructive analogy in the growth of crystals in saturated solutions.

If living organisms are composed of molecules that are intrinsically inanimate, how do these molecules confer the remarkable combination of characteristics we call life? How can a living organism be more than the sum of its inanimate parts? Philosophers once answered that living organisms are endowed with a mysterious and divine life force, but this doctrine, called vitalism, has been firmly rejected by modern science.

The drift in quantum physics is towards accepting a foundational consciousness as the ultimate reality of the cosmos. Metaphysics and physics have never been so close. Causality has now been only limited to the phenomenal world the quantum world and the still deeper world is ruled by uncertainty. *Vivardtavada* seems to harmonize both science and philosophy.
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