

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

## INTRODUCTION

### Historical Background :

There is no question that the system of early Buddhism is one of the most original which the history of philosophy presents. In its fundamental ideas and essential spirit it approximates remarkably to the advanced scientific thought of the nineteenth century. The modern pessimistic philosophy of Germany that of Schopenhaur and Hartmann is only revised version of ancient Buddhism. As far as the dynamic conception of reality is concerned, Buddhism is splendid prophecy of the creative evolutionism of Bergson. Early Buddhism suggests the outline of a philosophy suited to the practical wants of the present day and helpful in reconciling the conflict between faith and science.<sup>1</sup>

Though the Buddha was acclaimed as the incarnation of the Lord, his teaching was criticised by all the scholars of Vedānta. But their criticisms were not correct. Strictly speaking, the Buddha is a maker of modern Hinduism. The life of Gautama the Buddha is described by Āśvaghoṣa in his Buddha Carita. It is modelled in Vālmiki's Rāmāyana. The details of his life are well known. There is a dramatic turn in his life. It is recounted best by Sir Edwin Arnold in Light of Asia. The incidents are also carved and cut in the caves of Ajanta and Ellora.

The age in which the Buddha was born was a time of great spiritual unrest and remarkable intellectual ferment. It gave

---

1. Indian Philosophy : S. Radhakrishnan, Ch. VII, pg. 342.

birth to a galaxy of spiritual leaders of mankind. There was Pythagoras in Greece, Zoroaster in Persia, Lao-tzu and Confucius in China. Hindu tradition looks upon the Buddha as one of the 10 incarnations of the Lord, in spite of the traditional Vedanta outlook on the Buddha as one who is the heterodox and beyond the pale of the Vedas.

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan in his British Academy lecture (On a Master-mind) in June, 1938 submitted his estimate of the Buddha. He said that "In Gautama the Buddha we have a master-mind from the east, second to none so far as the influence on the thought and life of the human race is concerned, and sacred to all as the founder of a religious tradition whose hold is hardly less wide and deep than any other. He belongs to the history of the world's thought to the general inheritance of all cultivated men; for judged by intellectual integrity, moral earnestness and spiritual insight, he is undoubtedly one of the greatest figures in history."<sup>2</sup>

The Buddha was born in 567 B.C. to feudal Lord Siddhedana and his full name was Siddhartha. Sakya was the name of the clan to which he belonged. He was loved by his parents. His birth was on a full moon day as was his enlightenment and his passing away.

Gautama lost his mother<sup>3</sup> just seven days after his birth and was brought up by his stepmother. The parents were anxious to guard the child from the knowledge of all ills. At 16 he was

---

2. Quoted from "Fundamentals of Indian Philosophy - P. Nagaraja Rao, pg. 162

3. Māyā (mother's name)

married to one Yasodharā. To them the child Rahula was born. Gautama was sheltered from the sight and knowledge of the sorrows of human life. The royal prince was so perfectly protected as to become unaware of any sorrow of human existence.

But this was not long possible. One day, Siddhartha started on a glorious journey which gave the world the gospel of universal compassion. When he went out in his chariot, he saw four sights, an old man, a sick man, a corpse and a mendicant. These different sights burnt the lessons about the mortality of things into his life, their impermanence and the fact of pain and sorrow that is human life.

The sights of the major miseries to which human nature is subject to in a world of decay and dissolution agonised him. He learnt the fact of human sorrow and resolved to overcome it by a certain way of life. He was a different man after this experience. The prince became restless and was fed up with his life. He was determined to find a way out of human suffering. He made this great renunciation at the age of twenty-nine.<sup>4</sup>

Gautama left home and tried several modes of spiritual realisation. He first learnt from Ālara Kālma, the elements of yoga and went with five companions and practised the most serious form of austere penance. It only weakened him and did not help him in any way.

---

4. The popular story describes the act with great force. It is said that he arose at mid-night, went to the door of his wife's chamber and saw her sleeping, resting one hand on her baby's head. He had wished to take his son in his arms for a last embrace, but the fear of waking the young mother withheld him. He turned away and fled into the night in search for light.

He adopted the concept of a "reasoned life in which body was given what it needs by way of food and rest for its optimum functioning. He then sat under the Bodhi tree in Gaya, with the determination to experience the enlightenment. It is on a full moon day under this tree that Gautama became the awakened Buddha, overcoming the several temptations of the Devil Māra.

The enlightened Gautama became the Buddha and did not fall a victim to the temptation to keeping the wisdom exclusively to himself. He preached the gospel of the four Aryan truths and the eightfold path to the distracted world. Without troubling himself with the subtleties of metaphysics, he preached the ethical way. For his first pupils he selected the five ascetic friends of his. To them he uttered his first sermon on "Dharma cakra pravartana", or "Setting in motion the wheel of the Law."

The sayings of the Buddha were gathered into three baskets (Pitakas). He did not write down his philosophy; like Socrates and Jesus he too only discoursed. There was no Plato for the Buddha. A short time after his death, with the help of three of his disciples, Kāśyapa, Upāli and Ananda<sup>5</sup>, three collections were respectively made, i.e., (1) Abhidhammapitaka, (2) Vinayapitaka, and (3) Suttapitaka. They were reduced to writing only in 80 B.C. The Abhidhammapitaka sets forth the metaphysical view of Buddha, the Vinaya sets forth the rules of discipline and the Sutta contains the stories, parables and the teachings. They are the utterances of the Buddha himself. The works are in

---

5. Ananda was Buddha's cousin and favourite pupil.

the Pāli language, they are translated into English in the Sacred Books of the East series by Prof. Wood. The most important Buddhist scripture that represents the quintessence of the Master's teaching is the Dhammapāda. It is translated in English in the tenth volume of the Sacred Books of the East series.

The philosophy of Gautama the Buddha is very simple and is an original formulation of his enlightenment. He discovered the solution to human misery through his plenary spiritual experience.

For his spiritual experience, Buddha became convinced of four noble truths, that there is suffering<sup>6</sup>, that it has a cause<sup>7</sup>, that it can be suppressed<sup>8</sup>, and that there is a way to accomplish this<sup>9</sup>. In the whole history of thought no one has painted the misery of human existence with more feeling than Buddha.

It is quite intelligible that meditation on the fact of old age, illness and death should have induced Buddha to renounce secular life. It was now supposed that the Gods actually arranged for Buddha the sights of an old man etc. so that he might reflect on the ills of life. The apprehensive parents of Buddha are made to place him in such secluded luxury that he could get out of it only through divine intervention.

Even as a boy Buddha seems to have been of a serious, meditative temper. He had heard about their disparagement of the world. A definite problem seems to have gradually shaped itself before him. Buddha's quest thus had two closely associated aspects: on

- 
- 6. Duhkha
  - 7. Samudaya
  - 8. Nirodha
  - 9. Mārga

the one hand he sought the extinction of the passions and desires for this impermanent, unsatisfactory world; on the other, he wanted to attain to eternal peace.

Joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain<sup>reals</sup> to us. Sorrow and joy are hard facts to all living beings, rather happiness is true in a negative sense, meaning absence of pain or sorrow for the time being. Every creature seeks happiness and tries to avoid pain. All activities are based upon some desire or will and for its fulfilment these activities are initiated.

Again every fact demands an explanation, and no fact or event is without a cause, and whatever exists can never pass into nothing nor is lost for good. Buddhism is based upon such a causal theory and it attempts to explain events with reference to cause of its origination. If sorrow or pain is a fact of existence, then it can also be explained in terms of its cause and can be got rid of by removal of the cause that produced it.

For Buddha as for the Upanisads, the whole world is conditioned by causes. While the Upanisads say that things have no self-existence, but are the products of a causal series which has no beginning or end, Buddha says things are the products of conditions.

According to the Buddha nothing came into being without a cause. All phenomena and objects, as in the case of suffering, had their own causes or effect relations. A tree grew out of a seed, and therefore, the seed was the cause of the tree. There was a philosophical view that the growth of the tree was not the result of the transformation and development of the seed, but only the manifestation of the "tree-soul" which was inherent

in the seed itself. But Buddhism rejected this view, because according to it, a new object arose out of the destruction of an old one. All life is force. Though we can never see the working of the force, it is there; in consciousness we feel its presence.

But David Hume flatly rejects this view. He maintains that we cannot have the experience of such thing as force. There is no necessary relation between cause and effect. And never does the cause exercise any force or power in bringing about the effect.

Again Buddha makes the law of causation the basis of continuity. He says a child- a boy - a youth - a man - an old man are one. The seed and the tree are one. A thing is only a series of states of which the first is said to be the cause of the second, for they seem to be of the same nature. Identity of objects is only another name for continuity of becoming. The seeming identity from moment to moment consists in a continuity of moments which we may call the continuity of an ever changing identity.

On the other hand Hume's whole doctrine of causation is based on the assumption that the causal process is not continuous. In more technical language, Hume thought of the series of events as one in which every member has a next term and this way of conceiving it has coloured the whole subsequent treatment of causation by the inductive logicians who have commonly got their metaphysical doctrines for Hume.

But the real problem for the inductive logician we can now see to be not to discover the link by which an originally separate A and B have got joined together in thought, but to find the source of the distinction we habitually draw within what

comes to us as one continuous process between an earlier stage A which we call cause and a later stage B which we call effect. Again Hume's view about discontinuity gives rise certain logical difficulties.

We may state that (.) causation cannot possibly be thought of as discontinuous, i.e., as the sequence of one distinct event upon an assemblage of other events without gross contradiction. To think of it as discontinuous, we must conceive the cause A to exist first in its completeness and then to be suddenly followed by the effect B.

Hume has maintained that all things regarded as cause and effect are contiguous in time and space.<sup>10</sup> A second relation found between cause and effect is that of priority in time of the cause to the effect.<sup>11</sup>

Buddhism believes that causal relations are of the type of the seed growing into the trees, where the one is necessary for the other. But Hume says that the ideas of cause and effect are evidently distinct and separable, for the formal concepts of cause and effect are clearly correlative.

Any way, there are major differences between Buddhism and Hume in respect of causality. Attempts to discuss parallels between David Hume's philosophy and Buddhist philosophy have become very popular in the East and in the West— (1) The parallels between Hume's philosophy and Buddhist philosophy, (2) the question of

---

10. A Treatise on Human Nature, ed. Selby Bigge, pg. 75

11. Ibid, pg. 76

whether or not Buddha influenced Hume and (3) the contrasts between Buddha and Hume.

But of these I have selected only the concept of causality which plays a vital role in both of their philosophy. The topic of my investigation is a metaphysical problem and also have a slight touch in Logic : So it requires a thorough inquiry and careful study. I have attempted to present the concept of causality as <sup>an</sup> embodied in the Buddhism referring where necessary to Hume. Hume and Buddhism have similarities and also the dissimilarities in this context, and I have discussed them carefully in order to arrive at a comparative estimate on the subject.

As I have seen that few subjects are so confused in current philosophical thinking as causality. The traditional view of causation based on Aristotle, had to face the disruptive criticism of Hume in the eighteenth century. It is <sup>s</sup>ufficiently clear that Hume's analysis is inadequate, yet the difficulties he raised continued to dog the steps of succeeding thinkers. Modern theories of causation are attempts to improve on Hume. They want to do justice to the meaning of cause and effect, but Hume's avenging ghost is always lying in wait.

In the history of philosophy, the controversy over the concept of causality is very old indeed. Although the nature of the controversy has varied from time to time. The fundamental problem leads to some questions : What is the relation between the cause and the effect? Does the cause contain the effect in its implicit form or is the effect a new thing altogether? What

is the presupposition of the genetic process? Does it imply simply a gradual unfolding of what lies within, as eternally existing, or is it a creation ex nihilo?

We know that various answers can be given to these questions according to the differences of our view-points. There are different views given by both the Indian and the Western philosophy.

The advent of European colonialism in the eighteenth century and the diffusion of Western values and institutions throughout Asia participated <sup>in</sup> for reaching innovations which have significantly modified the traditional social role and teachings of Buddhism. The scepticism of Hume had challenged all the basic human concepts such as those of self, substance and causality. The schools of the Yogācāra and the Mādhyamika whose similarity with Hume cannot be missed by any student of comparative philosophy.

Thus by investigating from different angles I have come to the conclusion that the concept of causality would be the most important topic of investigation. And I also propose to arrive at the concept of causality by attempting to answer the main questions in course of discussion spread over the following Chapters—

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Causality : Its importance in Induction and Scientific investigation.
- 3) Principles of causality : Its Metaphysical Implication
- 4) Logical views of causality : Mill, Aristotle .... etc.
- 5) Causality and the Metaphysical problem : Views of some modern exponents, eg. Hume, Kant, Russell etc.

- 6) Conception of causality : Indian views
- 7) Causality : Its special significance in Buddhist metaphysics.
- 8) Hume's notion of causality : A critical examination.
- 9) Summary and Personal observation.

But before going to finish this chapter, I feel the necessity to give a clear picture of causation. All we, the human beings perceive a constant change in the world. Some of it is seemingly automatic, eg. the snows of the mountains melt into the waters of the rivers and run towards the sea. Sometimes the change seems to be due to some efforts of a perceptible active agent, eg., a weaver turns the yarns into a cloth with the help of a loom, shuttle etc. It will be worthwhile to note that the study of the concept of causation is very important. The importance of the concept is twofold : metaphysical and logical. It has metaphysical importance because it has great bearing on the conception of Reality. Is Reality intrinsically active or is it intrinsically passive? These are the questions which are intimately connected with the change and therefore with the concept of causation. This twofold importance of causation is also present in the Buddha's theory of causal genesis.

#### Western treatment of causation :

Before discussing the problem, it will <sup>be</sup> worthwhile to be acquainted with the western treatment of causality, because it will help us to get an insight into the problems of causation and shall equip us with the capability of looking at Indian treatment in comparison with that of the western.

### Aristotelian four causes :

A systematic treatment of causation in early western philosophy is found in Aristotle's philosophy. Aristotle, drawing upon the traditions of his predecessors, distinguished his four-fold forms of cause, viz., (1) the Efficient cause, (2) the Final cause, (3) the Material cause, (4) the Formal cause. But the predecessors of Aristotle laid emphasis on one, neglecting others. The early Milesians, for example, emphasized the Material causes. Again, Empedocles gave rise to the concept of Efficient cause by postulating two motive forces, called love and strife, to account for the evolutionary changes in the world. Plato's 'Ideas', on the other hand, were a sort of Formal causes and he believed that all things would be achieved simply by discovering their forms.

### Mediaeval and Modern conceptions of cause :

The scholastics also distinguished between a *causa Cognoscendi*; i.e., the reason or ground for a truth, and a *causa fiendi*, i.e., the cause of the existence of something.

In modern philosophy and science there is no much room for Material and Formal causes and the Final cause too finds some place only in Biology to understand the Biological or developmental phenomena, or in psychology in the form of 'goals' or 'purposes'.

The philosophers of the modern age have also distinguished some other kinds of causes. Spinoza<sup>z</sup> introduced the distinction of 'Immanent' and 'Trans<sup>eu</sup>sient' causes. Immanent cause is that which produces a change within itself, eg., the man who produces

his own voluntary motions and thoughts. Transient cause is that which produces a change in something else.

Thomas Reid and John Stuart Mill made a distinction between 'efficient' causes and physical causes.<sup>12</sup> According to them, efficient causes are agents performing voluntary acts while the physical causes are those through which the act is done.

### Traditional Problems of Causation.

#### Universality and Uniformity of Causation :

Universality of causation means that no change ever occurs without some cause, or in other words, every event has a cause. Uniformity of causation, on the other hand, means that the causal relation can be expressed in the form of general laws that similar causes always produce similar effects.

The Universality of causation, is quite different from the Uniformity. From very recent times, the Universality of causation has usually been regarded as quite obvious, rather self-evident. But now we find many thinkers who regard certain changes in the minutest constituents of matter to have no cause at all. Thus, the Universality of causation, which was considered to be obvious and self-evident, has now become a point of controversy. We cannot, in any way, prove that Universality of causation. But there is no logical absurdity also in imagining a change occurring without cause. However the non-Universality of causation too cannot be proved. If there is a change and we do not perceive any cause for it, we can imagine the change to be uncaused or we can infer, on

---

12. J.S. Mill : System of Logic, Vol.I, Book 3, Chap.8, Art 9.

T 193055

on the evidence of other causal connections.

The doctrine of uniformity<sup>✓</sup> of causation is relatively recent in philosophy. It has come into effect as a result of the development and the growth of science and its emphasis on the laws of nature. Of course, some uniformities in nature were observed by the past philosophers also, but the absolute uniformity of causal laws was never emphasised before the development of experimental sciences. According to the past philosophers there were many causes, the Sun for instance, which produced many effects and a similarity was not to be found in them.

#### The Idea of Power :

Before John Locke, it was always taken for granted that a cause has some power which it exerts on some other substance to effect some change in the latter. As for example, a sculptor has the power or ability to convert marble to statue. Berkeley could not even think of a cause without power and he used this as an important argument to prove that our ideas (sensations) cannot be caused either by matter or by other ideas, as they were inert or passive and hence lack the power to produce anything.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the ideas must be caused by some active being or an agent such as himself or God. Locke discussed it quite at length but could not reach any conclusion.<sup>14</sup>

---

13. A treatise concerning the principles of Human Knowledge, Sections 26-29

14. Essay concerning Human Understanding, Book II, Chap. 21.

David Hume established a landmark in the history of the theory of causation by proposing to eliminate altogether the idea of power from the conception of causation. Changes should not be explained, according to Hume, in terms of causes having the power to produce them; we simply find certain changes invariably conjoined with others and thereby come to expect them and speak of power in them.

Some philosophers after Hume have believed that he was essentially right in the elimination of the idea of power from the concept of causation. But there are some others who still believe in the idea of power. Thomas Reid, for example, maintained that the idea of the active power of the cause is everywhere presupposed in any description of deliberate and voluntary human behaviour.

#### The Idea of Necessary Connection :

Like the idea of power, the idea of necessary connection is equally important for the causal connection. Prior to David Hume, philosophers generally took such a connection for granted. The concept of necessary connection implies that the joint occurrence of both causes and effect is not "accidental", i.e., if a cause exists, the effect is bound to exist.

Hume rejected the idea of necessary connection with that of causal power.<sup>15</sup> He says that like the idea of power, the idea of necessary connection can never be experienced by senses and

---

15. An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding, Section 7.

therefore must also be a fabrication of our own mind. Its idea, according to Hume, is simply due to the habit of expectation.

Mill also faced the difficulty and he, therefore, introduced the qualification of unconditionality. Some other philosophers like A.C. Kwing, Brand Blanshard, and L.S. Stebbing, too, are inclined to accept some sort of necessary connection between cause and effect.

#### Plurality of causes :

J.S. Mill maintained that there are many events which can be produced in different ways. A man's death, for example, can be caused by various means, such as, bacteria, a bullet and so on. Such phenomena have given rise to the doctrine of what is called the 'plurality of causes'. But he was against the plurality of effects.

The doctrine of plurality of causes, has, however been criticized by many philosophers.<sup>16</sup> Critics have pointed out that this doctrine is based on illogical combination of a concrete cause with an abstract effect. Mill fails to observe that in any concrete case the effect exists in a special form, and with special character of the antecedents. In case of death, for example, a man who is shot and a man who is drowned are both dead, but their special symptoms of death are different. The conclusion is that if we take cause and effect at the same level of concreteness, they are always strictly correlative.

---

16. Elements of Metaphysics : A.E. Taylor, pg. 180

Distinction between cause and effect :

The concepts of cause and effect have always been different. It is that a cause effects its effect in a way in which the effect does not effect its cause. But Russell and McTaggart have expressed the view that there is no theoretical difference between causes and effects.<sup>17</sup>

R.G. Collingwood and Douglas Gasking have argued that causes and effects, differ essentially in that causes are always conditions within the control of agents, by means of which they can bring about or prevent certain other conditions. As for example, water can be evaporated by heating, but it cannot be made hot by evaporating it.

Again most philosophers make a distinction between cause and effect on the basis of temporal sequence, the cause always occurring before its effect in time. J.S. Mill maintains that "when we are in doubt between two existent phenomena, which is cause and which is effect, we rightly deem the question solved if we can ascertain which of them precedes the other."<sup>18</sup> This conception of cause has no place for the notion of power or efficacy. But some philosophers like A.E. Taylor, following Thomas Reid and others maintain that the meaning of cause cannot be grasped without associating it with the power or efficiency to produce certain changes in other things, and it is not the temporal sequence. This view has found support from the fact that causes not only precede their effects, but sometimes they are contemporaneous.

---

17. Encyclopedia of philosophy, Vol. 2, p. 64, Col. 1.

18. Logic, Book III, Ch. V., Art 6.

### Theories of causation :

We can, however, crystallize the different views into three main theories as given by A.C. Kwing.<sup>19</sup> These are : (i) The Regularity theory, (ii) the Entailment theory and (iii) the Activity theory.

### Regularity theory :

Common sense notion of causation consists in a cause producing its effect. The conception of producing implies some sort of necessary connection between cause and effect which Hume has denied. In our experience we only see one event following the other event. This is sometimes regular and sometimes irregular. When we regularly see one kind of event, we make a generalization and saying that the preceding event causes the following event. We regularly see that striking a match stick with a match box produces a flame and from that conclude that striking the match is the cause of the production of the flame. This, in brief, is the Regularity theory. It denies all intrinsic necessary connection between cause and effect and all active power on the part of cause. Night, according to it will be regarded as cause of day and day as cause of night because each follows the other regularly. This is clearly absurd according to common sense.

The Regularity view is quite popular among the modern philosophers because it agrees with the modern trend of empiricism. Its best known recent exponent is Mr. Bertrand Russell.<sup>20</sup>

---

19. The fundamental questions of philosophy, pp. 160-172.

20. The Analysis of Mind, Chap. V., and An Outline of Philosophy, Ch. VI.

Russell seems to maintain causal laws as laws with approximate invariability. He says that since a change occupies a finite time and since a change A that is usually followed by a change B may be interrupted before the completion of the process, we cannot assert that "A" is always followed by 'B', unless the two events are infinitely shortened and placed in succession without any interruption. This is not always possible in practice. The causal laws are, thus, not universal. Russell argues that "cause in the only sense in which it can practically be applied, means 'nearly invariable antecedent'. We cannot in practice, obtain an antecedent which is quite invariable, for this would require us to take account of the whole universe, since something not taken account may prevent the expected effect.

Mr. Russell's view represents in brief the modern regularity theory of causation. There are, however, several difficulties in accepting the Regularity theory. Firstly, if we accept it as Russell has put it, then every regular sequence is causal. Thus night will be the cause of day and day will be the cause of night. The fact is that while all cases of causality are the cases of regular sequence, all cases of regular sequence are not regarded as the cases of causality. The case of regular sequence of day and night is, thus, not regarded as the case of causation.

Another difficulty is in its application to more complex events such as wars and economic depressions.

**Entailment theory :**

Entailment is a logical term and stands for the relation between the premises and the conclusion in an argument where the latter follows necessarily from the former. It implies a logical necessity : given the premises, the conclusion must follow. In Regularity theory causes and effects are regarded as two separate unconnected facts, the former not implying the latter with a necessity. But in the Entailment theory of causation, a cause is supposed to be intrinsically connected with its effect so that a cause implies its effect.

Thus the Entailment theory is more akin to common sense than the Regularity theory, because common sense also believes that the cause produces its effect and as such there is an intrinsic relation between the two so that the effect must follow its cause. In the eighteenth century, David Hume for the first time, questioned the theory and established the Regularity theory in its place. But among contemporary philosophers too there are some, such as A.C. Ewing, who advocated entailment theory.

But theory also is not free from objections:

- (1) We cannot see any logical connection between cause and effect. There is no contradiction in imagining effect not following cause.
- (2) A necessary connection is found to occur only in two simultaneously existing entities while causes and effects are not normally at least simultaneous, they occur at different times.
- (3) The cases of entailment are the cases of a priori reasoning and there we attain certainty. But in the cases of causal reasoning we do not attain certainty but only probability.

### Activity theory :

The primitive notion of cause ascribes causation to some agency. This view is expressed in the definition of cause given by Locke. Locke says, a cause is that which makes any other thing begin to be, and an effect is that which had its beginning from some other thing.<sup>21</sup> Cause, according to this view, is an active agent which makes an effect, which is regarded as passive. This view, thus assumes a power in the cause which compels the effect to be. This is known as Activity theory of causation. Locke, thought that since causation ultimately involved will, the only ultimate cause must be mind or spirit. Berkeley also advocated this view and argued that for a cause to produce something it must be 'active' and assumed that activity involved willing.

The Activity view is not favoured much these days. According to L.S. Stebbing, "it is undoubtedly the view of the unsophisticated person",<sup>22</sup> and, "it may be confidently asserted that the notion of cause as exerting compulsion, as an agent forcing something to act in some way, no longer merits serious consideration."<sup>23</sup> It is supposed that when we voluntarily move a part of our body, we are immediately aware of our will causing to move. The chief defect of this, as shown by Ewing<sup>24</sup> is that an act of will never moves a part of the body by direct causation, but only by means of a number of intermediate links in the nervous system and this we have learnt not through the experience of willing in ourselves

---

21. Essays on the Human understanding, Book II, Ch. XXVI, Art 2.

22. A Modern Introduction to Logic, p. 261

23. Ibid.

24. Fundamental questions of philosophy, pg. 172.

but through the reports of physiologists.

From the above discussion, I may come to the conclusion that the Western thinkers also have treated the problem of causation elaborately. And I have tried to systematize them so as to present a correct picture of causality from their view points. Their different view points (both Indian and Western), specially of Buddhism and Hume have to be discussed in proper contexts in order to arrive at a comparative estimates on the subject.

----