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THEORY OF CAUSATION

The inquiry pertaining to causation is one of the central problems of historically carried out philosophical investigations. Historically, the problem of causation arose from the time when human beings started inquiring about the problem of change. The common sense always talks of cause and effect, and the whole world is deemed to be operating because of this cause and effect relationship. It is expressed not only by the word ‘cause’ and its cognates, but many other terms such as ‘produce’, ‘bring about’, ‘generate’, ‘effect’, ‘determine’ and countless others.\(^1\) However, the true notion of causation that whatever happen is due to causes, known or unknown has always been regarded as justified. The philosophers have always urged that the belief in universal causation cannot be proved certain. Before undertaking this problem it must be clear as to what we mean precisely by “causality”?

The word ‘cause’ is a correlative to effect when we consider one thing ‘B’ is regarded as taking place in the consequence of action of another thing ‘A’. Then we can understand that A is said to be the cause of B and B is the effect of A. In other words we can say that- ‘to be a cause is to produce an effect and to be an effect is to be produced by a cause’.\(^2\) But when we see this problem in the philosophical perspective it obviously is connected with metaphysics and psychology. It has been conceived to prevail between processes of changing. As one phenomenon occurs the other necessarily follows. When the latter occurs, the former must have preceded. But if everything is regarded as causally related with simultaneous and prior things/actions then existence must be a hypothesis.

The belief in the causation is both universal and primitive. It is derived perhaps from the human experience of performing actions and suffering the results of other actions. It brings about results intended by us,
but are sometimes frustrated by other people and external things that act is
an unfriendly manner. We feel ourselves to be causes and argue by analogy
that other persons and things are causes more or less similar to us. Whenever any change occurs anywhere, we conclude that it must be due to
something else which has caused it to occur – this genetic account does not
suggest that the law of causation is irrational. The relation between cause
and effect is one of the most familiar but it is ambiguous in our thought
and speech and it seems precisely on that account that a lot of
misunderstanding occurs i.e. everything is regarded as cause and effect in
popular usage. It is sometime thought our ability to make predictions and
inductive inferences in general depend on our knowledge of the causal
connection. It may be inherent in the mind; it may be an explanatory
hypothesis; a postulate, a convenient fiction, a necessary form of thought.
etc. In fact, some have regarded it as self-evident; some have held it to be
demonstrable by reason; while some others have sought to verify it by an
appeal to experience. The origin of a belief has very little to do with
validity. This informed understanding will suffice in everyday usage.  

There are some main philosophical issues related to the theory of
causation and these are mentioned hereunder:

Firstly, that the question of ontology may very well play a much
crucial role in connection with the problem of the nature of causation.
Secondly, the ontological issues have a crucial bearing upon the problem of
prevailing truth-conditions for causal and nomological statements. Thirdly,
how can causal claims be justified, what could count as evidence for causal
claims? Fourthly, how are causal relations between particular states of
affairs related to causal law? Finally, the idea about the causation is that
causation involves theoretical relation that determine the logical
transmission of probabilities what exactly this comes to depends as we
have seen.
(a) Western Approach

In this section, we would like to explain the theory of causation from the Greek to the Modern Western perspective in order to understand its broader meaning in Buddhist framework.

The Scientific approach to the problem of causality explicit appears at the beginning of the fifth century B.C. The first philosophers of the Greek antiquity were concerned with this problem. What is the substance out of which all things arise and to which they return, what is the nature of change and so on were the questions raised by early Greek cosmologists. In the classic period, Parmenides was a Greek Mathematician. He started with the hypothesis that “We cannot think which is not.” It is impossible that it arose from something other than itself because for Parmenides reality is a “polenum”. viz something which occupies the whole of the space and is solid and continuous. By this sort of argument Parmenides arrived at the conclusion and he asserted being cannot arise from non-being i.e. nothing can come from nothing was applied to justify a material substance. The next exponents of the Pluralistic systems such as Empedocles and Anaxagoras gave the same problem, which is proposed by Heraclitus and Parmenides. They agree that absolute change is impossible but there is relative change. This maxim was applied not merely to the eternity of the elements but also to the eternal elemental forces that is nature of particles of reality of which the world is composed and what cause these particles to combine and separate the eternal elements. In this way, the causal principle was introduced, events require both underlying permanent substance and forces to explain the various combinations and arrangements of things.

The first systematic treatment of the principle of causality in ancient Greek thought is to be found in Aristotle. Metaphysics, according to Aristotelian sense is definable as a science that investigates the ultimate principle of reality. The concept of metaphysics is the key point in
Aristotle’s philosophy. How shall we explain the world and what is the essence? Aristotle’s solution to the problem is allied both to the naturalistic or materialistic theory of atomists and to the ideal theory of Plato. In view of Democritus, the world is there by moving material atoms and for Plato by transcendent ideas, which somehow influence formless matter. However, Aristotle denies both the answers and seeks to mediate between them. The ideas and forms cannot be self-existent essences apart from matter. The cooperation between the form and matter, which is discernible in the process of nature, is even more clearly illustrated in the creative activity of man. This process described in terms of antithesis of potential and actual, of form and matter is governed by causes.

When we see around the world, we find that things are constantly changing, because changing is one of the basic facts of existence. But according to Aristotelian philosophy change means natural phenomenon in this universe, including, motion, growth, decay and generation. Sometimes we feel that some of this flux is natural and other is humanly artificed. There are several types of questions concerning the problem of change. From the Aristotle’s point of view, four questions such as: what is it?, what is it made of?, by what is it made?, for what end is it made?, are pertinent in regard. These four questions represent Aristotle’s four causes.

In this manner, Aristotle is drawing up on the tradition of his predecessors, distinguished four quite different kinds of causes in their application to nature. (1) Material Cause i.e. the matter from which a thing produce as from its parts. (2) Formal Cause i.e. the form or idea into which something is changed. (3) Efficient cause i.e. the external entity from which the change occurs and it also indicates all sorts of agents, acting as a source of movement. (4) Final cause: i.e. the end or purpose towards which the process is directed.
Aristotle has offered a unique conception of causation. It can be explained with the help of a concrete example. In the production or statue, the sculptor who made it, is the efficient cause, the purpose viz. possessing a beautiful object is the final cause, the piece of the marble, with which the statue is produced is the material cause, and the form of the distinctive properties of the statue is the formal cause.

These causes, which are so readily distinguishable in the creative activities of the man, are also at work in Nature and in the organic world. The purpose of the organism is the realization of its form or idea is also the cause of motion. Therefore, we have only two causes of form and matter that constitute one individual whole and these form and matter never exist separately. He suggested that changes do not involve bringing together formless matter with matterless form. Thus, Aristotle suggested a reciprocal, circular causality – as a relation of mutual dependent, action or influence of cause and effect.

(b) Modern Conception of Causation

In the modern view about the causal connection, there is no such room for the four causes mentioned by Aristotle. Modern age philosophers have distinguished some other kinds of causes. For Descartes the principle that causes must be adequate to their effect is applied in a new way. The content of idea requires adequate causes and it is this principle which Descartes employs in his main proof for the existence of God on the basis of two arguments: Casual or posteriori and ontological or a priori. In the first argument he stated that our mind the idea of God as the most perfected, all wise, infinite and Omnipotent Being. He is of the opinion that some of our idea appears to innate, certain idea we regard as effect or copies of an external world. All this may be called illusion. Nor can be the external objects that can infer the existence of God. All the perfection, which we attributed to God in some way, exists potentially in us. So that though they do not yet appear in our mind in their fully developed form.
The mind itself may bring them into actuality by its own striving towards perfection and thereby form the idea of God as the most perfected and infinite Being. In fact, that which contain greater reality in itself and which is the more perfect, cannot be consequence of, and dependent on. We ourselves cannot be the cause of idea of God, for I am finite, imperfect while the idea of is the idea of perfect, infinite being and to say that I am the cause this idea to violate principle of causality.⁹

Descartes’ proof for the existence of God is distinguished from Anselm proof of God; the idea of a perfect being existing in the mind. According to Descartes, it is unthinkable for the perfection of God, which we conceived. God must be self—caused for if he is the effect of another being, than that being is the effect of another and so on. We have an infinite regress and never can reach a causal explanation of the effect with we began. Descartes pointed out that the reflection upon the idea of God we perceive that he is eternal, omniscient, omnipotent, the source of all goodness and truth; the creator of all things. However, it is not true exposition about the conception of God. He is not corporeal and does not perceive by mean of the senses as we do. He has great power and will but not like ours. In another way, for the consideration on the external world, we imagine that there are bodies outside of us. The question is; how can we know that they actually exist? As for instance, we have feeling of pleasure and pain; appetites and sensation, which we refer instinctively to bodily causes. Once again, Descartes’ answered about this enquiry; our sensations deceive us, our desire and appetites are misleading. In the consequence that we cannot prove the existence of bodies from the existence of such experience, the existence in mind of illusion of senses and even hallucination and dream is, however, compatible with the divine goodness God has endowed us with great power of intellect and strength. To dispel and correct such delusion God is not deceiver, but a Truthful Being.¹⁰ Descartes’ radical dualism between mind and body introduced a special problem. His suggested that causal interaction within the physical
realm in the form of communication of motion. But there is difficulty in explaining how human volition can modify the action of bodies. According to him mind is united with the whole body, has its principle seat in the pineal gland of brain. The relation of mind and body is clearly conceived as causal; through the mediation of the pineal gland, a certain interaction between mind and body takes place. He does not shows how this interaction is compatible with his metaphysical dualism of thinking and extended substance. For if, we see in Descartes’ philosophy in different context we feel that most of his successors were unsatisfied to take recourse to the will of God in the explanation of mind-body relationship and introduced occasionalism.\textsuperscript{11}

The next exponent was Spinoza who was a monist philosopher. His philosophy is thoroughly naturalistic and deterministic. He holds that God or Substance to be the cause of Universe. The idea of the cause, according to him- is identical with the notion of substance and his conception of effect, with that of accident, mode or modification.

Spinoza resolved the problem of casual interaction in term of an identity theory. He gave his famous equation ‘Substance-Nature-God’. He bases his argument on the assumption that if change does exist, it can be of two kinds :\textit{(a)} Caused by external agency, and \textit{(b)} Self-caused.

He believes that substance is the substratum of everything, including human action and emotions must be explicable in terms of nature’s universal laws. In addition, he avoids any appeal to a set of absolute values that are independent of human desire. He uses the term ‘cause’ in a different way from its usual meaning; he introduced the distinction of ‘immanent’ and transient cause. ‘Immanent’ cause is one which produces changes within itself. Transient cause is that which produces a change in something else. His idea of cause is identical with the notion of substance and his conception of effect with that of accident. As Weber expresses, “God is the cause of the world, not in the sense in which the father is the
cause of the child nor in the sense in which the sun is the cause of heat, but in the manner in which an apple is the cause of its red colour or milk is the cause of its whiteness.” In other words, he suggested that God is not the transcendent and transient cause of the world – not a cause from which the world can exist apart. He is the immanent cause of the world, the permanent substratum of the things, and the innermost essence of the universe as a whole.¹²

Berkeley established idealism and thereby refuted materialistic interpretation of the world. He said, the ideas that are content of mind are causally inefficacious. He considered that a cause cannot be thought without the idea of power and used this as an important argument to prove that our ideas or sensations cannot be caused either by matter or by other ideas. The existence of ideas which we do not ourselves produce, indicates some causes which Berkeley construes as divine activity.¹³

Hume’s theory of causation is a landmark in the history of modern Philosophy. He was the most radical exponent of empiricism in modern philosophy and developed a devastating critique to classical metaphysical philosophy. He introduced empiricism in its most rigorous formulation. He most seriously wanted to know the genesis of metaphysical thought. Of all the modern philosophers, Hume gave unkindest cuts to the body of classical and medieval metaphysical discourse. Prior to the appearance of the idea of causality of Hume, empiricist Philosophers generally held that relation between cause and effect is necessary one i.e. joint occurrence of cause and effect is not accidental. If there occurs a cause the effect is bound to occur; the cause compels the occurrence of effect.¹⁴

Hume approached the problem of causality by scientific enquiry. He dealt with the concept of causality by recourse to scientific enquiry. What is the origin of the idea of causality? The ideas are the copies of impressions. The idea of causality arises in mind when we experience certain relation between object.
David Hume tries to show that our belief in the causal regularity of the world is a product of custom; we are habituated by experience to expect natural sequence to repeat themselves. All reasoning concerning matters of fact is based on the relation of cause and effect. In other words we always seek a connection between facts a man finding a watch or any other machine in a deserted Island, would conclude that there had once been men in that Island. Our search for cause and effect depends on speculation in the sense that we do not justify truth of this relation by priori reasoning. He says that cause and effect are discovered not by experience but by reason. No amount of reasoning will enable us to discover the explosion of gun power or attraction of loadstone. We cannot demonstrate that a certain cause must have a certain effect. That the effect is very different from cause can never be discovered by us.\textsuperscript{15}

Hume claims that there is no necessary connection of an effect with any respective causal power. He concludes that belief in causal connection has entirely different foundations. We observe nothing but the regular succession of events. The idea of necessary connection can never be experienced by senses and therefore, must also be fabrication of our mind. The repetition in our experience produces or a false expectation, which Hume calls – ‘an impression of reflection’. The idea of a necessary connection does not exist; its idea in us is desired from habitually felt expectation and has no other foundation. It is only a matter of customary expectation. On the basis of this argument, Hume denied the idea of necessary connection and affirming that we know cause and effect are invariably conjoined and we tend to believe that the conjunction is necessary. It is, however, entirely is due to constant association of idea.

There is no contradiction, for example in affirming that water does not solidify but boil when heated, we learn from experience. In this way Hume tries to bring out the absence of necessary connection between cause
and effect. ‘One event follows another’ he said, ‘but we can never observe any ties between them. They only seem conjoined.’

In the above discussion, we come to this conclusion. Thus, we can have a clearer idea of Hume’s analysis of causality. “It is therefore by experience only we can infer the existence of one object from another.” The causality is not a quality in the object we observe but is rather a habit of association in the mind.

Kant placed causality in the status of a ‘category’ or a principle of understanding. He tried to justify our belief in causality but ignored the other point urged by Hume. His appears to be augmenting rather than criticizing Hume’s Theory.

Kant suggests that notion of cause contains a strong empirical component, “Sequence in the time is the sole criterion of an effect in its relation to the causality of cause that precedes it.” He clearly states that the synthesis of cause and effect cannot be empirically expressed and he contended that causal connection involves a form of ontological, non-empirical, necessity is a pre-rational pattern imposed by mind. Hume recognized the causal necessity of a similar sort. This is the main argument throughout Kant’s “Second Analogy of Experience”. This section of his work is generally regarded as containing his reply to Hume’s skepticism. In this section, Kant distinguished a merely subjective from an objective succession of perception He states that manifestation of causality is experienced in the occurrence of an irreversible time order.

According to Kant, our mind is so operative as to construe the cogenesis of sensations in substantial and causal ways. He accepted that necessity for causal connection is thus dependent on the structure and the function of the human mind. He said that objective relation of the appearance is not to be determined through mere perception, the concept which carries with it necessity of synthetic unity can only be pure concept that lies in the understanding, The apprehension of manifold appearances is
always successive, all the appearances are possible only in conformity with the law of casuality.\textsuperscript{20}

Further, he suggested that, how things may be in themselves, apart from the representation through which they affect us, is entirely outside our knowledge. For an event, that should follow upon an empty time itself. In this case, we desire the subjective succession of appearances from the objective succession of appearances. However, it is entirely undetermined and does not distinguish one appearance from another. For the succession in our apprehension would always be one and the same and there would be nothing in the appearance which so determines that certain sequence is rendered objectively necessary. It is only through the perception and comparison of events repeatedly following in the uniform manner, upon preceding appearances, according to which certain events always follow upon certain appearances and that is the way in which we first construct the concept of cause. The universality and necessity of the rules would not be grounded a priori but only on induction. Only in the condition of space and time, we can construct clear concepts of them from experience, so add to their subjective reality, as modification, and ascribe to them some mysterious kind of subjective reality. It is therefore necessary or law of our sensibility and therefore a formal condition of all perception that preceding time necessarily determines the succeeding one. For only in appearance can we empirically apprehend this continuity in the connection of times.\textsuperscript{21}

In other words, the relation of cause to effect is the condition of objective validity of our empirical judgments. This principle of causal connection it applies to their co-existence when cause and effect are simultaneous. For instance – a room is warm while the outer air is cool, when I look around that cause the warmness of the room is caused by heated store. Then we understand that store, as cause is simultaneous with its effect, the heat of the room. There is no serial succession in time between cause and effect then. We can say that the majority of the efficient
natural causes are simultaneous with effect, their effect and sequence in time of the latter is due only to the fact that cause cannot achieve its complete effect is one moment. But the moment in which invariable simultaneous with the causality of its cause.\textsuperscript{22}

Thus, the sequence of time is thus the sole empirical criterion of an effect in its relation to the causality of the cause that precedes it.

Basically, Kant’s concept of causality leads to the corrupt of action and force and that is seat of the fruitful source of appearance must be what the function signifies. The relation of the subject of causality to its effect and since every effect consists in that which happens and so in the transitory which signifies time in its character of succession. Its ultimate subject as the substratum of everything that changes in the sense that the subject of the causality assumed to a conclusion that leads to empirical necessity and pursuance in existence. We are merely anticipating our own apprehension. The formal condition of which it dwells in us prior to all appearance that is given, must certainly be capable of being known as prior through the series of cause and effect the former of which inevitable lead to the existence of the latter and so render the empirical knowledge of the time-relation valid universally for all and therefore, objectively valid.

Mill tried to escape the above difficulty by interpreting the causal law simply in terms of invariable sequence. He maintained that there are many events such that they can be produced in different ways e.g. a match can be ignited by friction, but also by being heated. Similarly a man’s death can be caused by bacteria, by bullet, by fall and numberless other ways. Such types of phenomena give rise to difficulties in defining cause and effect in terms of necessary connection and sufficient conditions.

When for example, two gaseous substances hydrogen and oxygen on being brought together throw off their peculiar property produce the substance called water, the effect new phenomenon, the properties of water
for instance are easily found by experiment as the effect of any other causes.\textsuperscript{23}

If we take another instance of a match, being struck was a causal condition of its igniting and this to mean that a necessary condition, but we shall find with difficulty that a match can also be ignited by putting it into flame and thus striking. It cannot be regarded as necessary connection. We saw that in the absence of cause an effect is not produced. However, here we see that such a match igniting, for it might not have even in the presence of these conditions. Thus, Mill constructed the plurality of causes of an effect. He argues that, scientifically, the cause of anything is that total assemblage of the conditions that precede its appearance, and that have no right to give the name of cause to one of them exclusively. Mill says that a uniform consequence has several different antecedents. The cause of our knowledge of an event or, two causes evidently need not be the same. An object is called cause when its produces changes by its own activity.\textsuperscript{24}

The plurality of causes may become known in the course of collating a number of instances. A concurrence of two or more causes not separately producing each its own effect but interfering with or modifying the effect of one another.

It is impossible to trace in all cases in which the effect is met with any common circumstance but when we can exclude in the same antecedent, that no one of them is present in all the instances. However, it appears though no one is always present one or other of several always. Finally, Mill said, the relation between cause and effect is invariably conjoined as day and night. They must be unconditionally conjoined. By unconditionally he meant they must be conjoined under all imaginable as well as actual circumstances. They are not casually connected, we should generally have been indebted for our knowledge of the causes of this class of effect not to any-inquiry directly specifically towards that end. But
either to incident or to the gradual progress of experimentation on the
different combination of which they producing agents as susceptible.

The above-mentioned different approaches to the theory of causation
from Greek to the modern Western philosophy can help us to understand
the other related theories and the Buddhist theory of causation.

In fact, a comparative analysis of Western and Buddhist theories of
causality can arrive at a striking difference. The Western philosophical
tradition explores causality within the realm of space-time continuum. The
Western casualty is cosmological, scientific and epistemological. They want to
discover the laws or sequences operating across the universe. On the other
hand, Buddha’s doctrine of casualty is addressed to the exploration of
‘axiological’ or ‘moral’ implications. Buddha accepts the basic Indian onto-
axiological doctrine known as “Law of Karma”. The Law is metaphorically
summarized in the dictum, “As you sow so shall you reap.”

In reality, human action and its subsequent results or concomitant
implications are the central theme of Buddhist Causality. On the other
hand, the events or consequences of the world of phenomena or objects are the burden of
thought of Western theories of casualty. The Buddhist theory is primarily
axiological, teleological, eschatological and sortoriological. Conversely, the
Western causality is cosmological and epistemological. This is the main
difference between the two approaches towards Causality.

(c) Indian Viewpoints: Emphasis on Material Cause

In the previous section, we have discussed the Western theories of
Causation and it looks that they are mainly focused on the efficient cause
with its effects. While, on the contrary, the Indian theory mainly consists
in the material Cause with its effects. The main subject of dealing is the
material cause i.e. the matter that due to the activity of efficient cause
takes a new shape. This material cause has appeared in different systems
of Indian Philosophy. In the Sankhya theory of Satkaryavada – effect is
not new creation but the manifestation of that which was concealed in
material cause. Nyaya-Vaisesika and some followers of the Hinayana and Mimansa believe in Asatkaryavada that is also known as Arambhavada, which means the production, is new beginning. It appears in the different conceptions of inherent cause. Materialism follows Svabhavavada, Hinyana Budhism believes in the Anitya-Paramanuvada or Ksanabhangavada, Nyaya-Vaisesika and few followers in Mimansa in Nitya-Paramanu-Karanavada. Where as the essence of the effect is derived. The basic question is whether the effect is real transformation or unreal transformation of it cause? Does the material cause impart any essence to its effect, is the essence to the derived from void, i.e. the effect is created out of nothing? What happens to the cause when the effect comes into existence is it annihilated or continues to exit side by side? Thus, the material cause actually turns into its effect or present only an illusory appearance. The answers about these enquiries are those who believe that effect is real transformation of its cause or known as Parinamavadins (Parinama - real transformation of its cause) while those who hold that it is an unreal transformation of its cause are known as Vivartvada. According to Sankhya-Yoga is called Prakrti-Parinama-vada. In the view of Ramanuja is called Brahma-Parinama-vada, Sunyavada, Vijnanavada and Shankar School of Vedanta believes that Permanent basis of changing states which are not real, but only appears due to illusion (vivarta-vada). There may call Sunyata-Vivarta-vada. The view of Jainism and Kumarila are called Sadasatkaryavada – the effect both real as well as unreal before its production. These are main issue regarding theories of causation in Indian perspective.  

1. Problem of Essence of Effect: Two Main Theories

The problem of essence of effect is one of the essential topics discussed by the Indian thinkers. In fact, the whole partition of Indian theories of Causation is rest on its consideration. According to their views, two possibilities with regard to the essence of effect, either an effect
derives its essence from its cause or it does not. This is the main principle of the two comprehension division of Indian theories of causation-viz. Satkaryavada (i.e. The theory of existent effect) and Asatkaryavada (i.e. The theory of non-existent effect). The main supporter of Satkaryavada is Sankhya-Yoga and Vedanta and Asatkaryavada are Nyaya- Vaisesika and Buddhist.26

However, here we have taken some important arguments regarding the nature of effect. Different Indian thinkers light on this problem from different point of view. However, here we draw consideration on this problem from Satkaryavaveda—A Sankhya–Yoga view and Asatkaryavada- Nyaya-Vaisesika point of views. These two theories subject matter explain in the next portion. Such argument is as follows:

Satkaryavada holds that an effect is existent even before its coming into formal existence, but in so far as essence is concerned i.e. the effect is existent before coming into actual existent in a latent or potential form; it is only manifestation of the casual process. On the other hand, Asatkaryavada maintained that an effect is non-existent before the casual process; it is totality a new entity not only with regard to its form and to its essence, i.e. it does not derive from its cause. This is the main issue which I discuss below.27

Let us begin with the Sankhya theory of causation.

2. Satkaryavada: A Sankhya Position:

It is based on the Prakrti. They believe that effect pre-exist in the cause in an unmanifest state. As against Satkaryavada, for Asatkaryavada of the Nyaya-Vaisesika—the effect is completely a new entity. It does not pre-exit in the cause in any form. According to Sankhya an effect is not new entity. There can be no production of a thing previously non-existent. Causation means the appearance or manifestation of a quality due to certain changes of collocation in the cause, which were already in them in potential form before coming into existence. No amount of effort could
bring a non-existent effect into existence. For milk cannot be produced from oil. It means that there must be some kind of invariable relation between a cause and its effect.⁸

Sankhya theory of causation is known as *Parinama-vada*, according to it an effect is a real transformation of its cause, meaning that the material cause only changes in its shape. But its essence does not change. The essence continues to be the same throughout the cause-effect series. An effect does not separate from its cause. What is suggested that a cloth is not different from its cause, the thread, a gold ornament is not different from gold, and a pot is not separate from the clay it is made of. According to this, Sankhya show that effect is not different from cause or not a new entity.²⁹ The relation of causality from Sankhya point of view – is a relation of identity. He says that when we speak of one thing causing another, it is not meant that one phenomenon precedes and other follows. There is nothing but a bond of temporal succession between the two, no one thing give rise to other. Only the potential does become actual. The cause is not one thing and the effect is another, but the effect is same as cause. It is only a modification of it. It pre-exists in the eternal bosom of *Prakrti* where from it simply does come into existence at the time of creation and returns at the time dissolution. The indiscrete has manifested itself as discrete. In this world, there is no production of the non-existent. Whatever exists is not non-existent, what is non-existent cannot be called into existence. Therefore the effect subsists.³⁰

Sankhya proves *Satkaryavada* in the following verse of *Sankhya-Karika*.

Asadakaranad upadana-grahanat sarva-sambavabhavat

Saktasya Sakya-Karanat Karana-bhava ca sat-karyam.³¹

These five arguments are:

1. Asadakaranad:
If the effect were not existent in the cause prior to its operation, none can be brought into existence by anybody. For example, the production of oil from sand particles is impossible. Therefore, what exists comes from an operative cause having previously originated therein.\textsuperscript{32} We see that arising due to the fact of being produced. For the manifestation of a ‘pot’ the operative cause such as potter is there. Here is no fiction; the oil comes from sesame – pressure by seed. The milk comes from cow, by milking. The statue that resides in the midst of the stone, by the operation of sculptor rise from the husk by thrashing. Therefore, the production of effect is dependent on the manifestation of the effect. Here it is learnt that effect is already existing before the causal operation in an un-manifested state.\textsuperscript{33}

2. *Upadana–grahanat* :

In the world only a particular material for can be used for an end. A Jar can be produced out of clay, cloth from thread and curd can be got out milk. The effect must be subsisting. In the view of that, effect must be pre-existing before the causal operation.\textsuperscript{34} No relation can exist between an existent cause and a non-existent effect.

3. *Sarva-Sambhavabhavat* :

According to this rule, it is believed that there is some material only when extent is there. In phenomenal world, from the absence of Universal Production, everything is not got of it, as for Gold is not possible in silver or curd is not in water. Thus, the effect can only be produced that which is potent.\textsuperscript{35}

4. *Sakasyasakya–Karanat* :

The efficient cause can be produced only that which is potent and therefore, it is considered that relation cannot be non-existent effect. The effect before its manifestation is potentially contained in its material cause. Production is only an actualization of the potential. It is not so that curd
should be produced out of water, and cloth out of seeds and oil out of sand particles. Thus, the relation cannot be with the non-existence of effect shall have to be admitted.\textsuperscript{36}

5. Karana-bhavac ca Sat-Karyan:

The essence of the effect is same as the cause whatever the character of cause. It is not distinguished from effect such as cloth is not different from the thread that is constituted of it. The cause and effect are not different objects. There are implicit and explicit stages of the same process. This argument shows that effect is not different in essence from the material cause. Thus, the five argument and other modes to prove that effect pre-exist in nature, consequently the production is of what is and not of what is not.\textsuperscript{37}

Thus, Sankhya advocate \textit{Parinamavada}, which is the form of Satkaryavada – the effect, is the real modification of the cause and the effect is manifestation of something is already contained in the cause. Sankhya \textit{Satkaryavada} play an important role in Sankhya evolution. He suggested that ‘what is, always is; and whatever is not never is’.\textsuperscript{38} Sankhya prove the theory of \textit{Satkaryavada} which is their basis of the evolution of \textit{Prakrti}. He advocates a kind of dualism by asserting that ultimate reality is two: \textit{Prakrti} and \textit{Purusa}. The whole universe is the consequence of an interplay of these two principles.

According to Logian – the non-existent springs from the existent. The effect must have been existed before the causal action and was not them non-existent. It is the reason that because the non-existent cannot be produced. In other words the absence of universal production from observing a pot and like being produced from the earth. One can say that the world that which pre-existent in anything alone is evolved there from. If the effect were not non-existent than everything would be possible out of everything. For the production of curd is only from milk not in water. For if we belief that effect being non-existent in the cause, there is nothing to
be pointed a specific causality. Moreover, the effect is seem to follow the nature of cause as grain produce grain, rice, rice. If the non-existent were the produced then rice might come from grain and vice versa, but such is not in the case. It is understood that the pre-existence of the effect. All the conflict with the theory of pre-existence is removed by this. Therefore, even the identity of cause and effect practical effectiveness reside in effect when the manifested as such not elsewhere. The question is raised, against the satkaryavada, what is the principle that guides the transformation that takes places into atomic stages. For example, milk changes into curd and so on. Sankhya says, as the total energy remains the same while the world is constantly evolving, cause and effect are only more or less evolved from of the same ultimate energy. The sum of the effect exists in the sum of the causes in a potential form the grouping or collocation alone changes and this brings on the manifestation of the latent power of the gunas, but without creation of anything new. What is called material cause is only the power which is efficient in the production. His means that this power is unmanifested of the energy set free in the effect. But the concomitant conditions are necessary to call forth the so-called material cause in to activity.

The Yoga school of Patanjali view on causation is practical same as the Sankhya. According to yoga, the primordial prakrti is the basis of all modification. It is constituted by the three gunas, sattva, rajas, tamas. These gunas are always functioning. They do not rest for a single moment. It is very nature of gunas which induces tendency of transformation. All the changes are the collocation of the gunas and materially does not different from them. According to Yoga, the relation of the cause and effect is the relation dharmin and its dharma. Yoga school however, explains more clearly on the basis of transformation of Potential energy. The sum of the material cause potentially contains the energy manifested in the sum of effect. It is the substratum of both genesis and particular. It is inseparably connected with them. He says when the effectuating condition
is to added to the sum of the material condition they disturb the relatively stable equilibrium and bring on a liberation of the energy together with a fresh collocation. As for example, the energy that collocate the milk-atoms to form the milk was in a state of arrest in the milk state. If by the heat and some other instrumental causes remove the barrier, the energy naturally changes direction into corresponding manner and the collocates the atoms for the transformation of curd. So all the barrier are get away from the Prakrti guided by the constant will of Isavara, the real in equilibrium in the state of Prakrti leaves their state of arrest of evolve themselves into Mahat etc.42

All realms, including existence as the highest duty, are manifestation of primordial materiality. It disassociates from one’s pure consciousness and also from the agency of work with Prakrti. Sankhya causation tend to incorporate atheistic element in the tradition though is clearly incompatible with dualistic metaphysic which leave no room for a creator God.

2. Asatkaryavada : Nyaya-Vaishesika Version

The Nyaya-vaisesika theory of causation is we known as AsatKaryavada. In the simple words, the asat-karyavada mean that effect does not pre-exist in the cause and that it is however a new production.

Nyaya-Vaishesika defines “cause as unconditional and invariable antecedent of an effect”.43 An effect is the unconditional invariable consequent of the cause. As such that the same cause produce the same effect and same effect produce the same cause. Causal relations are reversible and reciprocal. They are not any mysterious forces. Cause is directly connected with effect. The cause must be an antecedent. There is no place in the plurality of cause. But if when we examined that the same effect produces different causes, e.g. fire which is produced from different causes – viz. grass asami (a piece of wood of the asami tree used for kindling fire by attrition), Nyaya-Vaishesika argues that it is wrong to
thinks that there are many causes to produce a single effect. They hold that
effect appear to be same, yet in reality they have special antecedent and
consequences. If they are examined with their distinctive feature, then
specific effect have specific causes, if there is a specific difference in the
causes, there must be specific difference in the effect. Plurality of causes
appear to be true, because we are ignore the distinctive feature of the
effect.\textsuperscript{44}

However, if we consider that an unessential antecedent has no role to
play in the production of effect, the fact that antecedent must be
unconditional also implies that it is immediate and not remotely with the
effect. Nyayaikas says that there is no mysterious or transcendental
efficacy in the cause that produces an effect, “It is an expenditure of
kinetic energy. For all energy is kinetic and unconditional antecedent of
cause ultimately depending upon the expenditure of energy”.\textsuperscript{45} Nyaya
described cause as a sum total of operative conditions. For example, in the
production of effect (pot), they held that clay is the material cause of the
pot, had some power within. Nevertheless, the instrumental cause such as
stick, wheel etc. had other power with the collocation of these two
destroyed the material cause and produces the effect (pot) which was not
existent before but was newly produced.

From the above definition of cause, the first essential characteristic of
cause is its antecedent and the fact that it should precede the effect
\textit{(purvarvtti)}. The second is invariability. It must invariability precede the
effect \textit{(Niyata purvarvtti)}. The third is its unconditionality. It must
unconditionally precede the effect \textit{(ananyathasiddha)}. Thus we see that
Nyaya definition of cause is similar to the western inductive logic, Hume
define cause as an invariable antecedent. J.S Mill it as an unconditional
and invariable antecedent. An effect is defined as counter-entity of its own
prior non-existence. It does not exist in the cause prior to its production, a
fresh beginning or as the doctrine of new production. Thus, Nyaya view in
this respect is directly opposed to Sankhya-yoga and Vedanta view of Satkaryavada. Nyaya maintained that production does mean change in the form of causal stuff but the emergence of new entity which is completely non-exist (asat) in the cause, it is distinct from cause and can never be identical with cause – is called atskaryavada or Arambhavada.\(^{46}\)

The Nyaya-Vaishesika theory of causation is based on the relation between dharma and dharmin. The essential principle of the Nyaya-vaisesika metaphysic is dharmi-bheda i.e. the differentiation is essence between substrate and their properties. It holds that there is absolute difference between cause and its effect.

The Nyaya-Vaishesika system mentions three kinds of causes. These causes are (1) Inherent cause (samavayikarna), (2) Non-Inherent cause (Asamavayikarna) and (3) Instrumental cause (Nimitta karana).\(^{47}\)

Let us briefly explain them:

**1. Inherent cause (Samavayikarna)**:

For the conception of inherent cause in Naya-Vaisesika is some what parallel to material cause to Sankhya the effect is so identical with the material cause that it cannot separate from the cause, i.e. yarn are inherent cause of the cloth, clay is the inherent cause of the pot. However, the question is? Why does the clothes inhere in the threads only and not in the shuttle etc. which are connected with the cloth. Just as a thread are. The relation of inherence is defined by Kanada as ‘that by virtue of which it may be said of cause and effect that the one is in the other’. Nyaya-Vaisesika suggested that the cause is in the form of parts in which the effect as a separate substance. It is not exactly identical. It is only substance which can be inherent causes. Qualities, actions etc., cannot be inherent causes. Nyaya-Vaisesika believes that inherent cause is always in the form parts in which an effect in the form of whole comes to inherent as a separate substance. His view is opposed to the Buddhist that ‘whole’ is not merely an aggregate of its part. However, an altogether new entity
quite distinct from its part, the ‘whole’ emerge as residing its part by inherent relation (samavaya-sambandha) mean that effect is separate in essence from its cause. In short, Sankhya point of view cause and effect is not different entities. They are identical. He states that e.g. a piece of cloth is a different arrangement of thread. But the essence of the both is same. Nyaya-vaisesika hold, that inherent cause which exist simultaneously side by side with its effect and its essence cannot, in anyway, impart to its effect.\textsuperscript{48}

(2) Non-inherent Cause (Asamavayikarana):

It is defined as “that which subsist in the inherent cause and is capable of producing the effect”.\textsuperscript{49} And it represent that those properties and characteristic belong to Samavayi-karana. For example, the conjunction of thread is a quality that inheres in the cloth. Conjunction of thread is also capable of producing the effect, i.e. is a cause of the cloth. But an invariable antecedent.\textsuperscript{50}

Another problem is regarding colour. They suggested that colour of the thread is non-inherent cause of the cloth, although, it contribution to the production of the cloth, hence is a cause of it. In the view of that non-inherent cause of the cloth, should some entity exist in the thread and not in the colour of cloth? They believe that non-inherent cause is always a quality or action, while the inherent cause is a substance.\textsuperscript{51} The non-inherent cause is an important feature in the Nyaya-Vaisesika system which elaborated that every case of the production is a fresh combination of part performing a new whole. It is not enough that yarn should merely exist. They also required to conjoin in a definite order. But they have little significance. They can participation in the whole only through being joined together.

(3) Efficient cause (Nimitta-karana):

It is the power which help the inherent cause to produce the effect. It includes on the one hand conscious agent like potter or weaver etc. On the
other hand, the instrument through which the agent activates the inherent cause. We looks that i.e. auxiliary cause such a wheel and potter stick in the case of production of pot and shuttle and loom in the production of cloth. The essential future of the efficient cause is that while inherent and the non-inherent causes are inseparable from the effect, only efficient cause (*Nimitta-karana*) which is separable from the effect. This cause is also major role-play in Western Philosophical thought. It is only efficient cause which figure as a main cause.\(^{52}\)

Hence, all these three kinds of causes such as *Samavayikarna, Asamavayikarna and Nimitta-karana* are operating together in the production of existing thing. The important features of this causes, if anyone is absent there can be no production is possible.

From the above discussion, we come to this conclusion that the theory of causation in Nyaya-Vaishesika is different from the Buddhist theory of Dependent origination.
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