

Indian Philosophical Views And Their Characteristics: A Conceptual Analysis

Paper Id : 19290 Submission Date : 2024-09-09 Acceptance Date : 2024-09-21 Publication Date : 2024-09-25

This is an open-access research paper/article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.13989621

For verification of this paper, please visit on <http://www.socialresearchfoundation.com/innovation.php#8>

Sanjiv Kumar

Assistant Professor
B.Ed Department
Km. Mayawati Govt Girls
P.G. College, Badalpur
Gautam Buddha Nagar,
(U.P) India

Abstract

Indian philosophy is a profound and ancient system of thought that encompasses a diverse range of spiritual, metaphysical, and ethical ideas. Rooted in texts such as the Vedas, Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita, and other classical works, Indian philosophy primarily focuses on the quest for self-realisation, the nature of reality, and the liberation of the soul (moksha). Unlike Western philosophy, which often emphasises logic, reason, and empirical evidence, Indian philosophy integrates spiritual practices and experiential knowledge as fundamental aspects of philosophical enquiry.

The key differences between Indian and Western philosophies are their approaches and foundational principles. Indian philosophy often prioritises holistic, intuitive, and spiritual experiences, aiming to transcend the material world and achieve unity with ultimate reality (Brahman). In contrast, Western philosophy traditionally values analytical reasoning, scientific enquiry, and the separation of the metaphysical from the empirical world. While Western thought is frequently concerned with individualism and objective truth, Indian philosophy emphasises the interconnectedness, karma, and cyclical nature of life.

The characteristics of Indian philosophy include its focus on dharma (duty), karma (action), samsara (cycle of rebirth) and moksha (liberation). It often delves into complex metaphysical concepts, such as the nature of the self (atman) and universe, and embraces a pluralistic outlook that accommodates various schools of thought, including Advaita Vedanta, Sankhya, Buddhism, and Jainism. Additionally, Indian philosophy highlights practical wisdom, ethical living, and meditative practices as paths for enlightenment. Indian philosophy provides a unique, integrative perspective that contrasts the more rational and empirical traditions of Western philosophy. Its rich, diverse, and spiritually oriented framework offers profound insights into human conditions, and continues to influence global thought systems.

Keywords Indian Philosophy, Characteristics of Indian Philosophy, Metaphysics, Self-Realization, Dharma, Karma, Moksha, Atman, Brahman, Vedanta, Spirituality, Western vs. Indian Philosophy, Non-Dualism etc.

Introduction

The man is an intellectual animal. Thinking is a special quality for a man. As a result of this quality, he is considered different from animals. Aristotle described man as a rational animal. Because of the dominance of wisdom, men have been trying to understand the nature of various things in the world by looking at them. Man's intelligence has forced him to know the answers to many questions: What is the nature of the universe? How and why did this come into existence? Does the universe have a purpose or is it purposeless? What is the soul? What is a living being? Is there God or not? What is God's nature? What is the proof of God's existence? What are the ultimate goals of life? What is the nature of power? What is the means of knowledge? What is the nature and limits of true knowledge? What is good and bad? What are right and wrong? What is the subject of moral judgment? What is the relationship between individuals and the society? Philosophy attempts to answer these questions logically. In philosophy, to answer these questions, one does not resort to emotions or beliefs but rather uses intellect. Through these questions, a man's love for or yearning for knowledge is expressed. Therefore, philosophy refers to a love for knowledge

or love for learning. (Philos = love, Sophia = knowledge) Looking at these questions, we come to know that the entire world is a subject of philosophy.

Humans have been answering these questions since time immemorial and will continue doing so in the future. It is part of human nature to know the answers to these questions. This is why this question was not answered before us. The question arises of whether we should become philosophers because we are philosophers anyway. In this context, Huxley's statement is noteworthy "We are not divided into philosophers and non-philosophers. Rather, it is possible only in the form of a skilled and unskilled philosopher." In India, Philosophy is called 'Darshan'. The word 'Darshan' is derived from the root 'Drish' which means 'that by which one can see'. In India, Darshan is called the science by which one can realise this principle. The Indian philosopher is not satisfied with the intellectual explanation of the principle alone; rather, he wants to realise this principle. In Indian philosophy, there are two kinds of experiences: (1) sensuous and (2) non-sensuous. Of these two experiences, the non-sensory experience, which is called the spiritual experience, is important. According to Indian thinkers, the realisation of essence is possible only through spiritual experience. Spiritual experience (intuitive experience) was higher than intellectual knowledge. In intellectual knowledge, duality exists between the knower and known, but in spiritual knowledge, the distinction between the knower and known is destroyed. Since Indian philosophy believes in the realisation of the essence, it is called 'Tattva Darshan'.

Objective of study The main feature of Indian philosophy is practicality. Solving life problems in India Philosophy has been created for when man found himself surrounded by sorrows, he wished to get rid of pain and suffering. In this way, to obtain relief from suffering, he adopted philosophy. That is why Prof. Hiriyana has said, "Like Western philosophy, Indian philosophy starts not with surprise and curiosity, but for the sake of alleviating the moral and material evils of life. The basic objective of philosophical efforts was to find an end to the suffering of life and answer metaphysical questions. It was in this connection that knowledge emerged." From the above discussion, it becomes clear that knowledge in India is not discussed for the sake of knowledge but for the sake of attaining salvation. Hence the pursuit of philosophy in India is salvation This has been done only for Moksha, which means relief from sorrow. This is a state in which all sorrows were absent. Due to considering the feeling of sorrow i.e. salvation as the ultimate goal, Indian philosophy is called 'Moksha-Darshan'. The attainment of salvation is believed to occur via the soul. This is why the soul has been practiced in all philosophies except Charvaka. An explanation of the nature of the soul is evidence of the spiritualism of Indian philosophy. Indian philosophy, because of the ultimate importance given to the soul, is sometimes also called 'Atman Vidya'. Therefore, practicality and spirituality are the characteristics of Indian philosophy.

Review of Literature

A comparative account of the nature of Indian and Western Philosophy:

Each country has its own unique philosophy. The very naming of 'Indian philosophy' and 'Western philosophy' proves that both philosophies are different from each other. When we come to the field of science, we do not find the names 'Indian Science' and 'Western Science'. This is because science is universal and objective. However, the subject of philosophy itself is such that the objectivity of science is not visible. This is why Indian and Western philosophies appear to be opposed to each other. Now we will explain the inherent differences between Indian philosophy and Western philosophy Western philosophy is thus theoretical.

Western philosophy begins with wonder and curiosity. The philosopher has been inspired to think about the world, God, and soul to satisfy his curiosity. Thus, philosophy had no practical purpose in Europe. Philosophy is a form of a mental exercise. Philosophy is not pursued to achieve any objective but for the sake of knowledge itself. Therefore, philosophy has been portrayed as an end to the West. In contrast, Indian philosophy is practical. Philosophy begins with spiritual dissatisfaction. Indian philosophers have taken refuge in philosophy to eradicate various types of suffering around the world. These lines of Prof. Max Muller confirm this statement - "Philosophy was studied in India not just for gaining knowledge, but for achieving the ultimate goal of life." The ultimate objective of philosophy in India is to assist people in attaining salvation. Thus, in India, philosophy is seen as a means by which salvation can be achieved. From this discussion, it becomes clear that in the West, philosophy is considered an end, whereas in India, it is considered only a means. Western philosophy is called scientific, because most philosophers have adopted scientific methods.

Western philosophy is also called scientific because philosophers have adopted a scientific approach to explain ultimate power. In Western philosophy, owing to the predominance of science, the relationship between philosophy and religion is considered contradictory. In the West, philosophy has been considered theoretical, but religion, on the contrary, is considered practical. Therefore, religion has been neglected in Western philosophy. However, in the field of Indian philosophy, we find that its outlook is religious. This is because religion has an indelible mark on Indian philosophy. The purposes of both philosophy and religion are practical. The realisation of salvation is a common goal of

philosophy and religion. As a result of being influenced by religion, Indian philosophy has emphasised self-control. Religious conduct is considered necessary to understand the truth. In Indian philosophy, priority is given to spiritual knowledge (intuitive knowledge). The philosopher here is not satisfied with the theoretical interpretation of truth; rather, he emphasises the realisation of truth. Spiritual knowledge is higher than logical knowledge. In logical knowledge, the duality of knowers and knowers remains present, whereas in spiritual knowledge, duality disappears. Without a doubt, spiritual knowledge is certainly certain.

Western philosophy is analytical. Western philosophy is analytical because it combines various branches of philosophy, such as Metaphysics, Ethics, Epistemology, Theology, Aesthetics. aesthetics) have been interpreted differently for each philosophy. However, another method has been adopted in Indian philosophy. In every philosophy, the problems of proof-of-science, logic-science, ethics-science, and God-science have been considered simultaneously. Shri B.N. Sheel calls this viewpoint of Indian philosophy a synthetic outlook. Western philosophy believes in the existence of this world only, whereas Indian philosophy believes in the existence of the other world apart from this world.

According to Western philosophy, there is no other world than this one. On the contrary, in Indian ideology, there was a philosophy of heaven and hell which has been recognised in all philosophies except Charvaka philosophy. The outlook of Indian philosophy is sad and negative towards life and the world. It's In contrast, in Western philosophy, the sad outlook towards life and the world has been neglected, and the emotional approach has been given priority. The above discussion of the differences between Indian and Western philosophy explains the main tendencies of both philosophies. It would be unfair to conclude from these differences that the union of Indian and Western philosophies is impossible. For the last 50 years, scholars of Europe and India have been trying to edit a world philosophy on the combined basis of Eastern and Western philosophy. Once a world philosophy is created, philosophy will also be universally accepted like science. Common Characteristics of Systems of Indian Philosophy While discussing India's philosophical sects, we have seen that they are generally placed in theistic and atheistic categories. The philosophy that considers the Vedas to be authentic is called 'theist' and the philosophy that considers the Vedas to be inauthentic is called 'atheist'. There are six theistic philosophies: Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Sankhya, Yoga, Mimamsa and Vedanta. In contrast, Charvak, Buddhist, and Jain philosophies are placed in the category of 'atheistic philosophy'. There is great diversity in these philosophies.

Main Text

1. The main characteristic of Indian philosophy is that philosophers here have considered the world to be sad. Philosophy has developed because of spiritual dissatisfaction in India. Due to sorrows, such as disease, death, old age, and debt, there is always unrest in the human mind. The first noble truth of Buddha describes the world as sad. He has called the experiences of disease, death, old age, union, separation, and so on. Man sees sorrow in every aspect of life. His statement that the number of tears shed by the suffering people is more than that of the sea water proposes his outlook towards the world. All philosophies, including Sankhya, Yoga, Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Shankar, Ramanuja, and Jain, align with the Buddha's First Noble Truth. Sankhya has called the world an ocean of sorrow. There are three types of sorrow: spiritual, semi-physical, and spiritual. Spiritual suffering is a form of physical and mental suffering. Semi-physical suffering, such as that of animals and humans, is received from the external world. Examples of this type of sorrow are misdeeds, such as theft, robbery, and murder. Semi-divine sorrows are caused by unnatural powers. Examples of this are suffering caused by ghosts, floods, famine, earthquakes, etc. Indian philosophies have also called the world sad happy experiences. The incompleteness of the world has been pointed out in philosophical literature such as Upanishads and Geeta. Every philosopher presented a distressing picture of the world. It is a short-sightedness to consider worldly pleasures as real pleasures.

Some Western scholars have called Indian philosophy pessimistic. Pessimism is a theory that portrays the world as gloomy. Hope in the world according to pessimism: There is no message. The world is dark and sad. The opposite principle of pessimism is 'optimism'. Optimism is the tendency of the mind to consider the world pleasant. Now, we have to see whether the opinion of European scholars that Indian philosophy is full of pessimism is correct or just an accusation. In the beginning, it would not be inappropriate to say that it is fallacious to call Indian philosophy pessimistic. An overview of Indian philosophy shows that pessimism has been refuted in Indian ideology. There is no doubt that all philosophers consider the world sad. However, they do not become silent just after seeing the sorrows of the world; rather, they try to understand the reason for the sorrows. Every philosophy ensures that man can stop suffering. The cessation of suffering is called salvation in India. Except for Charvaka, every philosopher here considers salvation the ultimate goal of life. If the truth is said, philosophy has developed in India only to attain salvation. Moksha is characterised by the absence of suffering. Some philosophers have called salvation a state of bliss.

The philosophers here do not calm down just by describing the form of salvation but continue to make efforts to attain salvation. Each philosophy indicates a path to salvation. According to Buddha's statement, a human can attain salvation by following the 'Eightfold Path'. The eight-fold path comprises the Right View, Right Resolution, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Livelihood, Right Exercise, Right Memory, and Right Samadhi. In Jain philosophy, to attain salvation, a threefold path called right philosophy (right faith), right knowledge, and right conduct (right conduct) is prescribed. According to Sankhya and Shankara, man can attain salvation through knowledge—that is, by knowing the true nature of things. According to Mimamsa, humans can attain salvation through action. There has been a lot of discussion about salvation and the path to salvation in Indian philosophy, due to which it is a mistake to call Indian philosophy pessimistic. Prof. Max Muller has rightly said, "Since all the philosophies of India demonstrate their ability to remove suffering, it is misleading to call them pessimistic in the ordinary sense." Pessimism means 'giving up action'. The same philosophy can be called pessimistic, in which escape from action is ordered. Doing work brings hope. It is based on karma in which man sees the golden dream of his future life. If this meaning of pessimism is taken, it would be wrong to call Indian ideology pessimistic. Every philosopher gives orders to perform an action. The slightest tendency to run away from life tasks is unacceptable to Indian thinkers. The life of Shankar, who died at a young age, is a unique example of karma. Mahatma Buddha's life was also full of action. Indian philosophy cannot be considered pessimistic because it is imbued with spiritualism. It is wrong to call spiritualist philosophy pessimistic. According to William James, spiritualism is that which believes in an eternal moral order in the world which gives rise to abundant hope. Indian literature opposed the pessimism of Indian philosophy. All contemporary plays in India have happy endings. When there is a hint of optimism in Indian literature, how can Indian philosophy be called pessimism? After all, why is Indian philosophy pessimistic? The Indian philosopher became distraught after seeing the state of affairs in the world. In this sense, he was pessimistic. However, in reality, he cannot be disappointed. This proves that pessimism is the beginning, not the end, of Indian philosophy (Pessimism in Indian Philosophy is only initial and not final). Indian philosophy begins with despair but ends with hope. Dr. Radhakrishnan has said, "Indian philosophers are pessimists as far as they consider the world system to be evil and false, but as far as getting rid of these things is concerned, they are optimistic." "Thus, we see that pessimism in Indian philosophy has a premise, not a conclusion. Dr. Devraj and Dr. Tiwari have compared the pessimism of Indian philosophy to that of a betrothed, who is separated from her beloved but has strong faith in the arrival of her beloved. Similarly, Indian philosophy is pessimistic in the beginning, but ends with optimism. Philosophy begins with suffering, but philosophers here have a strong belief in getting rid of suffering. Indian philosophy is pessimistic, even at the beginning, because it is difficult to evaluate optimism in the absence of pessimism. Prof. Bosanquet has said, "I believe in optimism, but at the same time I say that no optimism is meaningful unless it is combined with pessimism." A famous American named G.H. Palmer While appreciating pessimism and criticising optimism, the teacher has used these words, "Optimism seems inferior to pessimism. Pessimism warns us of calamities, but optimism provides shelter to false security." "Thus, Indian philosophy began with pessimism.

2. The second characteristic of Indian philosophy is that all philosophers except Charvaka believe in the existence of the soul. From Upanishads to Vedanta, emphasis has been placed on the search for soul. The core teaching of the sages is Atmanam Viddhi (Know Thyself). Indian philosophy represents spiritualism as a result of belief in the soul. Here, philosophers generally consider the soul immortal. The main difference between the soul and the body is that the soul is indestructible, whereas the body is perishable. Indian philosophers have presented various views of the soul. Charvaka considered the soul and body to be synonymous with each other. Chaitanyavishtha body itself is known as Charvakas. Has called soul. The soul does not separate itself from the body. Like the body, the soul is also perishable because it is actually the body. This opinion of Charvak is called 'Dehatmism'. Sadananda mentioned four different opinions regarding the soul certified by Charvaka in 'Vedanta-Sara'. Some Charvakas called it the soul body. Some Charvakas have considered the soul a sense organ. Some Charvakas have called karmendriya the soul. Some Charvakas have called manas the soul. Charvakas refuted the idea of the soul as represented in Indian ideology by denying its immortality. Charvaka's idea of the soul is called the materialistic view.

Nyaya and Vaisheshika's view of the soul is called a realistic view. Nyaya-Vaisheshika has considered the soul to be unconscious by nature. Consciousness is transmitted to the soul only when it comes into contact with the mind, body, and senses. Thus, consciousness is called an accidental property of the soul in these philosophies. In a state of salvation, the soul is devoid of quality of consciousness. The soul is considered to be the knower, doer, and enjoyer. Like Nyaya-Vaisheshika, Mimamsa also considers consciousness the visiting religion of the soul. In Mimamsa's philosophy, the soul is considered eternal and eternal. Sankhya considers the soul a form of consciousness. Consciousness is an essential property of the souls. In the absence of consciousness, even imagination of the soul is impossible. The soul remains a constant knower. that knowledge cannot be the subject. Sankhya called the soul a non-doer. The soul is devoid

of joy because it is the result of virtue, and the soul is beyond the three gunas. Shankar also considered consciousness a basic characteristic of the soul. He called the soul 'Sachchidananda' (Sat + Chit + Anand). The soul is neither a knower nor subject of knowledge. As far as the number of souls is concerned, all philosophers except Shankara have considered the soul to be many. Shankar considers only one soul as truth. Nyaya-Vaisheshika believes in two types of souls – (1) Jivatma, (2) Paramatma. There are many souls, but God is only one.

3. The third similarity of Indian philosophy can be called belief in 'karma theory'. Except for Charvaka, all the philosophies of India, whether anti-Veda or compatible with Vedas, recognise the law of karma. Thus, Karma's law has been accepted by six theistic and two atheistic philosophies. Some believe that believing in Karma's law is evidence of the spiritualism of Indian ideology. The law of Karma means "As we sow, so we reap." According to this rule, the result of auspicious deeds is auspicious and the result of inauspicious deeds is inauspicious. According to this, 'Krit Pranaash' i.e. the fruits of the deeds done do not get destroyed and 'Akritmyupagam' i.e. we do not get the fruits of the deeds not done, we always get the fruits of the deeds. Happiness and sorrow are considered inevitable results of auspicious and inauspicious deeds, respectively. Thus, Karma-siddhanta is the 'law of reason, which works in the field of morality. Just as 'reason-law' explains the system inherent in the physical field, in the same way, 'karma-principle' explains the system inherent in the moral field.

That is why some scholars have called 'karma-principle' as the philosophical explanation of the system inherent in the world. All philosophers who believe in 'karma theory' believe that our present life is the result of the deeds of past life and that future life will be the result of the deeds of the present life. Thus, past, present, and future lives are linked in a cause-and-effect chain. If we are sad, then it is the result of our deeds in our previous lives. If we want to make our next life happy, we need to strive for it in our present life. Therefore, every man is the creator of his destiny. The principle of karma is first embodied in 'Veda Darshan' in the form of a seed. The sages of the Vedic period had a feeling of reverence towards the moral system. He called the moral system Rita (Rta) which means 'the order of the world'. The moral system was also included in the 'world order'. Rita's idea takes the form of karmaism in Upanishad philosophy. In Nyaya-Vaisheshika philosophy, the principle of karma is called 'invisible' (Adrsta) because it is not visible.

All objects in the world, including atoms, are influenced by this law. In Mimamsa philosophy, the principle of karma is called 'Apoorva'. In Nyaya-Vaisheshika philosophy, the operation of the invisible is under God's control. As a result of being 'unconscious', it itself does not become fruitful. The idea of Mimamsa opposes that of Nyaya-Vaisheshika, because Mimamsa believes that the principle of karma is automatic. God does not need to govern this. All philosophers in India have written about the scope of the theory to be considered limited. The principle of karma does not apply to all the actions. This applies only to actions which are driven by attachment, hatred, and lust. In other words, actions which are done with a purpose in mind come under the purview of the Karma principle. On the contrary, actions which are performed without any reason are not governed by the principle of karma.

In other words, selfless action is independent of karma. Selfless actions are similar to those of soggy seeds which are unable to bear fruit. This is why this principle does not apply to selfless actions. Karma is used in two ways. Karma is generally used in the form of the karma principle. Apart from this, Karma also has another use. Karma is sometimes used in the form of Shakti, which creates results. From this point of view, there are three types of karma It is considered: -

1. Sanchita Karma
2. Prarabdha Karma
3. Accumulative action

Sanchit Karma is the Karma which arises from past Karmas, but whose results have not yet started. This karma is related to past life. Prarabdha karma is that karma whose results have just started. Its Relationship with Past Life. The actions of present life, whose fruits will be reaped in the future, are called cumulative actions. Many objections have been presented against the karma theory. First, against the theory of karma, it refutes theism. According to theism, God is a creator of the world. God made men happy and sad. However, the theory of karma opposes theistic ideas by attributing the cause of man's happiness and sorrow to him himself.

Karma theory also refutes the attributes of God. God is said to be omnipotent, omniscient, merciful, and so on. However, because of the application of the principle of karma, God cannot deprive a person of the fruits of his deeds, even if he wishes. A person who does evil cannot benefit from God's mercy. Thus, the principle of karma opposes God's perfection. This is the second objection to the karma theory. The third

objection to the principle of karma is made by saying that this principle creates laxity in social services. It is useless to serve a helpless or suffering person because they suffer the consequences of the deeds of their previous life. It can be said that this objection is made only by those who want to run away from their duty. The fourth objection to karma theory is that karmaism is fatalism. Gives recognition to. Every person enjoys the fruit of his deeds. Therefore, it is foolish to expect any improvement. However, this criticism is baseless. Karma theory, as far as present life is concerned, supports fatalism, because present life is the result of the deeds of past life. However, as far as future life is concerned, it gives man the right to create a perfect future based on present good deeds. Karma's theory thus refutes fatalism.

4. All philosophers except charvaka, Vedic and non-Vedic, believe in reincarnation or transmigrations. Reincarnation means taking birth again. The philosophers believe that the world is a series of births and deaths. The idea of rebirth originates from the principle of karma and the soul's immortality. The soul cannot receive the fruits of its actions in one life. To enjoy the fruit of one's deeds, it is necessary to take birth. The principle of rebirth results from the soul's immortality. Because the soul is eternal and indestructible, it passes from one body to another after its death. Death refers to the end of the body and not the soul. Thus, after the destruction of the body, the soul takes on another body and is reborn. Charvaka did not believe in the soul's immortality. According to him, after the death of the body, the soul is also destroyed because both are inseparable from each other. This is why they do not believe in the idea of rebirth. The sages of the Vedic period believed that in a state of unconsciousness, the human soul leaves the body. With this idea, they began believing that after death, the soul takes over another body. Holds.

Apart from this, the people of the Vedic period believed that the person who did not perform his work with full knowledge took birth repeatedly. The idea of the reincarnation of the Vedic period was fully developed in the Upanishads. In Upanishads, rebirth has been explained based on analogies. Among these, it is necessary to mention the following analogy. "Like food, man is destroyed and like food, he is also reborn again."* The principle of reincarnation was fully explained in Geeta. "Just as the human soul passes through different stages like infancy, youth, old age, similarly it enters from one body to another." "Just as a man puts on new clothes when his old clothes become worn out, in the same way the soul leaves the worn out and old body and takes on a new body." Is. Humans remain ignorant of the state of their previous birth, whereas God knows all things. Buddha explained rebirth without the eternal soul, and as a result, his idea of rebirth appears to be unique. Just as the light of one lamp illuminates the light of another lamp, in the same way, the first state of the future life is created from the last state of the present life. In the Nyaya-Vaisheshika philosophy, rebirth is explained by the laughing and crying of a newborn baby. The laughing and crying of babies can be said to reflect the experiences of their previous lives. According to Sankhya Yoga's philosophy, the soul does not move from one body to another. They explained rebirth in terms of subtle bodies. Only a subtle body enters another body after the destruction of the physical body. Mimamsa and Vedanta adopted the principle of general rebirth that is inherent in Indian ideology.

Therefore, it is not necessary to explain these views separately. Critics have presented many criticisms against the idea of reincarnation. whose work the theory of reincarnation has also been criticised, saying that this theory is unscientific. According to this theory, a person takes birth in a future life according to the deeds of his present life. A person dies; hence, thinking that after death, he will get the fruits of his actions in this life in another life seems invalid. Accepting this means believing that yogadatt will have to suffer the consequences of Devdutt's actions. Thus, the theory of reincarnation is of practical importance. Despite being born under similar circumstances in this world, there is a difference in the status of a person. The reason for this difference and opposition is the theory of reincarnation. The person who is happy in this world enjoys the fruits of his good deeds in his past life, and the unhappy person suffers the fruits of his inauspicious deeds in his past life. Thus, through rebirth, man This discrepancy can be explained. The theory of reincarnation can be said to be a proof of the spiritualism of Indian ideology. As long as there is a belief in the soul's immortality, this theory will definitely remain alive. Thus, spiritualism they. At the same time, the principle of reincarnation continues to flow uninterrupted.

5. The main similarity of Indian philosophy is that the practical aspect of philosophy has been emphasised here. Philosophy is deeply connected to life in India. The purpose of philosophy is not just to satisfy mental curiosity but also to solve life problems. Thus, philosophy has been considered an integral part of life in India. It is impossible to imagine philosophy as separate from life. Prof. Haryana has rightly said that "Philosophy is not just a method of thinking but a way of life'." - Charles Moore and Dr. Radhakrishnan have also confirmed the views of Prof. Haryana in these words, "Philosophy in India is for life The reason for calling philosophy a part of life is that the development of philosophy here helps in reducing the sufferings of the world. This was performed to remove it. Frustrated with the sorrows of life, philosophers sought solutions to the sorrows. As a materialistic philosophy, Charvaka does not believe in the soul. When the soul does not exist, who will attain salvation? Therefore, with the denial of the

soul, salvation is also denied. In Charvak's philosophy, only Artha and Kama are considered. Moksha refers to the destruction of sorrow. This common idea of salvation has been considered by all philosophies. The philosophers here do not just discuss the form of salvation, but also strive for salvation. The basic reason is that the aim of philosophy is salvation. Philosophy is studied not only for knowledge, but also for salvation. Prof. Max Muller has explained this form of Indian philosophy in these words: - "Philosophy in India was not for knowledge, but for the highest goal for which man can strive in this life." In Buddhist philosophy, salvation is called nirvana. Nirvam means 'to extinguish'. However, it would be misleading to understand from 'extinguish' that Nirvana is a state of destruction. Nirvana is not the cessation of its existence. A person can attain Nirvana during his/her lifetime. Even after achieving this state, human life remains active. Nirvana was indescribable. After attaining Nirvana, all the sorrows of a person end and the chain of rebirth also ends. According to some followers of Buddhist philosophy, Nirvana was a state of bliss. This idea related to nirvana has not received much authenticity. Buddha discussed the eight-fold path to attain Nirvana in his Fourth Noble Truth.

In Jain's philosophy, salvation is the ultimate goal of life. Moksha can be said to mean the soul attains its natural state. In a state of salvation, the soul again attains infinite knowledge, infinite power, infinite vision, and infinite joy. Attainment of salvation is possible with the help of the right knowledge, philosophy, and conduct. According to Sankhya, salvation means getting rid of the three types of sorrow. The cause of bondage was indiscretion. Purusha differs from nature and its distortions; however, under the influence of ignorance, man establishes a relationship between affinity with nature and its distortions. Salvation is realised only when a man starts to consider himself as different from nature. Bondage is apparent, because men are free of nature. In a state of salvation, the soul does not experience joy. In Advaita Vedanta's philosophy, salvation refers to the soul merging into the Brahman. The soul is Brahma, but influenced by ignorance, it starts considering itself as separate from Brahma. This is the bond. The attainment of salvation is only possible through knowledge. Shankar called moksha a state of bliss. The soul is truly free. Therefore, the meaning of salvation is said to be to get back what has been achieved – Prapaasya Prapti. Moksha refers to the attainment of the soul's natural state. Shankar considered bondage an illusion.

6. Except for Charvaka, all philosophers of India consider ignorance the root cause of bondage. Humans suffer worldly sorrow only by being influenced by ignorance. It is influenced by the ignorance that humans move from one birth to another. Although ignorance has been held to be the cause of bondage in all philosophies, it has been explained differently in each philosophy. In Buddhist philosophy, ignorance means not knowing the four noble truths of Buddha. In Sankhya and Yoga, ignorance refers to non-discrimination. Humans and nature differ from one another. Humans are conscious, whereas nature is unconscious. Purusha is passive, and nature is active. Purusha is nistayagunay, whereas nature is trigunaya. Under the influence of ignorance, man starts to consider himself separate from nature. Therefore, in Sankhya, ignorance refers to a lack of knowledge of the difference between Purusha and Prakriti. In Shankar's philosophy, ignorance refers to the true nature of the soul. The destruction of ignorance is only possible through knowledge. Therefore, in all philosophies, knowledge is considered essential to attain salvation. Just as the sun shines when the clouds move away, similarly to the destruction of ignorance, the bondage automatically gets destroyed. In Jain's philosophy, there is great emphasis on the right knowledge. The right view has been adopted in Buddhist philosophy. In Nyaya-Vaisheshika philosophy, salvation is considered attainable through the knowledge of philosophy. Sankhya accepts the attainment of salvation through Viveka-jnana, which is knowledge of the difference between man and nature. Shankar believes in the removal of bondage through knowledge, which is the opposite of ignorance.

7. To remove ignorance, mere philosophical knowledge is not considered sufficient in Indian philosophy. Apart from the knowledge of the principles, continuous thinking about them is also necessary, because the principle adopted only with bare knowledge remains momentary. For this reason, some types of practice or yoga have been discussed in the Indian philosophy. Although Yoga has been completely explained in yoga philosophy, it has been explained in more or less form in Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Buddhist, Jain, Sankhya, Mimamsa, and Vedanta philosophies. The darshans are acceptable. Here, great emphasis is placed on the cultivation of the body, mind, and speech to attain knowledge. Therefore, the importance of yoga in the Indian ideology has been highlighted.

8. Every philosopher of India, except Charvaka, considers the world to be a moral theatre. Just as actors come to the stage dressed in different clothes and return after performing their acts, in the same way, a human being equipped with the mind and senses comes into this world and performs his actions. Human actions were scrutinised for evaluation. by successfully performing these actions in his present life. Universal theatre can be successful by keeping every person believing in a moral system. Thus, one must strive to become an actor.

9. In every philosophy in India, self-control is emphasised. Charvaka's philosophy is a significant exception to this. Self-control is necessary to attain truth. Our actions are driven by lust and base tendencies. According to attachment, hatred and lust lead to the emergence of false knowledge about the world in humans. Therefore, it is essential to control for these animalistic tendencies. In Indian philosophy, emphasis has been placed on self-control in order to control animalistic tendencies. Self-control can be understood as the control of attachment, hatred, lust, etc., and the control of sense organs and action organs. As a result of the emphasis on self-control, ethical discipline and virtuous life have been considered essential in all philosophies. In all philosophies, orders have been given for non-violence, that is, abandonment of violence; asteya, that is, prohibition of sensuality; celibacy, that is, abandonment of desires; and aparigraha, that is, abandonment of sensual attachment. Apart from this, emphasis was laid on moral discipline like Shauchha (purity of mind and body), Santosha (contentment), Swadhyaya (study) etc. Some scholars believe that Indian philosophy teaches self-abnegation and asceticism. However, the opinions of these scholars are fallacious.

10. The speciality of Indian philosophy can be said to be the coordination of philosophy and religion. The importance of religion has been fully explained in all philosophies except Charvaka philosophy. Owing to the close relationship between philosophy and life, the flow of philosophy and religion has flowed together. The glory of religion has also been reflected in the Jain and Buddhist philosophies developed in India, as a result of which Jainism and Buddhism are considered the main religions not only of India but of the world. The basic reason for coordination between Indian philosophy and religion is that their objectives are the same. Philosophy aims to achieve salvation. Moksha refers to relief from suffering. This form of Indian philosophy differs from that of European philosophy. In Europe, there is a gap between religion and philosophy; as a result, religion and philosophy are considered contradictory. Although Indian philosophy has been linked to religion, there has been no resistance to any philosophical development. These lines of Dr. Radhakrishnan are indicative of this thought, "Although philosophy in India has not been free from religious attraction, yet there has been no hindrance in the philosophical debate." This cannot be considered an obstacle to development.

11. Epistemology is an important component of Indian philosophy. Various types of evidence have been discussed in the scientific literature. Correct knowledge is called 'Prama'. The medium through which accurate knowledge is generated is called the 'pramana'. The amount and nature of evidence have been considered in each philosophy. According to Charvaka, direct evidence is the only proof of this. The authenticity of the estimates was not acceptable for Charvaka. In Buddhist philosophy, both direct inference and inference are called evidence. In Sankhya philosophy, three pieces of evidence—direct, inference, and word—are considered real. Sankhya considered the remaining evidence to be included in these three pieces of evidence. Justice has considered direct inference, word, and analogy as evidence. Mimamsa and Advaita- In Vedanta's philosophies, direct, inference, word, simile, arthapatti, and non-availability are considered evidence. Thus, there are differences in opinions regarding the number of different pramanas within each philosophy. These proofs have immense importance in Indian philosophy because the philosophy of every philosophy depends on its proof of science.

12. The speciality of Indian philosophy is that the thinkers here have demonstrated faith in the past. The biggest proof of this is that the authenticity of the Vedas has been emphasised in all theistic philosophies. In addition, all six parts of Shat Darshan can be said to be based on the Veda because its conclusions have been confirmed. All theistic philosophies have considered Shruti as evidence. Although Charvaka, Jain, Buddhist philosophies have opposed Vedas, the negative influence of Veda on these philosophies is visible. Therefore, through these Darshana's, the importance of the Vedas is revealed in some form, or the other Theistic philosophies have considered the Vedas proof because the actual philosophy of truth in the Vedas has been believed through intuition. The place of intuition is higher than that of the logical knowledge. This differs from direct knowledge through the senses. Truth is realised through this knowledge. This knowledge is unquestionable. If we ask for the truth, Vedas is the storehouse of insight of wise sages. Because of faith in the Vedas, some scholars have accused the Indian philosophy of dogmatism and stagnation. It is misleading to call Indian philosophy conservative. In contrast, he is distinguished by logic and debate. Vedic ideas have not been considered here as a conclusion, but they have been shown to confirm the conclusion that has been adopted about the element through logic. Thus, Indian philosophy is based on an independent thought. Pramana science has been discussed in all the philosophies. Tatv-vigyan has developed in accordance with Prama-vigyan. Although Shruti is considered proof in theistic philosophies, there is literature available in Indian philosophy which refutes Shruti's authenticity. In Indian philosophy, various subjects have been explained in an unbiased manner. Tactics were used in their fullest manner here. This is the reason why commentators like Shankara and Ramanuja have analysed Shruti based on their

experience, and as a result, they have been able to give different philosophical principles. Thus, Indian philosophy is not dogmatic, but critical.

Conclusion Indian philosophy, which has a long and unparalleled tradition of numerous schools of thought in India provides deep rooted understanding about life, existence and reality. An offshoot of spiritual introspection, Indian philosophy is borne out in a number of concepts ranging from karma and dharma to moksha; emphasizing the bonds existing between all creatures on earth while seeking self-realization. Eastern thought fuses metaphysics, ethics and spirituality together into a unified understanding quite unlike Western Philosophy — in which we so often seek logical reasonings based on empirical evidence, dualistic divisions of mind from matter. The Western love of individualism differs starkly to the Indian, philosophical bent toward altruistic values and selflessness. Indian philosophy, in contrast to Western thought where the material is often separated from religion, involves a life filled with both materials and spiritualism. Last but not the least, with its seasoned blend of inner experience and free exultation by way of a deep study and meditation oriental philosophy had given another alternate world vision that has still now effectuating human mind irrespective to culture.

- References**
1. Chakrabarti, K., & Weber, R. (2016). *Classical Indian Philosophy of Mind: The Nyāya Dualist Tradition*. Routledge.
 2. Radhakrishnan, S. (1923). *Indian Philosophy, Volumes 1 & 2*. Oxford University Press.
 3. Chatterjee, S., & Datta, D. (1984). *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*. University of Calcutta.
 4. Hirianna, M. (2000). *The Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
 5. Mohanty, J. N. (1993). *Essays on Indian Philosophy: Traditional and Modern*. Oxford University Press.
 6. King, R. (1999). *Indian Philosophy: An Introduction to Hindu and Buddhist Thought*. Edinburgh University Press.
 7. Dasgupta, S. (1922-1955). *A History of Indian Philosophy (Vols. 1-5)*. Cambridge University Press.
 8. Müller, M. (2004). *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. Kessinger Publishing.
 9. Ganeri, J. (2001). *Philosophy in Classical India: The Proper Work of Reason*. Routledge.
 10. Halbfass, W. (1988). *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding*. State University of New York Press.
 11. Chakrabarti, K. (1992). *Classical Indian Philosophy of Mind: The Nyāya Dualist Tradition*. State University of New York Press.
 12. Deussen, P. (1906). *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
 13. Smart, N. (1964). *Doctrine and Argument in Indian Philosophy*. London: Allen & Unwin.
 14. Bhattacharya, R. (2002). *Studies on Indian Philosophy and Literature*. Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
 15. Williams, P., & Tribe, A. (2000). *Buddhist Thought: A Complete Introduction to the Indian Tradition*. Routledge.
 16. Halbfass, W. (1988). *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding*. State University of New York Press.
 17. Olivelle, P. (1996). *Upanishads: A New Translation*. Oxford University Press.
 18. Matilal, B. K. (1986). *Perception: An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
 19. Sullivan, B. M. (2001). *The A to Z of Hinduism*. Scarecrow Press.