

THE VITALITY AND ROLE OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY TODAY

Methodological Remarks

- I,1 Results depend on the method
- I,2 The method depends on the philosophy
- I,3 The criteria depend on our philosophy
- I,4 We need meta-criteria
- I,5 Meta-criteria are necessary but not sufficient
- I,6 Phenomenology is worth trying

Phenomenological Analysis

- II,1 The phenomenon is bound to time and space
- II,2 Indian Philosophy implies āstikas and nāstikas
- II,3 'Living' means presence, visible or invisible
- II,4 'Dying' means absence, visible or invisible
- II,5 Cosmologies, systems and institutional implications are dying
- II,6 Mumukṣutva and yukti are living

Theoretical Considerations

- III,1 Determining the fluxus quo
- III,2 Rupture : technology, pan-economy, the western way
- III,3 Continuity : urge for 'mokṣa
- III,4 Philosophical relevance should be intrinsically determined
- III,5 Areas : Social Phil.; Anthropology; Phil. of religion
- III,6 Sociology : coexistence of old/new; slogans, justice
- III,7 Anthropology : Technology and science
- III,8 Phil. of Religion : religion as the best and worst feature

Philosophical Orthopraxis

- IV,1 Philosophy : pregnant with action
- IV,2 Authentic philosophers
- IV,3 Cross-cultural
- IV,4 Traditional Phil. ; Western Culture; modernity
- IV,5 Dialogical dialogue

Practical Suggestions

- V,1 Consciousness of being an all-important issue
- V,2 Radical measures needed, not patch-work
- V,3 Permeating all spheres of learning and life
- V,4 Chairs of Philosophy and in Philosophy
- V,5 Up-grading of Ph. D.
- V,6 Creation of All-India Academy
- V,7 Emphasis on cross-cultural and dialogical approaches
- V,8 History of Philosophical Thought
- V,9 Handbook of Fundamental Terms of the Indian Tradition
- V,10 Alternative to Modern Culture (UNESCO)

Some Axioms

- VI,1 Vitality depends on philosophers
- VI,2 Philosophers have to philosophize within a global horizon
- VI,3 Rooted in the three worlds

Over a decade ago the "Indian Philosophical Congress" asked for papers and organized a symposium on Does Indian Philosophy Need Reorientation? The papers are published in the Proceedings. The problem has been haunting Indian intellectuals and is of particular interest to Comparative Philosophy, for, undoubtedly, what provides the horizon of the question is the challenge of Modernity in general and of Western Christianity in particular. Even if some of my suggestions descend to the area of concrete proposals, I think that they may be of more than particular interest, for - independently of their merit - they give expression to the necessary incarnation of philosophical activity into praxis.

Although this paper was originally delivered at the Symposium, it has since been given its final form. I am glad to express my gratitude to the conveners and my colleagues, and my agreement with most of the proposals made during the course of our meetings. I have tried not to repeat them here, assuming that silence will not be interpreted as disagreement.

During an entire week the last month of October a dozen of Indian philosophers met in order to discuss 'What is living and what is dead in Indian philosophy.' The convener was the University Grants Commission and the host the Department of Philosophy

of the Andhra University at Waltair. Some position papers were circulated in advance and the initial discussions were centered around those papers, although the colloquium became more alive and pertinent when the exchange of views took the turn of personal philosophical confessions.

Besides the written contributions sent by K. K. Banerjee, D. P. Chattopadhyaya, D. Malvania, R. C. Pandeya, and K. Ranga Rao and T. N. Murthy, the participants presenting and defending their papers were : N. K. Devaraja (Varanasi), M. N. Gangopadhyay (Shantiniketan), T. M. P. Mahadevan (Madras), K. J. Shah (Dharwar) and Jaganath Upadhyaya (Varanasi). The three professors from Waltair, B. V. Kishan, K. S. Murthy and K. R. Rao took active part in the discussion. Daya Krishna (Jaipur) and myself were the other members of the group besides the junior teaching staff of the Department of Philosophy.

The purpose of the Symposium may be better served if, instead of expounding my personal opinions at length, I put forward only those ideas which may enjoy a wider consensus, and adopt a sutra-like style.

Our common concern being philosophical, requires a philosophical approach. Some of the sutras will therefore transcend the pragmatic issue at stake in this Symposium. This should not be misconstrued as a diversion but as an attempt to penetrate more deeply into the problem itself. Indian Philosophy cannot divorce itself from Philosophy.

I - Methodological Remarks

I, 1 - The results depend on the method.

The answer to any problem is a function of the problematic we see. What we see is conditioned by our perspective, i. e., by the method we adopt.

I, 2 - The method one adopts depends on the philosophy one follows.

There is a *vital circle* enveloping our methods and the overall existential situation of our philosophizing. This is a fact which determines the limits of all our speculation : the method depends on the philosophy one holds and the philosophy holds cond-

itions the method one adopts. Only from a logical point of view, however, is this circle vicious, because life is not reducible to mere logic, nor do we start our speculations from point zero. What we need is a critical reflection on the criteria we use in philosophical analysis.

I, 3 - The criteria we apply in deciding what is alive and what is dead in Indian Philosophy depends on previously-held philosophical views.

For some, truth is alive no matter how dead it may be socio-logically. For others, something which does not have the power to transform human existence cannot be said to be living - to put only the extreme cases. We must find some points of agreement if we are to proceed in a collegial way.

I, 4 - In a pluralistic philosophical situation there can be a certain consensus only in mythical meta-criteria or in non-philosophical, pragmatic concessions.

The first alternative represents an inherent limitation of philosophy, and depends on what take for granted and thus agree upon either consciously or unconsciously. The horizon of such a consensus is provided by the myth in which we live. There is, for instance, a certain agreement today that philosophy-in whatever sense we may understand it - has to be relevant for people in general; that it cannot be reduced to an uncritical repetition of the past, etc.

The second alternative represents the death of philosophy as a free and ultimate enquiry, for it would have to assume that a non-philosophical power, say the State or the Church, has the right to dictate what philosophy has to defend.

We, have, thus, three possibilities: to be commanded by a non-philosophical agency (thereby being placed at the service of some other will), to use the criteria of our particular philosophical systems (to use any other), to agree upon some meta-criteria (becoming open to dialogue and inter-action).

I, 5 - The meta-criteria are necessary but not sufficient.

The meta-criteria are formed by the basis on which rest the different and divergent criteria (of the concerning philosophies). They allow a free interplay among the different criteria emanating

from the diverse philosophical views. They provide the horizon which makes dialogue, interaction and even disagreement possible. But they are not, properly speaking, criteria to be applied, because they provide only the arena where the discussion can meaningfully take place. The meta-criteria may be of help in finding acceptable criteria to people of different philosophical persuasions. Some meta-criteria are, for instance, that philosophy should be relevant, that it should open us to a clearer vision of truth, but they do not tell us how we detect relevance or find truth.

I, 6 - Phenomenology may offer us an acceptable starting point.

The proof of the cake is in the eating. It is a question of trying it.

II - Phenomenological Analysis

II, 1 - The Phenomena we detect correspond to the presentday socio-historical situation.

We should beware of universalizing our conclusions. Nobody can claim meaningfully to cover the universal range of the human experience. The temporal factor should not be overlooked, for it plays an important and limiting role. We can only speak for our time and place, although these two categories can embrace much more than our day and our village.

II, 2 - Indian Philosophy here means the classical systems, the āstikas or orthodox as well as the nāstikas or heterodox.

This seems advisable to reduce the field of our inquiry and focus our discussion. Considerations regarding the nature of philosophy and its distinction from theology and religion, viz. the relation between dharma, darsana, brahmavidya, atmajnana, etc. should be overlooked in this particular context. Philosophical systems coming from Islam, Christianity, aboriginal wisdom, etc. - important as they may be-have also to be disregarded here.

II, 3 - What is living means that which is sufficiently present so as to be effective either on the visible, conscious and sociological level (a), or on the invisible, unconscious and anthropological level (b), or on both. Effective here means affecting life in some non-negligible degree.

Something can be present among a sociologically powerful group and yet have hardly any roots in the Indian soil, and vice-versa. The discrepancy between the two levels creates the complexity of the problem. Here the question of alienation becomes relevant.

The term living should be free of axiological overtones. To be living does not mean to be good and true; it could be equally harmful and wrong. Yet there is an intimate relationship between life and values which is in itself a peculiar philosophical problem.

II, 4 - What is dying means that which is sufficiently absent so as to be ineffective on one or both of the above-mentioned levels.

The term 'dying' seems more apposite than the term 'dead', not only to balance 'living', but also because human existence, on every plane, is an 'in-between life and death'. The whole of existence ek-sists in a two-way transit between life and death; and it is the tension between the two that constitutes our factual situation.

II, 5 - What is dying in Indian Philosophy is : (1) on level (a) practically every idea tied up with obsolete cosmologies : (2) on both levels most of the systems as they were once taught; and (3) mainly on level (a) many of the religious institutions and practical implications of the systems.

(1) The greatest impact of modern science is to be seen not in the technical gadgets that science has made possible, but in the change of world-view which it has brought about. Today anything which contradicts the 'scientific' world-view has very little chance of survival. Miracles and apsaras may be still considered real, but they have to pass through the screen of 'Science' - whether this be valid or not. This point is less applicable in the case of the Indian peasant, but even here watching television, or at least the 'belief' that such a thing is possible and real, has fundamentally changed the cosmological background over against which his conceptions of reality rest - to illustrate a long process with a single example. There is no philosophy without a cosmological ground, declared or undeclared. We face today in India a phenomenon similar to the collapse of the medieval world-view in Europe. The

purānas may still be very much alive, but currently they are being 'situated' in a different framework, which alone permits them to live.

(2) Some schools of Vedānta could be said to be an exception to this and yet there seems to be general agreement that even they are on the decline and that they are, in any case, simply expurgated and oversimplified versions of the traditional sampradāyas.

(3) Traditional institutions are on the wane; they exercise less and less influence on the ordinary life of the people. The caste system, for example, may still be strong in certain milieus, but its maintenance is primarily due to inertia, and it seems to have been stripped of whatever rationale that once made it at least meaningful. Furthermore, traditional Indian Philosophy shaped a social order and created an anthropological situation which are hardly alive today. Many aspects of the old order survive, but the wind of change seems irresistible and has already blown unto the four corners of the country. Not only are gurukulas, vedic practices and mīmāṃsā categories declining, but also the practice of shaping one's life according to the views of the traditional systems is disappearing, notwithstanding the many noble efforts at renewal. Indeed the very existence of reform movements is evidence that the 'unreformed' systems are dying.

II, 6 - What is living in Indian Philosophy is its Spirit, which can be detected in (1) mumuksutva or the unquenched desire for liberation and (2) yukti or the wholistic approach to reality, especially to the ultimate questions.

An all-pervading conviction seems to be very much alive throughout India. Philosophers have given it the most variegated names such as mokṣa, nirvāna, bhoga, jñāna, apavarga, ānanda, brahman, tattvajñāna, etc. These names may represent a human invariant, yet they present a peculiarly Indian slant. The vast majority of the people of India still react positively to the idea of liberation and emancipation, even if these are interpreted in socio-economic or political terms. There is in mukti, freedom, an aura of 'plus' which seems to indicate that this goal of human existence, in whatever it may consist, is worth pursuing.

(2) There is a synthetic feature which some will say belongs to the Indian mind, and which undoubtedly belongs to the spirit of

Indian Philosophy : it consists in an all-embracing or integrated ideal of truth and perfection. Jnāna or knowledge does not mean only technical know-how or specialized cognition. A sage in India has to be holy as well as knowledgeable, while an unethical man is not considered capable of purely intellectual achievements; religion and ethics, the sacred and the profane, theory and praxis, etc. all go together. Except for a tiny little minority among the British 'educated', hardly anybody in India considers Philosophy as just another science or as an analytical endeavour. On the contrary, it is seen as an all-embracing wisdom having constitutive links with religion and holiness. The salvation man longs for is an integral state including sarvam, all - from which the very word salvation derives.

III - Theoretical Considerations

II, 1 - It is the task of Philosophers in India, not only passively to analyze the status quo, but to intervene actively in the fluxus quo by taking a stand in determining what should live and what should die in Indian Philosophy.

Thus we need both a critical analysis of the situation, and practical proposals based on such an evaluation of the nature and function of philosophy itself. There is no need to recall that classical Indian Philosophy was part and parcel of the life of the people.

III, 2 - The main factors with which Indian Philosophy has to deal, are : (a) the technological civilization, (b) the pan-economic system and (c) the western way of life.

Philosophy cannot be cultivated *in vitro*. Its ground is the living soil of the people philosophizing. It is for his fellow-beings that the philosophers proper philosophize. The three factors of rupture modify not only the results and the methods of Indian philosophizing today, but philosophical activity itself in its very roots. Today, Philosophy in India—as elsewhere—has to address itself not only to the rethinking of solutions, but to the awareness of the problems themselves and ultimately, of reality. Indian Philosophy cannot live in an enclave.

III, 3 - The main element of continuity in Indian Philosophy today is the inborn urge of the peoples for mokṣa or liberation,

this latter understood according to the divergent interpretations of the different philosophies, ancient or modern.

A permanent factor common both to the traditional philosophical systems and the present day mentality seems to be the human longing for emancipation. This dynamism confers unity and purpose to the philosophical enterprise. If the desire to know Being could be said to be the central thrust of western philosophy, the desire for liberation characterizes Indian Philosophy. To the satyajijnāsā of the West, we could present the mumukṣutva of India as the main concern of Philosophy. This mukti, however, does not need to be interpreted in one particular way. The study of what makes the human being free could be said to constitute the central philosophical question for our times.

It is this element of continuity that is largely responsible for the tremendous appeal of Indian wisdom throughout the world today. This gives Indian Philosophy a relevance far beyond its traditional boundaries, not only geographically and historically but also philosophically, as we shall suggest when affirming that Philosophy today must be cross-cultural (IV, 3).

III, 4 – The concept of philosophical relevance cannot be dictated from outside philosophy but must spring from the nature of the philosophical enquiry itself.

Here we should recall what has been said concerning the criteria governing philosophical enquiry. For some philosophers, certain types of problems are considered more important than others. We repeat: the fact that we have not mentioned something here does not mean we under-rate its importance. The Philosophy of Mathematics and Aesthetics, for instance, should not be neglected. The specific problem under examination, however, is not the nature of all Philosophy, but the situation of Indian Philosophy today.

III, 5 – The main philosophically relevant areas are: (a) Social Philosophy, (b) Philosophical Anthropology and (c) Philosophy of religion.

To persist in looking for relevance in any of the classical disciplines such as metaphysics, epistemology or logic, etc. would only

increase the gap between past and present, and reinforce the divisions between the philosophical disciplines. We need precisely to overcome such watertight compartments. Furthermore, these three areas of enquiry require the collaboration of all philosophical disciplines. To concentrate on clarifying traditional notions such as *ātman*, *brahman*, *cit*, *ānanda*, etc. may set a priori limits to what should be a free philosophical enterprise. It may further divert us from an analysis of our contemporary understanding of reality and impose on our thought categories from the past, relevant as they may prove to be. Moreover, all these problems will re-emerge in their proper setting in the process of tackling the three proposed areas.

In sum, these three areas of concern do not exclude traditional disciplines or Indian categories, but reorient them to serve living issues.

III, 6 – It is imperative for Philosophy in India today to scrutinize sociological problems, e. g. : (a) the possible juxtaposition, superimposition, interaction or symbiosis between currently emerging institutions and traditional patterns; (b) the meaning of current slogans and myths such as ‘democracy’, ‘secularism’, ‘socialism’, ‘humanism’, ‘scientific progress’, etc. and (c) the problem of justice.

It goes without saying that here social philosophy does not mean purely descriptive and quantitative sociological behaviorism. Especially in India sociology cannot be divorced from its ontological foundation and religious implications.

(a) If the subject-matter of philosophy is reality, a social philosophical study cannot fail to see two Indias painfully ‘co-existing’ in our times. Tradition and modernity have not yet married. The philosopher here has a priestly function. The world of work, family life, political involvement on all levels, etc. are urgent philosophical issues which need theoretical clarification as much as practical orientation.

(b) It has always been the task of a living philosophy to take a stand regarding existentially burning issues and to clarify the powerful ideational forces which drive individuals and peoples, in order to help emancipate Man, so often caught either in mere slogans or else hopelessly exploited. To rescue Man from fear of

the higher powers and anxiety about the underworld has ever been a driving impulse behind any authentic philosophy. The corrective and critical function of philosophy should be applied here.

(c) Nothing is more deleterious than living on borrowed ideas and ideals. Almost every great philosophy has elaborated the intellectual foundation on which the idea of justice rests. The very fact that many Indian systems have neglected this point calls for a more thorough study today.

III 7, - Philosophical Anthropology is relevant today in as much as a technological civilization and a scientific era are both based on a conception of Man which needs fundamental research.

Philosophy of Science and Technology have all too often taken for granted an image of Man which has been furnished by a mainly western intellectual history, without considering that Indian anthropological assumptions, for instance, may be different. It is the task of the philosopher, as well as the man of politics, to tackle this problem which generally escapes the technician and scientist, for it requires a radical questioning of the very foundations of 'homo faber et technicus.'

III, 8 - Philosophy of Religion has a special relevance, for religions show an intriguing ambivalence, being at once the best but also perhaps the worst feature of Indian culture.

Throwing away the baby with the bathwater is neither philosophical nor efficient. Indian Philosophy has been intrinsically connected with the religious urge of Man; in fact, it has been the intellectual side of religion as it were. Traditional religions may not satisfy us any longer, but an uncritical dismissal of religiousness will not do justice to truth or to Man. Here the inflation is not cured by philosophical poverty.

IV - Philosophical Orthopraxis

IV, 1 - Philosophy is not mere ideology. Philosophy is as much a theoretical activity as it is pregnant with action. The function of Philosophy consists not in justifying any given state of affairs, but in enhancing Man's awareness and by this act improving reality itself.

Radical criticism is a feature of any authentic philosophy. Philosophy questions itself and is ready to make a total self-sacrifice for the sake of the philosophical activity. The critical selfreflection of Indian Philosophy should be free from a priori attitudes of defense or attack. Indian philosophers are willy-nilly caught up in the crossing of philosophical currents which conditions their own philosophizing.

IV, 2 - Indian Philosophy will be relevant if Indian philosophers are authentic philosophers : i. e., (a) if we feel the excruciating problems of our times on an ultimate level; (b) if we suffer the human condition of our people; (c) if we think through the problems in order to clarify them; and (d) if we struggle to find ways of solving them.

Philosophy is more than a non-committal brooding on safe issues and also much more than an uncritical plunge into action. It is more than just teaching and also more than simple involvement. In a word, Indian Philosophy will be relevant if it is truly philosophy - and not just a regurgitation of past 'glories'.

The main task of philosophers is not to 'teach' a discipline called 'philosophy', but to live it, to spread it just as the *ṛṣis* spread the sacrifice. Philosophers should not constitute a sort of closed and self-perpetuating body which is maintained in existence solely for the sake of its own preservation.

IV, 3 - Philosophy today-and Indian philosophy is no exception-has to be cross-cultural.

The very ground of philosophical speculation today is cross-cultural. Indian philosophy has to meet this challenge not by hiding behind an impregnable bulwark, but by allowing itself to be thrown as a seed into the soil of the contemporary world.

Cross-cultural Philosophy does not mean comparative philosophy if by the latter term one understands the comparison of Philosophies. Philosophy does not deal with 'philosophy' or 'Philosophies' but with reality, and with all the means that Man has at his disposal on the ultimate level of understanding.

Cross-cultural Philosophy implies the awareness that both the ground or starting point of philosophical speculation and its results,

answers or clarifications spring from and are addressed to a cross-cultural man situation. Our human predicament is today, generally speaking, a more or less confused mingling of cultures and the interaction of many world-views and life-styles. It belongs precisely to Philosophical awareness to create certain order in the present-day mingled state of affairs. Cross-cultural Philosophy is thus both an exigency and an aim.

Cross-cultural Philosophy assumes that there is no neutral platform from which one can casually philosophize. The cross-cultural approach studies philosophical problems in the light of more than one philosophical tradition, trying to integrate the immense variety and riches of the human experience. A new kind of hermeneutics is required here : morphological and diadronical hermeneutics are not sufficient. Diatopical hermeneutics is needed, not as a substitute for the other two, but to complement them.

IV, 4 - Indian philosophers today could be exceptionally well equipped to play leading role in India and in the world. They can have a first hand experience of (a) classical Indian culture, (b) western civilization (and non-western cultures), and (c) modernity.

This exceptional socio-historical possibility entails the exceptional danger of schizophrenia of defensive caste-isolationism. Syntheses are as barren and pernicious as attitudes deemed self-sufficient, which lead to arrogant withdrawals. Philosophy today cannot be fruitfully cultivated in isolation, nor-obviously-in superficial relations.

(a) Classical Indian Philosophy may have to undergo a painful and fundamental transformation, but it has not yet spoken its last word. On the contrary, all the evidence leads one to suspect that its role will become increasingly crucial if it remains loyal to its genius. Indian Philosophy is not a racist concept; rather, philosophers steeped in the still-living Indian tradition are exceptionally fit to imbibe a spirit which implies more than general ideas or abstract principles.

(b) The many centuries of more or less happy symbiosis between India and the West also account for the fact that what goes under the vague heading of ' western philosophy ' is in no way foreign to the cultural climate of India - although one might

wish that Spanish, Dutch, Portuguese and French elements could have had a greater philosophical impact in order to complement the more predominant Anglo-Saxon influence. Goa and Pondicherry could have become philosophical symbols if only they had not been polarized into exclusively political issues.

(c) Modernity today can no longer be equated with one particular culture, despite its notably 'western' connotations. The philosopher in modern India, like anyone else, bears the excruciating burden of finding his way in the present day situation. We are certainly all at a crossroads.

IV, 5 — The revitalization of Philosophy, and thus of Indian Philosophy as well, depends to a great extent on the dialogical dialogue to provide the proper mode of philosophizing. The dialectical dialogue is not sufficient.

The clarification of existentially decisive issues cannot be entrusted to a merely dialectical interplay, which assumes that the epistemic principle of non-contradiction also has a supreme ontological value and thus is the only possible basis for deciding the validity of a philosophical intuition.

Dialectics are a fundamental philosophical method, and something which contravenes the principle of non-contradiction cannot seriously claim philosophical validity. But dialectics are not enough for the present philosophical situation.

The dialogical dialogue does not substitute for but complements dialectics. It is based not on a common confidence in the neutral field of logical dialectics, but on a genuine mutual trust in the other, i. e. on the fact that the other is a source of understanding and of original perspective, just as I am, and that in consequence he/she not only merits human respect, but philosophical attention as well, even if I do not exactly understand his/her opinions. The dialogical dialogue is a real 'going through the logos' (*dia ton logon*) so as to overcome—not deny—the logos by piercing through it and reaching that other sphere of human experience which only confidence in the other qua other can make possible. In the dialogical dialogue, I open myself to the other so that my partner may discover my myths, my underlying assumptions and criticize the very foundations of my convictions; and vice-versa, of course. The dialogical dialogue

does not stop when we reach a logical impasse or when I convince the partner of contradiction; at this point the dialogue looks for another way to proceed further and deeper, and does not cease until we have reached a common myth on which we may both rest, because neither questions it. The common ground here is not the logical arena, but the total human reality. The dialogical dialogue implies, obviously, the belief that I am not self-sufficient in constructing a complete picture of reality and that the other can offer a fundamental contribution (and not only a minor correction to my, by then frozen, convictions). This is why the dialogical dialogue opens us up for radically new vistas. The real dialogue is neither what I say or what my partner adds, but what happens in the dialogue itself; something about which neither I nor the other party has any previous knowledge.

This is why the dialogical dialogue is risky. It cannot be pre-planned, nor can we determine its results. I may be convinced or change my opinions or a new awareness may emerge. In any case the rules of the dialogue are not presupposed a priori or dictated by one of the parties. Today Indian Philosophy can have a creative encounter with the other philosophical world-views, which are alive even in the very soil of India, only by means of such an authentic dialogical dialogue.

V-Practical Suggestions

V, 1 - Everything depends on the conviction that philosophical activity is of the utmost importance and that the time, attention and money given to it are not superfluous luxuries.

Philosophies often have an inferiority complex, which creates a pernicious feed-back feeding a vicious circle: the bigger the complex, the greater the actual sociological inferiority of philosophy. Philosophy considers itself of little importance in the actual situation of India and this very belief is at least partly, the cause of its meagre importance and minor impact.

V, 2 - The nature of our problem is fundamental and so calls for radical measures. Minor adjustment may prove to be counter-effective and merely prolong a status quo which needs to change fundamentally.

Radical change does not mean hurried and improvised reforms; but the experience of the last 25 years of Indian University life should be a warning and a challenge. We cannot perpetuate a system which corresponds neither to the vital needs of the people nor to the very nature of Philosophy. The implementation should be progressive and prudent, and the plan thorough and far-reaching. Philosophical thinking is always bold and radical; courage and imagination are also philosophical virtues. It is not a question of giving lustre to a once glorious philosophical past but of making Philosophy in India what it should and could be: a school, a place of real wisdom which serves to emancipate the human being from the bondage of ignorance which besets Man - to use a particular traditional language, although not necessarily in its traditional sense.

V, 3 - The post renaissance western notion of 'Philosophy' as a discipline among other disciplines should be superseded. Authentic Philosophy permeates all spheres of academic as well as of human life in an *autonomous* way.

This is such a radical suggestion that we may not be prepared to implement it, but it could at least, be studied. The first step would be to create chairs or prescribe 'papers' of Philosophy in all faculties and institutions of learning. One could begin with the 'higher learning' and then proceed to other more 'elementary' schools, This would also have the effect of creating more 'jobs' for philosophers, thus hopefully enhancing both the number and the quality of the students attracted to professional cultivation of philosophy. Schools of Engineering, Medicine, Law, Technology, etc. should all teach Philosophy in an adequate manner. The traditional 'Studium generale' of the classical Universities and the requirements on 'General Knowledge' could provide a model which, however, should be improved.

Instead of the *autonomous* reaction of the particular sciences against the *heteronomous* dominance of Philosophy and Theology, which was the pattern in the past, a more balanced and harmonious *autonomous* relationship is required.

Most of the modern disciplines and sciences are off-shoots of western philosophy; they are not children of the traditional Indian darshans. This fact both facilitates and makes more difficult the integrating task of Indian Philosophy. It facilitates the task, because

of the absence of historical resentments and cultural misunderstandings. It makes the task more difficult because the synthesis, which should remain open, has to be freshly created.

To provide an open, but coherent and comprehensive world-picture, to offer a universal frame of reference, still remains one of the most important tasks of Philosophy. This task cannot be left to a few specialists and much less to sociology. The dialogical dialogue mentioned above is not restricted to 'philosophers' or 'philosophies' alone, but involves all branches of human activity.

V, 4 - Besides Chairs of Philosophy in all Faculties, special Chairs in the Philosophy of each Faculty should be created.

The students of the different faculties should have a general knowledge of Philosophy, as proposed in 5 V, 3- This need could be met by instituting Chairs of Philosophy in the different Faculties. As an intermediary step one could institute compulsory papers on Philosophy for the students of all Faculties under the responsibility of the Department of Philosophy.

Besides this, special emphasis should be laid on the intellectual unity of a particular Faculty and its integration into the general pattern not only of knowledge, but also of life. Medicos, lawyers, historians and engineers, to give just a few examples, should have not only a general knowledge of the philosophical problems of our times, but also be conversant with the anthropological and philosophical foundations of their respective disciplines. A general theory of medical sciences, which by definition can only be philosophical, is as necessary as mastering particular medical technique. Philosophy is not only cross-cultural, it is also essentially interdisciplinary.

Not only is accurate preparation of the curricula and syllabi needed; the personnel and problems themselves must be prepared, for we are entering here an extremely important new area. For once Philosophy in India could take the lead!

V, 5 - The title of Ph. D. should be upgraded so that it becomes an exceptional qualification.

A new degree could be created if the 'old' Ph. D. were still to be required. One cause of the low esteem in which Philosophy in India today is held, is the generally poor quality of University students and consequently of staff (brilliant exceptions notwith-

standing). This can only be remedied by revalorizing the title and then the philosophical course of study of Philosophy.

V, 6 - The creation of an All-India Institute or Academy of Philosophy.

The example of other countries may be stimulating and enlightening. India has first class national institutions for Arts and Sciences, Law and Medicine, but in spite of the Indian philosophical tradition she does not have a corresponding Indian Academy of Philosophy, which could enjoy a consultative status to different bodies of the Country, including the State. Parenthetically one might add that some genuinely philosophical thinking would do no harm to the studies and disquisitions of the Supreme Court and other Higher Courts of Law. Is India not running too much in the wake of classical foreign models, despite the fact that elsewhere these very institutions are now being considered in need of radical reforms?

For far too long, and after the sciences have already overcome this stage, philosophers continue to believe that philosophical speculation is a highly individualistic affair. This does not need to be the case. To be sure, the genius is always an exception and cannot be foreseen or produced, and certainly thinking requires solitude and concentration (as in the sciences as well), but this does not exclude the communitarian and collaborating character of Philosophy. The many traditional schools of the past witness that a proper climate, a tradition, and a two way communication are required.

The function of such an Academy could be to encourage 'team work' and common reflection on fundamental issues as well as to coordinate philosophical activities at the highest level. It should not become a 'think-tank' in the service of vested interests or political power, but should embody the philosophical awareness of the people and should contribute to enhancing the quality of the spiritual and intellectual life of the community.

V. 7 - Emphasis should be given to the areas of special relevance and to cross-cultural studies, also providing more or less institutionalized opportunities for fruitful philosophical dialogues and interactions.

Without encroaching upon philosophical freedom, ways of fostering these above-mentioned goals could be found : Prizes, Seminars, Summer-schools, guidelines for Ph. D. theses, etc. These activities go beyond the competence of Departments of Philosophy which in any case should not have a monopoly on the cultivation of Philosophy.

- V. 8** - Indian philosophers could take the lead in promoting the publication of a History of Philosophy on a human scale which would overcome national and cultural, as well as religious boundaries.

The "History of Philosophy, East and West" edited by S. Radhakrishnan could serve as an example here. This project should not be a mere juxtaposition of essays, nor follow historical and geographical divisions but cut across times and places, and present the main philosophical problems as they have been seen, suffered and solved by the human race across all boundaries. Being in itself a difficult philosophical task this very activity could help create the organ to realize it. Needless to say, the project, although directed from somewhere, should be truly universal and not only Indian, in collaboration perhaps with UNESCO.

- V. 9** - A Handbook of Fundamental Terms of Indian Tradition could help to give consciousness, identity and perspective to the bewildering variety and richness of the philosophies of India.

For two years the present writer has conducted a feasibility study on this matter, which has since been shelved until a proper agency would take the financial and administrative burden, and would be glad to provide further details on this point.

- V. 10** - Today many responsible thinkers of the world are searching for an alternative to modern culture. Indian Philosophy should enter this quest and see whether it can contribute to the discovery of a viable alternative. A common project could be set up.

The present writer has presented a draft to UNESCO calling for a symposium involving the different philosophies of the world in order to agree on the diagnosis before proceeding to the therapy,

and would be honored to give details of his proposal.

VI - Some Axioms

- VI, 1** - The vitality of Indian Philosophy today depends on the vitality of today's Indian philosophers.
- VI, 2** - The vitality of Indian philosophers today depends on their taking seriously their role as thinkers in a global context.
- VI, 3** - The effectiveness of their thinking will depend on such factors as : (a) how deeply they are rooted in the Indian tradition; (b) how well they are at home in western culture; (c) how sincerely they are engaged in the modern struggle for a humane world.

Department of Religious Studies
University of California
Santa Barbara
California U. S. A.

R. Panikkar