

PHILOSOPHY AND THE QUESTION OF ITS UTILITY

Devendra Nath Tiwari*

Abstract: Philosophy begins with some problem caused by some or the other sense of illusion, doubt, confusion, inconsistency, incompleteness, etc., we confront when we become reflective or self-conscious of in a theorization, or conceptualization on a concept and the reflecting on continues until the problem is clarified or the confusion is removed. The removal of the problem is not the end of philosophical reflection because, being a rational animal and moreover a reflecting being, a man may again confront with some or the other problem. This is relational to his rational hunger. The paper under discussion critically observes the theories that take philosophy as vision of reality, description of the vision into ultimate, speculation into the substance, etc. It critically examines theories that take philosophy as subjective or objective reflection and observes it as a cognitive activity par excellence; a reflective or self-conscious activity on the objects of knowledge that are intelligible being. Since Philosophical reflections aim at conceptual clarification, interpretation and lastly wisdom, the question of a risk against philosophy does not hold merit. Philosophy fulfils human aspiration because of which its individual and public utility can neither be denied nor be overlooked.

Introduction

IT IS GENERAL opinion of a major group of scholars that, in the present age of materialistic need, philosophy has no future of its own because of the simple reason that it cannot satisfy material desires. They think that materialistic spirit has destroyed mental peace and has deformed human relations. Therefore as a remedy Yoga, ethics and spiritualism, in an easy and consolidated form should be the future of philosophy. The former view does not give importance to mental peace and prosperity while the latter, being a consolidated course to be followed or practiced does not give importance to any enhancement and enrichment of thoughts. The former is a prediction lacking insight while the latter is a practice lacking philosophical interest.

Philosophy is taken by the masses as a vision of reality, a description of the ultimate vision, speculation into substance, etc. If this is philosophy then doing philosophy is limited to metaphysical speculations of seers and saints who claim to have that vision; they claim to have dialogue with the truth or the reality.

In traditional practices, metaphysics is taken as a theory involved in determining the real or ultimate nature of things, questions about the reality of external things, their kinds, modes and epistemology based on proving them. Modern thinkers take the term for the study of things transcendental to what we know but have more intrinsic reality and value than empirical things. I use the term 'metaphysical thing'

*Dr. DEVENDRA NATH TIWARI, Professor and Head, Department of Philosophy and Religion, Banaras Hindu University. Varanasi, India. Email: dntphil@rediffmail.com.

for thing-in-itself without splitting it into transcendental and empirical. More precisely, I have taken the term 'metaphysics' in the sense of a mode of thinking in which the thought and the thing or the essence of thing-empirical or transcendental-are considered exterior to language that refers to or represents them. However, in both of the senses metaphysical things are transcendental and independent from the mind. Metaphysics and metaphysical things as the object proper of cognition have been criticized by the scholars of repute as a course of proper philosophy. Scholars have given different sets of arguments for the refutation of metaphysics. I am not repeating them here. My argument follows thus. Being transcendental to knowledge a Thing-in-itself-metaphysical or physical-is not the object of knowledge. Objects of knowledge to my mind are all those beings that are not only expressed by but are infused by language also. I have made a difference between the thing and being. By the term 'being' I mean concepts, an idea/ thought, an object of awareness in nature, the object that is expressed in the mind by language, but this is not the case with the thing. Ideas or thoughts as figure in cognition are also existences. They are intelligible existences. Objects belonging to the past, present and future can figure thus because the language presents them so in the mind. If philosophy is a cognitive activity par excellence then the intelligible beings are only objects of a philosophical reflection and therefore they can be called philosophical objects in contrast to the thing-in-itself that according to realists and idealists exist independently of knowledge. By the term 'thing' I always mean the thing-in-itself in Kantian jargon, the reality isolated from language.

I ask a question: why is there philosophy at all? What is the truth of saying 'none of us or all of us is a philosopher? If philosophy is taken as the construction of metaphysics, it will be the subjective activity of the metaphysician, his intellectual game. If it as seer's speculation is taken into account then a philosopher is a person gifted with divine revelation, and it then will not be different from mystical experience and then none of us in that sense is a philosopher.

Different from the aforementioned metaphysical view, Philosophy, for us, begins with some problem caused by some or the other sense of illusion, doubt, confusion, inconsistency, incompleteness, etc., and we confront them when we become reflective and the reflecting on continues until the problem is clarified or the confusion is removed. The removal of the problem is not the end of philosophical reflection or philosophisation because man, being a rational animal, may again confront some or the other problem. This is relational to his rational hunger. Thus the problems caused out of certain rationalization, conceptualization with which we confront in the process of understanding, rationalizing, analyzing and interpreting some conception invite philosophical reflections that continue till clarity and completeness of concept popular in communication are accomplished. Anybody who is dedicated to such self-conscious activity for a clear vision of the concept as it figures in communication is a philosopher.

I

After refutation of metaphysics by A.J.Ayer (1982), philosophical thinking shifted to the analysis of language for clarity and conception of meaning. Rorty's writings on de-epistemolisation and "Recent obituaries of epistemology" by Susan Haak, (1990)" completely ruined the metaphysical design of doing philosophy. With the dawn of post modernistic influence, we are noticing a materialistic rush at the global level. This has questioned the utility of philosophy. Politicians and policy makers in education have started thinking as to why to spend a huge amount of budget for a discipline having no material production. The whole scenario has made the persons doing philosophy chaotic about the future of philosophy. In the name of mounting up philosophy, they do involve themselves with ethics, yoga, and spirituality as a remedy against the destruction caused by post -modernistic influence on the life. Will they not do more harm to philosophy?

Philosophy is identified with philosophy of language and analysis. Is philosophical activity like peeling an onion? Analytic philosophers think that philosophical problems are caused by the misuse of the language or confusion caused by the improper use of language or when language goes on holiday. And the only remedy for healing those problems is to analyze the language to the extent of liquidation of the problems. Problems are removed when by analysis we get clarity of the thought expressed in the language. This analysis is analogous to the peeling of onion because after peeling we realize that nothing is hidden either in the parts analyzed thus or in the whole separate from the parts. Philosophical analysis is different from grammatical analysis and hence from peeling the onion in which we separate the parts from the whole that is decomposed. Philosophical analysis is a self-conscious activity in which not only the language and the meaning it represents are given objects of analysis but also their awareness, cognitive ground of proper analyzing and self awareness of the awareness are also involved. This activity is not like flying the fly from the bottle because the purpose of philosophical reflection and the analysis it involves is clear understanding of the concept as it is popularly known in communication. When the problem through analysis is removed and clarity is achieved, one gets wisdom and bliss.

Theories like linguistic analysis, semantic analysis, functional-analysis, analysis of cognition, cognitive philosophy, cognitive-holistic analysis of language and the autonomy theory of language—all influence the minds of those persons doing philosophy. Holistic theory of language has just germinated and the plant of autonomy theory of language has to yet to grow as a solution to our philosophical problems. It is hoped that these philosophies will move forward to their maturity in the years to come.

II

Since the dawn of culture and civilization there have been attempts to understand our knowledge. Generally it is supposed that the world of our knowledge consists of the duality of mind and matter, mind as thought and matter as thing or body. The former

is internal and the latter is external. Attempts made to consider this dichotomy have given birth to a number of realistic and idealistic theories. Here I shall confine my discussion to only a few of them: those requisite to come to a conclusive position. Then on this position I can proceed to present a philosophical response to the dialogue on philosophy and knowledge. The former is universal and the latter is individual or particular. Buddhist logicians assume that the former is construction of mind and thus they are not existences and the latter are real and hence existences but are beyond description. External things are always individual, discrete and desperately real but the mind cannot know them. The mind can know only thoughts, that is, the universals and they are not real. The latter is only perceived and what is perceived is real. The former is caused due to confusion between the imagined constructions and external real. They give utmost importance to indeterminate knowledge we can have by instant perception of the real and the determinate cognition is all constructions. The real is not the object of philosophy but of *sādhana* and the latter does not add any reality to serve the cause of philosophy. Here philosophy dies and religion flourishes. Advaita Vedantins assume that our world of experience and knowledge comprises of the subject and the object. None out of the thoughts and the things are real; the real transcends the two. Being beyond our grasp the transcendental cannot be an object of knowledge and philosophical reflections. Intuition is given primacy to which reason is subordinated. All that the mind knows is illusory and it cannot know the real, which can be known only through intuition. The real can be known only by being so. Philosophy is subordinated to religion that is *sādhana* and is placed as having no philosophical purpose to fulfill. The whole constructive reasoning of logicians like Nagarjuna, Dharmakirti, Jayarasi and to some extent Sriharsa was centered on the refutation of reasoning. Reasoning and logic in their hands have nothing to live for and this is only to pave the way to knowledge of the real which is beyond the grasp of reasoning and the senses. Their intellectual exercise was anti-intellectual in its purpose.

The dichotomous position of the duality of the world of thought and the world of external things has been resolved in different ways. I am putting herewith some for evidence. 1. Realists accept the two—the universals and individuals as independent existences that contact only in knowledge. 2. The two are independent but for knowledge the latter is subordinated to the former. 3. None of them are existences and they are false impositions of the existence that is real and transcendental to both of them. 4. Both of the two are real but as parts only. They are parts of the transcendental real. 5. The transcendental is consciousness and that is all pervading. The individuals and universals are only ignorance or false dualities. In responding to the controversy of objects of knowledge—individual, universal or both several theories emerge out in Indian and Western philosophical traditions.

In brief the problem of the external and the internal shifted to knowledge. Taking knowledge into consideration, different subtle issues are raised regarding the nature of knowledge, its difference from objects of knowledge, object of knowledge and external things, kinds of knowledge, verity and validity of knowledge and finally limits of knowledge.

By accepting the duality of the thing in the external world and the thought that is the duality of individuals and universals, if we proceed in philosophical reflections by taking any of the two as real and the other as imaginary then any of the two will be ignored from being the object of knowledge. If the two are taken as the objects of knowledge then their knowledge will have to be assumed as transcendental to both of them. The knowledge is always the knowledge of the objects that is non-difference of knowledge and object of knowledge has to be assumed or the difference between the knowledge and the object of knowledge has to be accepted. Both of them cannot be non-different because of objects characterized as 'other'. Otherness is the character of objects and not of their knowledge. Buddhists accept the indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) knowledge as original that grasps real. For them the determinate knowledge is by construction and hence cannot be the knowledge of the real. Now, if knowledge is always the knowledge of the objects, it must be in all cases determinate otherwise the object known will not be identified as the object. If we accept that we can perceive an individual, but being instant particular it is known as object by the construction of mind through inference etc.. then we get a unique dichotomy of perceiving the individual or real and knowing the universal or constructed. This is just like the saying that I perceive an ant but I know the elephant in that perception. If it is knowledge then it must be determinate and discrete. Even we know the 'doubt' or doubtful cognition because it is determinate and discretely known so. Otherwise we cannot know that something is doubtful. Inference to be implied after perception cannot be determinate of that determinate cognition. The knowledge of svalakṣṇa or indeterminate different from constructions or determinate is possible only when it is determinately and discretely known so.

The way of philosophy is not that of meditation (Sādhanā). Overlooking philosophy for giving way to sādhanā is not the way of a wise. A wise is called so because he has determinate knowledge of the entire general and the specific problems. He takes the objects of knowledge (that object may be imaginary) not as unreal but as determinate and distinct. This something may be construction but the knowledge of that is determinate, otherwise it will not be distinctly known as constructed even. Construction means different and not imaginary. Language is the differentiator of the objects of knowledge in knowledge. It is the determiner of the knowledge and it is it by which distinct knowledge of the reality or objects is accomplished.

It has been a general opinion of Western and some of the Indian schools of Philosophy that language and thought are different and the former is the tool through which latter is expressed. Reality is independent of thoughts. Thought may be the thought of a reality that is existent or of non-existent. Reality is perceived by senses, mind makes those senses as thought and when thoughts needs to be expressed, language comes forward. Here, philosophical problems are shortlisted as confined to language, thought and reality. One may observe that throughout the discussion I have been refuting others' conceptions to come to a different conception and thus may ask is it philosophical? Am I doing philosophy herein? If I reflect on a concept for a comprehensive vision of it in its totality then I have to go through all conceptions of it popular up to my time. It is the concept on which our day-to-day communication is

based on. An ordinary illiterate person may not know your or my conception of a reality but he understands the reality as communicated to him in day-to-day practices. It is possible because of the existence of the concept of that reality.

III

Philosophy is the discipline of reflecting upon the problems involved in conceptuality of the concepts. Difference between the concept and conception of the concept are well known to those trained in the discipline. Concepts are ubiquitously given. Our communication is based on the identical cognition in between the speaker and the audience and this is possible because the concept is revealed in both –in a speaker before he speaks and in the audience after the grasping of the garbs spoken by the former. This may alter in case of conceptions of the concept. Conceptions are not ubiquitous; they are formed. The same concept is embodied in a multitude of conceptions with the difference of attention, articulation and cultural allegiances of the persons. Conceptualization of the concept may forms conceptions of the same concept different. However, if the conceptions of the speaker and audience are non-different or embodies the same concept, there is possibility of mutual understanding, sharing and communication. The concept is communicable but when it is articulated in the garb or dressed up with our allegiances, communication may be altered or may not take place with the deviation from the concept as it is popular in communications. Concepts are universal. To express this universal we use garbs and that manifest the concept embodied through our allegiances with another set of them for the cognition and thus one apprehends the concept in one's own allegiance.

i. There is difference between thinking and reflecting. All disciplines are occupied with thinking, but reflecting on problems caused in this or that thinking or ideology is concerned with philosophy. Other disciplines think for the conceptions while philosophy reflects on problems involved in the conceptualization of those conceptions for clarity and wisdom; the conceptualization by thinking is enriched in proportion to the information one gathers from tradition and modernity. Conceptual thinking in this view is complete if it is advanced with the latest conceptions formed in different disciplines of thinking. The scholars doing it are supposed to be the masters of the thinking on the concepts. This is what most of the scholars do in the name of philosophizing. But philosophy is not confined to that stereotyped thinking. It is cognitive activity par excellence in the sense that in a philosophical reflection one becomes self-conscious of the problems emerged in thinking or in a conceptuality of the concept. It is a direct dialogue with the problems of which one becomes conscious of and the dialogue stops the moment the problem is clarified. It is in brief, a reflection that starts with one or the other problem or confusion caused out of analysis of cognition as it flashes forth in cognition and stops when the problem is removed or when a solution to the problem flashes forth and self-conscious activity gets freedom from the problem.

ii. Humans think, speculate and perceive the world around. Their thoughts may belong to the categories namely physiological, psychological, logical, cosmological, ontological, metaphysical, epistemological, axiological and so on so forth. These

speculations are housed in philosophy because of the idea that their contents figure as object in a philosophical reflection. When the mind reflects on the self or consciousness as the immediacy, reflection is called subjective and in objective reflections it is taken that the consciousness instead of turning upon itself, goes forward to an object that is the object that confronts consciousness. All thoughts and theories stand proper only as objects of philosophical reflections and only that way it can be said that philosophy is reflective awareness. However, it cannot be said that it talks to a Meta philosophy or philosophy of philosophies because the latter stands as object in a philosophic reflection and, hence, it is philosophy proper.

Is Philosophy a subjective or an objective reflection? Some thinkers consider philosophy as a subjective reflection; they think that contemplative consciousness is not directional to the objects but to consciousness itself. This is because consciousness is the object of reflection, and that is not a type of object consciousness. But this definition differentiates philosophical reflection from other reflections concerning different types of objective –consciousness which leads to contemplation and hence religion where no dialogue is possible. Those who accept philosophy as an objective reflection may say that reflection does not yield a disease of treating consciousness as an object. Consciousness cannot turn to itself and therefore there is no possibility of a self awareness of self awareness also. According to them, consciousness is directional; it is consciousness of some or the other object. If this is so then there will not be a possibility of philosophy because consciousness can get no freedom from object consciousness and hence no possibility of being self –consciousness and hence its autonomy is questioned.

The third view on the nature of reflection is concerned with the theorists who accept that philosophy transcends all modes of subjective and objective consciousness. Here lies the autonomy of philosophy. To be self-conscious means to occupy a non-objective form of consciences. But if this is so then that form of consciousness will not be free from subjective form of it. If philosophy is taken as self-conscious activity concerned with the problems involved in the conceptuality of the concepts and if arguments and counter arguments are applicable within it and not outside the system, how is discourse possible? How can we argue with, communicate and convince others to an activity acclaimed as cognitive? It cannot be taken as a matter of rational tastes and temperament. The situation may lead to religion if philosophy as a constant dialogue with the mind is accepted. Over all, if concepts are abstractions- abstracted differently on the basis of different experiences of different attributes and functions, and, hence, different to one-another, how can dialogue and communication be possible? How can one claim a better philosophy comprising full compatibility and adequacy? Can abstraction without language be possible? And even if possible, can it be of any philosophical significance without language? The problems raised above are concerned with the centrality of language in a philosophical activity.

The generally accepted view of philosophy as subjective, objective or non-objective reflection considers cognition in relation to language, reality (not only logical but ontic as well) and truth that comes from the epistemological proofs and justification. In such reflections, all the three are separate entities. We know that self

consciousness flows when the objective flow of mind or object consciousness is stopped and vice versa and this flow is not exhausted with the satiation of some specific problem. There is always a possibility that the mind is bothered by one or the other problem. If they are separate, philosophy, as self-conscious activity, will not be possible because it will not be then the self awareness confined to the awareness of the thoughts/ideas which are only intelligible objects. Philosophy is acclaimed as critique of knowledge not in the sense of experiencing and abstracting, verifying or confirming them but in the sense of self-awareness of the principles and laws in the very formation of the concept and in analyzing the problems there of which belongs to the object of awareness.

Philosophy has a transcending nature. It reflects not merely on the objects it confronts but on its reflections thereof. It is not identical with the history of philosophy but, philosophy that has a history of its own. Distinct from history of other disciplines of learning, history of their philosophy is possible. In a reflective- activity we are confronted only with the problems –practical or theoretical- as the object and not with the things-in-itself –internal or external.

The idea of philosophy as autonomous provides us the points for reflecting on the question ‘what is not philosophy.’ It is properly taken that philosophy has no definite definition because different theorists have different conceptions of it. However, all agree on the point that it is a reflection independent from any kind of prejudice, bigotry of authority or assumption. It is not just logical induction or deduction because it exercises its excellence even on them so as to find their indisputability, clarity and proper conceptualization. It trusts worshipping neither of philosophers nor their system but the ideas and arguments made by them, to bring to light the problems involved in the conceptuality of the concepts in different theorizations and to expose the stages of rationality they reach.

“Refutation of metaphysics” and inefficiency of epistemology have weakened the argument given by the theorists who accept philosophy either as subjective or as objective reflection. The view of it as non-objective reflection does not say anything about the transcendence from the subjective. What actually is the nature of philosophical reflection? In fact, philosophers are concerned with the objects that figure in a knowledge and not with the things internal or external. We perceive the objects by the eyes, acquire sense-data from the thing perceived, and on the basis of such acquired data, the mind constructs the object of knowledge. That object of knowledge is a cognitive unit. This cognitive object is free from the thing and the data even; it is the object with which philosophers are concerned. I can say it is a philosophic object, an intelligible being. Anything without being revealed in the mind cannot be the philosophic object. Similarly, the object of philosophical reflection, namely the theoretical problems involved in the conceptualization of the concepts, inconsistencies in theorization, confusions, etc., are cognitive or intelligible units that are thoughts or ideas as expressed by language for which I use the term “being or beings” with small “b” with contrast to the thing or thing –in itself for which I use ‘Being’ (with capital ‘B’) and they are the object of philosophical reflections. No problem is external; every problem by nature is at the level of ideas or thoughts and

only they can be analyzed and clarified by a self-conscious activity. We in a reflective activity become self-aware of objects awareness in nature.

IV

Most of the problems in philosophy arise out of wrong conception that language, thoughts and reality are different. Thoughts are again dividedly understood as rational in some theories and as spiritual in some other theories out of which the former is relegated by the latter in spiritualistic philosophies. Similarly reality is taken by some as physical, some as spiritual while language in most of the cases is considered as linguistic, material product, a reference or representation of the reality. Reality is also observed by theorists as metaphysical, physical, object-empirical, logical, ideational, revealed and in so many kinds. The most repeated view is that thought is original and is different from language that is employed later to express the thought. Reality is different from thought and language, and language is used to represent or refer to the reality of which we have acquired thought by perception or experience. The whole corpse is a remedy to make the process of understanding the thought, language and reality. Philosophically the position is different. Whenever we know, think or reflect on a reality we never find it necked without language. There is no thought that we have and we do not know and that we know is always infused with language. Isolated from language no thought, no reality is thinkable. The reality we know is confined to thought and thoughts are not only infused with but are expressed by language also. We know a reality as the language presents it in the mind and the reality transcending language is a mystery and hence of no philosophical importance.

Philosophy as cognitive activity par excellence overcomes the problem of relation caused by the theories who believe in separateness of cognition, language and reality in a reflection. The being of language and the meaning are expressed by language itself. The cognition expressed by language is determinate as it is infused by language and is self-veridical as it is revealed. It is self-veridical and, hence, foundational to epistemological proofs, justifications and evidences advanced later on for convincing others about the verity of the cognition revealed first by language itself. Had the knowledge expressed in the mind not been determinate and veridical, reliability and leadership in the philosophical reflections would not be possible and then there will be no meaning of autonomy of language. Truth and falsity based on epistemological proofs, verification, confirmation, falsification, compatibility, incompatibility, adequacy, dissatisfaction, etc; serve only as a demarcating line between logically truth and falsity of the cognition on the basis of availability and absence of referents in the experience. But the verity of cognition revealed in a self-conscious activity is foundational in all activities of testifying, verifying or falsifying on the basis of experience for convincing others about the verity in a logical/empirical manner.

Throughout history, we find philosophers mostly concerned, in a particular period of time respectively, with intuitive speculations, faith, reasoning, emotion and experience. In Early Greece, the intuition as we find in Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, encompassed faith in the medieval period, and the dominance of perception and

conjecture in the history of western philosophy analyze the situation of human experience, faith and knowledge. Contemporary western philosophy is marked as the critique of experience with a wonderful analytic skill. However, the possibility of reflecting on the nature and function of knowledge, nature and role of language in knowledge and the determination of object-proper for a holistic rationalization is still open before philosophers and I hope, reason with analytic excellence will shift reflections on those issues of philosophy-proper.

Is philosophy a cognitive activity par excellence because of being a reflection on consciousness itself? The reflecting consciousness at the same time cannot be reflected. Moreover, consciousness in-itself is transcendental to its reflections and thus, it is logically impossible to say that consciousness stands in an objective mode in a self-conscious activity. Metaphysical or physical things or thing-in-itself, being transcendental to a reflective activity, are objects of contemplation and hence of religion in broader sense of the term. But metaphysical theories /concepts/thoughts and different sorts of ideologies are included in the object proper of the reflecting activity. The problem that causes incentive for reflecting comprises of confusion, inadequacy, inconsistency and ill universalization, etc., or any of them in a conceptualization and the purpose of reflecting on them is to remove those confusions, etc., for clarity and conception. This way of doing philosophy has a constant future and hence needless to conjecture a death of philosophy. It was reflective, it is and it will be reflective activity.

In brief, philosophical reflections are different from the subjective and objective modes of reflection based on the idea of problems as problems themselves. There can be no problem by itself. All problems are problems for self-consciousness. Problems revealed in the mind are awareness in nature and this awareness nature makes the flow of self-conscious activity possible. Reflective consciousness starts when the objective consciousness stops and stops when the latter starts and the same is applicable to subjective consciousness as well. There is difference between subjective and objective consciousness. In the former, consciousness turns to self or minds while it is directional to out worldly objects in the latter. The former is not different from contemplation while the latter is a type of object consciousness and the reflective consciousness includes theoretical problems caused by the former and the latter mode of thinking. This very character of philosophical reflection differentiates philosophy from other disciplines on one hand and considers the philosophy of religion, philosophy of sociology, philosophy of Art, philosophy of history, philosophy of science, etc. distinctly as included in the realm of philosophy on the other hand. Daya Krishna rightly observes 'here is a region, a realm, a set of problems. It only needs a name and we submit that the word philosophy' can adequately perform this function (1955).

V

i. The other aspect of the present discussion on philosophy concerns with utility of philosophy. Philosophy is not only the reflective activity on the situation of human experience and knowledge or on their cognition but it concerns fulfilling human

aspiration also. Philosophical traditions of the East and West accept knowledge not only a formal reasoning, information, induction, deduction, calculation, computation, etc., but as virtue also and hence philosophy is not confined to formal/logical reasoning (śuṣka tarka) only but it is value and hence practice also. It belongs to the tradition of wisdom that comprises knowledge and cultivation –individual and social (jñānasanskārahetva). Seers, sages, scholars preached what they practiced and practiced what they thought. Their preaching is not for formal knowledge but for the welfare of the universe, for cultivation of the individual and the social self also to the extent of wisdom or even to the liberation. Taking the human aspirations and utility of philosophy in satisfying them in view, a talk about the utility of philosophy can relevantly be initiated. Now, I proceed to point out the human aspirations that philosophy and only philosophy can fulfill.

Since the world is growing materialistically applied, can philosophy emerge in future as something applied? I am utterly against the idea that philosophy can serve as if it is a managerial science, health science or technology because then it will lose its identity and that will be suicidal of philosophy. Managing of the thought for a better technology is a good idea, but philosophy as a managerial science is worst. Three decades ago, philosophy was the guide of management and technology as well. Philosophical knowledge, for a philosopher, is not data or theory impregnated perception and experience. It must be free from such impregnations and from our allegiances to physiological, psychological and ontological commitments. Philosophy liberates from theory impregnation, ambiguities, confusions and our allegiances to metaphysical and cultural things. By metaphysical things we very remotely mean the things- in- themselves transcendental or empirical entities separate from the knowledge. Philosophy for freedom of thoughts from our allegiances can only serve as a philosophy in its true spirit.

Nowadays, philosophy has to be given primacy. It is a known fact that fire can burn but the idea of fire cannot and philosophical reflections for the clarification of the idea of fire can dawn wisdom, peace and bliss. The tool cannot cook but the cooking agent can manage well for the tool even. In precise, philosophy should not and cannot be converted into management, sociology or any of the disciplines known as applied rather, as I think, to save the social virtues and human values on one hand and to enliven even those applied areas of learning for a better defense against the danger of cyberlogy which is growingly trying to construct human persons as cyber units on the other hand, they need to be married with philosophy. If science is married with philosophy, it will apply its weapons for safety and progress of life on the earth. It will not use its atom bombs to destroy humanity, which is of the supreme value. Commerce and management if wedded with philosophy will not misuse the capital and refrain from furnishing data for promoting terrorist activities and disorder, rather use it for acquiring wisdom and welfare of life. Technology will not then turn humans as cyber units rather; it will try to better creativity, progress and the liveliness of human relations.

A discussion on utility of philosophy must encompass our aspiration for freeing our thoughts from different physiological, ontological, religious and cultural allegiances lying very deep into the structure of our consciousness and enforcing our

thinking and reflections to an extent of misleading and confusing conclusions which cause conflict and chaos in mind—individual and social. By reflective analysis, philosophy helps to distinguish real from the mixture and philosophical thinking redeems our thoughts from the different allegiances. This is redemption or freedom from ignorance and, positively, a way to wisdom.

ii. Thinking directs life and the direction determines the distinction of the life of the people of the different period. In India, philosophy has never been welcomed as a dry exercise. The seers preach what they live. Thoughts must be disinterested and independent from different allegiances of mind: otherwise, they may misguide the thinking. The openness of thoughts and thinking useful for uncovering wisdom within must dawn in a self-conscious activity. Since discriminating knowledge of what to do is good (*hitapratīsādhana*) and what is harmful and hence to be avoided (*ahitapratīṣedha*) is determined by philosophical reflection, escaping the light of philosophy, not only individual but social life also cannot run properly

There are so many factors that may cause sick thinking. By the term ‘sick thinking’ I mean confusing or illusive thinking, disguised ideologies and misguided by the passions of mind. Sickness of thoughts cannot be cured by taking medicines, surgery of the body or mind or putting on of the jewels or offering alms to the deities or psycho-analysis of mind. The diseases caused in or the illness of the thoughts, make the sufferer cynical, desperate, restless and ignorant. Thoughts can get cured only by philosophy that is a therapeutic system of thoughts. Philosophical systems in India as clinics or systems of cure of thoughts are most practical and applied discipline of which morality, religion and spirituality serve as engineering, management and technology respectively, in the cure of the diseases because of which philosophy is genuinely and meaningfully called the science of spirituality.

iii. From the Utility perspective, the problem of the schools of philosophy is *to remove the defects or illness of the thoughts* for which the knowledge of metaphysics, epistemology, axiology, etc serves as objects of reflections. The problem of those systems is to know the nature and causes of suffering and their purpose is to act as means for giving rise to wisdom. For such a system, the illness of thoughts and thinking is the sole cause of suffering against which philosophy is the only remedy.

No doubt, management has occupied the position of a guide of the recent era of science and technology for which it feeds data. In such a situation, the idea of applied and professional philosophy in the recent times has attracted research and courses, specifically in India, very quickly towards environmental, social, ethical, political and religious issues. Philosophy is taken wrongly to have the function like cement. But, philosophy never believes in cementing rather in opening or digging out the theoretical problems involved in the conceptuality of the concepts. In the name of ‘applied’, if philosophy is identified with management of ethics, yogic postures and spiritual techniques, will it not involve in non-philosophical activity and then independence of philosophy as cognitive activity par excellence will be put to risk. In that case there will be no possibility of studies like philosophy of history, philosophy of technology, philosophy of sociology, ethics, etc. Will it not then amount to an unfortunate chapter in the history of philosophical reflections?

All systems of Philosophy are useful methodical therapies that ensure the eradication of the diseases or suffering with its causes in their own ways. There are three major diseases that cause all sorts of suffering; they are categorized as those pertaining to body, to language and to thoughts or thinking. Ayurveda and different medical paths occupy with the cure of disease of body, the philosophy of language and grammar engages with the cure of the abuses of language for clarity of thoughts and finally, the systems of philosophy serves as a therapy against the ills/diseases of thoughts or reasoning. Our thoughts are not always sound and sometimes we get wrong conclusions from our misguided and confusing reasoning. Contemporary Phenomenological method emphasizes freeing our thinking and thought from different sorts of superstitions and allegiances we have learned since birth. This method is inevitably essential for any philosophical endeavor. As a remedy of removal of ignorance and consequent causes of suffering lying deep in one's very structure, philosophy is covetously a very practical discipline.¹ Philosophy is the only cure against the ills of thoughts and thinking, a therapy that transforms the life and personality of a wise.

Suffering is the basic problem of all the heterodox and orthodox systems of Indian philosophy. It is caused by ignorance, illusion, confusion and that is the reason they form the problems of those philosophies. In Buddhism, it is the first of the four-fold truths (āryasatya); in Jainism, it is the secretion of material elements that penetrates the conscious atoms and leads to bonds and hence suffering. Sāṃkhya and other orthodox systems including vyākaraṇa and Ayurveda observe suffering as the basic problem the eradication of which is the purpose of these philosophies. They believed methodical diagnosis helping exclusive and everlasting eradication of suffering. We can understand these systems as clinics of treatment of suffering with its causes lying very deep into the very existence of human beings.

iv. I observe that even the materialistic system of Cārvāka, howsoever; its philosophy is misunderstood by History writers, as a way of life based on a hedonistic ideology of "eat, drink and be merry." It is very prudent about pointing out a healthy and happy living of the present. How can one live a merry life if his stomach is disordered by eating foul meal? He will be more conscious about truth that his stomach is not just a dustbin where anything unhygienic, digested at the risk of damaging his liver, can be put in. He will be more caring about keeping his kidneys healthy while drinking alcoholic products and more and more caring about protecting himself from being affected by AIDS while enjoying irregular sex where he is not sure of being safe. Being merry requires a morally balanced conduct for oneself and for others as a prerequisite of a happy present life and such a conduct is not possible without healthy and balanced thoughts.

v. Philosophy is a critique of knowledge. Knowledge is indivisible and only by analysis, it can be made understandable to those who can understand it only through piecemeal. No practice, no grammar is possible without analysis of indivisible cognition. Scientists analyze external things by breaking them into atomic parts.

¹ kāyavāṅgabuddhiviṣayā ye malāḥ samavasthitā. Cikitsālakṣaṇādhyatmaśāstrai teṣāṃ viśudhaya. Vākyapadīya, 1/146

Psychologists analyze the psyche by implication through the functions of its faculties, but philosophers analyze cognition, including cognition of scientists and psychologists as expressed in language. Analysis demands a cognitive base that serves as the objects of analysis; otherwise, it may not fulfill any philosophical purpose. Bliss is not acquired by satisfaction of one's interest or by inferring the faculties of mind through the actions performed by it but by knowledge only and the cognition of the objects of knowledge in a self-conscious activity serve as the basis of philosophical analysis. As cognition in itself is indivisible, analysis serves as the instrument not only in making the indivisible understandable to learners through piece-meal scheme, but in facilitating us in making agreement, transparent and rational satisfaction also which ultimately provide bliss. It is the bliss providing character of philosophical reflections that philosophy, in the East and the West, has been a very popular discipline of learning and investigation since the dawn of culture and civilization.

Philosophical or reflective analysis, different from grammatical, linguistic or syntactical analysis goes very deep into the very structure of a problem whether it is concerned with science or religion. It analyses the problem into simpler to the extent of liquidating it. It helps in observing whether the problem is real or imposed. Analyzing the problem gives rise to universalizing and agreement. There is no conflict on real and the philosophical enquiry liquidates it if it is unreal or imposed... For illustration, I am taking a problem of quarrel between two persons belonging to two communities. One has a religious bigotry that "Khuda is the only God and there is no other God" while the other believes that "OM is the only God." They stick to their belief about the cultural difference of the terms as the reality about "God". Their bigotry of using the terms of their likeness goes to the extent of wounding the person who uses the word which the former dislikes. They do not even agree to disagree for using the same word 'Khuda or OM' and the fighting flames a communal riot. Philosophy can be employed for liquidating the fight. If there is a philosopher, he may invite dialogue in between the two parties. He will analyze the different meanings of the words on the use of which they fight.

The analysis may be done in the following process- What do you mean by the term "Khuda/OM"? Is it the God, the creator? Does God create the universe out of nothing? Is the Universe a mixture of mind and matter? Is he the creator of all creatures in the universe including you and me or only your creator? Is it one or many? Is he the preserver and the destroyer of the universe? Is he just and loving father of fathers? I think, both of the parties will agree to accept the points. Now the philosopher may invite a dialogue on the issues of their difference. Is it Khuda/OM as reality that concerns with quarrel or the language you use to denote? As the two terms are separately used by two different communities and there are a number of communities on the earth that use different terms for the same reality, the reality is not the concern in the quarrel. If the quarrel concerns with language Khuda/OM, it is about the name and the God can be addressed with so many names in the same tradition because of infinite qualities. There are thousands of languages that are used by people for the same ultimate reality. If it is so then is it not that the quarrel is not concerned with the reality but with the difference of tones and marks an issue that is

imposed on God. Philosophy tells that what is imposed can only be removed and the reality remains untouched by such impositions. The philosopher should not don the false plumes of the shaman, the priest or the prophet. If he is ashamed of his job, he may as well leave it, rather than deceive the people with regard to a function that is not his own (Dayakrishna 1955, 233).

There is difference between the concepts given and concepts revealed when presented so by language. Unless the given concept is not revealed by some manifestant, no understanding and hence no doing, in case of absence of incentive, is possible. Subjects other than philosophy study these concepts on the basis of doings performed, but Philosophy concerns the nature and analysis of concepts as they are expressed in the mind, and then it observes how and how far different theories belonging to different disciplines are successful in approaching the different aspects of the concept as revealed or expressed in the mind, and all cognitive activities are possible only through language. Language, for philosophy, is not exactly what the water is for the fish rather it is very like the gills of the fish.

Conclusively, philosophy is a cognitive activity par excellence: a self-conscious activity that starts with some or the other problem to which it confronts and removal of them for clarity, and conception which is the goal that it achieves. It as the reflection on cognition is a constant process with which all rational beings are concerned naturally. Philosophy is a reflection on the cognition and on the objects that figure in that cognition. It reflects on concepts as they flash when presented by language. Philosophical problems may arise when the concept as popular in communication is not expressed accurately or is presented by language incompletely and deviatedly in different usages and conceptions. It is only by analysis that the problems are made clear, and this clarity prompts for philosophical reflection to the extent of distinctly complete understanding of the concept. A reflective activity does not perceive cognition separate from the language and the reality different from how the language presents it. Since philosophical reflections aim at conceptual clarification, interpretation and lastly wisdom, the question of a risk against philosophy does not hold merit. It is only by taking human aspirations that philosophy fulfils in view that the question of future of philosophy is warrantable.

References

- Ayer, A.J. 1982. *Language, Truth and Logic*, Penguin Books.
 Dayakrishna, 1955. *The Nature of Philosophy*. Coronet Books Inc.
 Haak, Susan. 1990. Recent obituaries of Epistemology, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 27, No. 3 July 1990.
 Murti, T.R.V. Ed. 1968. *The Concept of Philosophy*. Centre of Advanced Study in Philosophy. Banaras Hindu University.
 Ramarao 'Pappu. Ed. *Indian Philosophy: Past and Future*. P. 372.
 Tiwari, D.N. 2008. *The Central Problems of Bhartṛhari's Philosophy*, ICPR.
 Tiwari, D.N. 1998. Dayakrishnas Conception of Philosophy some reflections. *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, Poona, Vol. XXX, No. 3, July 1998, p. 376.

