

Utility of Philosophy in Everyday Indian Life

Devendra Nath Tiwari and Kumari Puja

Abstract: How do the philosopher's work for diluting the problems regarding the different aspect of the individual and social life? Usually either they universalize the problem to the extent it is diluted or they analyze and divide it till it disappears. A problem one confronts in any corner of the society or a conflict is there in the society or in an individual which is going on and persisting. How do the philosophers do in that situation? Are they just watch dogs? Do they side with the problem or favor any of the conflicting groups? Philosophy deals with the highest knowledge that is wisdom and in the process of philosophizing, philosophers dig out the problem, analyze the problem. They start with the simple to the complex one, invites discussions between the conflicting groups, tries to come up to an agreement and resolve. If there is no agreement with the parties, it observes whether the problem is real or imposed. They reflect over to come to clarify the problem and resolving for the agreement. There is no conflict on real and the conflict is created when we impose our interest and allegiances on real. That causes problem and if agreement is not done on the certain part of the problem philosophy tries to make agreement on disagreeing on that point and thus, the conflict is diluted. This way we can practice philosophy useful for day to day living.

Keywords: darśana, dharma, innate debts, puruṣārtha, family-quarrel, philosophization,

The Sanskrit term '*Darśana*' is taken generally as synonym of the English term 'philosophy' and the term 'philosophy' (Philo=love, Sophia=knowledge) is taken to mean 'love for knowledge or wisdom'. Are the two terms belonging to two different cultures synonyms? If it is yes, what are the grounds and justification for such an agreement? The word '*Darśana*' is made of root *√dṛs* and is taken for the meaning to perceive, to see, to look at, to observe, to investigate, etc. Perceiving or seeing is performed by senses and the senses perceive the objects of their own for which they are naturally fit. All senses have their fitness to perceive only their own objects and not to the object of one another. Seeing for ordinary men is confined to the perception of external things, which are objects of senses. Philosopher's 'seeing' is concerned with perceiving thoughts. They perceive thoughts, counter the problems, analyse and reflect on them for a clear and distinctive understanding of knowledge¹. *Ekamevadarśanamkhyātireva 'Darśanam'*² according to the statement of Asuri, quoted by Vacaspati Miśra in his *SāṃkhyaTattvakaumudī*, the term '*khyāti*' is the knowledge that is only to be reflected upon. Knowledge is light; it is the guide to the life and incentive to the activities of human communities. If the thoughts are not clear and distinct they may not function for guiding and providing incentive for activities in life. Reality, knowledge and in case of some confusion or ignorance, we reflect on the objects we know for clarity and conception. For this 'cognitive activity par excellence' we coin the

term 'Philosophy' in Western and '*Darśana*' in Indian tradition. The two traditions love wisdom, analyze, reflect on and interpret knowledge as highest value or wisdom and therefore despite of their differences in approaching knowledge the two involve in reflecting and investigating wisdom the acquisition of which provides bliss.³

Everyone thinks that he has his own philosophy but only he knows what he means by philosophy. Is it his ideology, his view of life or is it his thinking of life? It is used for the principles and theories in discipline other than philosophy. He is not clear and confuses the term 'philosophy'. He can also think that his philosophy is the best and that should be followed by others. Such thinking creates conflict and paves a way to imperialism, the violence to others. It is like thinking that my philosophy is good and it has to rule over others mind. So how the philosophy will emerge within one is the problem. Here, I want to say that you may have philosophy and you may think that your philosophy is best and it has to rule over other minds but is it philosophically proper to think like that? Philosophy does not bind one's mind to a thought; it opens the mind, analyses, clarifies and makes agreement with the problems by rationalizing the problem.

Philosophy is cognitive activity par excellence. It is an objective and critical rationalization. The question is: what is rationalization? Is it mere universalization? If it is mere universalization then it will be more mechanical discipline that lacks creativity. If it is critical rationalization then it will also be partial, because in that case the other activities performed under philosophy are overlooked.

There have been two sorts of people in this universe. First, who live by their own experiences and their own reasoning and second who live by other's experiences and reasoning. Those who live by others' experiences or follow experiences of a person or a book which they take revealed by God they are called followers and some of them, I can say more specifically the blind-followers who never search and rely on their own thinking and independent experiences. They never question to the experience of the others and follow them like rams. In fact, copying or following some makes the mind dull and lazy. Now, if I follow only the others experiences, can I still claim to be a rational being having a mind? But why should I follow other's experiences? Overlooking the freedom of experiencing the things first hand and living the exercises of the mind for others is clear-cut denial of one's own existence as a rational being.

With this philosophical question we can recollect ourselves about utility of philosophy in day to day life. We are thinking beings; we take decisions of our own and follow with determination, take a resolve and trustfully follow our decisions. This is a philosophical way following which one may feel satisfied and others may also feel one's presence. That is the merit of being rational human. Let me clear the point by an instance. We go in a supermarket,

we roam around the variety of the things there but we do not find anything to buy; we are only killing our time, but if we resolve about what we have to purchase from the market beforehand, it will hardly take two minutes to come back with the things desired. If we see a bottle labeled poison, we keep ourselves away from that because we are already resolved about those things. We have water in front of us and when we are thirsty, we drink it because we are already resolved about the water. Likewise, we need to resolve about all the activities in our life. And only then we can be satisfied with living our own experiences. It involves a process, a method that I can put them in brief as follows; firstly, the mind confronts with any problem, we should not overlook it rather we should ponder over it. Secondly we should make a counter of the problem. If there is a thesis we must form a counter thesis, that is, antithesis immediately. This is to exercise the questioning power of the mind, which one needs to develop in the process of philosophizing. If there is any statement, any idea in any area, it must have a counter, and we just reduce it by countering it, and think over that, to come to clarity the problem, that is called philosophical reflection. Thirdly philosophical reflection in order to solve the problem rationalizes the problem to come to a synthesis which we call synthesizing wisdom. We resolve and move on, that is the light of our own experiences. But if our mind is wired by a book or by an idea of others experience, our mind does not work; it follows only the wired commands. Now the question is- are we rational, are we spiritual if we are following others experiences without reflecting over them? If others experiences are great, then it deserves to be respected but Indian Philosophy prescribes to testify any great experience with our own reasoning and only then we can trust upon them, this is what philosophy offers.

The problem needs to be universalized to the extent of its dilution. Universalization is rationalization of the problem that helps us to come out from our narrow tube of perception like the famous allegory of Plato's cave. Without rationalization, ignorance will rule over one's mind and will continue cementing the brain. If there is a problem in any corner of the society or the globe, the philosophers are responsible for that. Why is it so persisting? There are three situations first- the philosophers are not doing their vocation honestly. Second, they have made themselves a member of the conflicting party and third their minds have not been cultivated philosophically.

How do the philosophers work for diluting the problems regarding the different aspect of the individual and social life? Let us illustrate it by an example. Suppose a problem crops up in any corner of the society or a conflict is there in the society which is going on or persisting. How do the philosophers do in that situation? Are they just watch dogs? Do they side with the problem or favor any of the conflicting groups? Philosophy deals with the highest knowledge that is wisdom and in the process of philosophizing, it digs out the problem, analyzes the problem; starts with the simple to the complex, invites discussions between the conflicting

groups, tries to come up to an agreement and resolve. If there is no agreement with the parties, it observes whether the problem is real or imposed, reflect over to come to clarify the problem and resolving for the agreement. There is no conflict on real, the conflict is created when we impose things on real and if agreement is not done on the problem, it tries to make agreement on the disagreement and thus, the conflict is diluted. This way we can practice philosophy as rational activity par excellence. For example: one party is adamant to say on the issue of the name of the God and the other Khudā, which they borrow from their communities. The fight increases and goes to the communities in the society. It may take a form of communal riot and consequently thousands of people may be killed. But if there is a philosopher, immediately he will come forward to solve the problem. He may invite the two parties to sit and reflect over the problem of the fight. Then, he analyzes the problems and starts observing them if they are real or imposed. He may by analysis locate the problem that is imposed and causing conflict. He may ask the question how is your Khudā different from God? Is your God one or many? Both the parties may agree that it is one. Now, is your khudā only your God and not his or others God? Is the God not the God of the whole Universe? What is the difference between God and khudā. Then he may shifts on the issue of difference of God and Khudā and accordingly he analyses that it is only different designation in different languages about the same God and thus fixes the problem. And when the problem is fixed, their differences will evade. There is no problem on the issue that I will wear a particular dress and not the other one. The problem is imposed and what is imposed can be removed by rationalization. What is really in the boom of the problem? The fight or conflict starts on the issues that are imposed on the real. When one ascribes the truth in different ways, the problem arises. Again when one imposes that one's ascription is only true to be accepted by one and all then, problem arises and the fight starts. One can speak creole, the other can speak French, Sanskrit, English and in that way all languages spoken by the communities have their own diction, own tone, their own vocabulary, scripting and own culture but these differences are not real they are created by us. Then both may agree that the fight is not on the God but on the naming of God and the God can be named differently in different languages and thus the conflict is irrational and the issue is imposed. They have to keep away from the conflict over the issue and the problem is resolved.

There are family quarrels, quarrels between the husbands and wives, between the children and the parents. The question is why does a dispute take place between a wife and a husband? The husband thinks that he is a male and privileged to dominate over the wife. The basic ground of the privilege of the husband is based on the ignorance. Likewise, the wife may think that she is superior and she is not supposed to be dominated by males. The difference between the two widens more and more because of not clarifying the issue of the difference; more distance is formed between them day by day and that results in family quarrel, hating to each

other, and culminates in divorce, suicide and murder. If any of the two invites the other on the issue of the problem between them for a talk or if they sit together and put the problem for clarity, analyze the problem, and try to find out if the problem is real or imposed, and if it is imposed what is the cause. They can make an agreement on all the points and if they do not agree on any point they may for the time being, agree to disagree on that point and then, the quarrel of the family may change into the happiness of the family. Both are rational being, both are the members of the family having equal opportunities, and the tendency to dominate each other on the basis of sexual discrimination is not a value for maintaining the family which is natural tie of the both the sexes and thus, both will agree on this point, there will be no divorce, no struggle and all problems between them will be solved by dealing philosophically.

There are confusions about philosophy. Is philosophy a rational thinking? Is it a metaphysical speculation about god, soul, and immortality? Is it about a supernatural things, is it confined to metaphysical, mythical, historical, ethical and political thinking? But if this is so then why there is philosophy of history, politics, etc. possible? Philosophy starts with the problems concerning all the disciplines of life and living. If there is no problem there will be no work for the philosophers and there will be no meaning of man being a rational animal. All problems are problems at idea, thinking level. There is no problem outside. No problem is problem for itself. All problems are at mental level, idea level and if something is mental, idea or thought that can only be diluted by philosophization that is the beauty of philosophy. A day will come where everyone would be loving rationalizing fellow and that would make this world worth living; this is the beauty of rationalization, with which philosophy is concerned.

Nowadays, we talk about why there is philosophy, why not science, technology, etc. Philosophy is not concerned with a dry abstraction; it makes the life lively and worth living. It cultivates our mind and conduct, and makes our life interesting. It makes a man a man, a cultivated rational being. A great philosopher of the 5th century, Bhartrhari in his *Vākyapadiya* has said 'vidyā bhedaḥ pratāyante jñānasanskārahetavaḥ', that is, all systems of learning is expanded for knowledge, learning and cultivation. All over the world each family, nowadays, is transformed as a school. The mothers teach the children, family is now an institute. The family imparts and cultivates all the members as a school does, all mothers teach their children, all are educated because knowledge is the highest value and virtue and, therefore, the educational institutions are growing. We cultivate men but not the machines, but man cultivates the philosophy of the machines that guides their operation that is they should not work in a way that produce pollution, consume more energy lesser to work, and so on, the operators how their welfare is based on a good work culture and their honesty, dedication and protection of health and happiness for more creativity, etc. and the use of the products for the welfare of human community. Man manages how machines have to work. The machines have to work for

the welfare and not for the destruction of the human communities. Philosophy is most encompassing discipline. It deals with the problems concerning with all the disciplines and hence the Philosophy of Music, Philosophy of Technology, Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Sociology and so forth, and hence philosophy is concerned with for each and every aspect of life and the life for philosophy is not limited to my or your life but the life in present and the future generation. It is because philosophy is a cognitive reflection on the problems concerning different aspect of life, that it helps bettering the thoughts, clarifying the problems and taking resolve.

The work of philosophy is not like cementing. By cementing it is understood that some way of thinking or principles will attract people strongly if the term philosophy is used in the place of idea or thought. Generally, non-philosophers use the term philosophy for any idea, any thought, any rule or any norm. In that case the view of using philosophy is just for cementing. But Philosophy is not cementing. By using the word philosophy in the sense of cementing, one understands that he is using the term in a disguised sense that may appeal to the people more valuable and stronger but such uses of philosophy creates confusion. Philosophy works for de-cementing, that is, it digs out the problems, analyzes the problems and reflects over them for clarity and wisdom. If there is a problem, it should be encountered and then the analysis of the problems starts; till one comes to a solution, one's philosopher is at work. When he comes to a resolve, he feels as happy as if a king that has conquered over a fort feels.

Philosophy is always a cognitive activity; it aims at clarity and wisdom that provides bliss. Rationality does not function at narrow level but it broadens the thinking on problem and this is the way of diluting the problem, and coming to a determination and resolve. When it is resolved it comes into practice. If it is put into practice, it becomes culture so it has a therapeutic use. One has to observe, what one's problem is. It may be a physical one. One considers oneself to dominate over others; it may be one's opinion about philosophy. The next step is that one cares for his children, her husband or his wife and others, third step for the society and then fourth step the world is to be taken into consideration. Philosophy widens your world and makes you live in a beautiful world of thoughts where everything is venerable. The nature before you supplements all medicine for you air, water, fire, sky, earth, everything is there surrounding which you have to care with venerable conduct if you want to live your life lively harmonious and peaceful. If you live a life only at selfish level then you have nothing to affirm. Philosophy teaches about life affirmation.

Now let us see some points on Hinduism. So many problems are there not in one's mind but others' mind as well about what is Hinduism. Is it Saivism, Shaktism, Vaishnavism, Krishnavism, Vedantivism or is it identical to any of them? So many sects of Hinduism are there namely Swami Dayanand Saraswati's Hinduism, Devendranath Tagore's Hinduism, Vedic Hinduism, Pauranic Hinduism, etc? If a question is being asked what is Christianity or Islam

to not only a Christian or Muslim but to any, he would precisely respond to it immediately, but anybody belonging to any religion find it difficult to say in categorical words if asked the question 'what is 'Hinduism''. They fail to define it in few words. It is so because of many reasons. They do not find out those basic faiths (like, a monotheistic God, a book and the prophet) on which the Religions are founded and defined, predominant in Hinduism and the stereotyped ability to trace religion does not facilitate them in defining and, hence, they get difficulty in defining Hinduism. Born Hindus are living it and they never think any need to define their own ways of life differing from one Hindus to Hindus. Attempts, by the western and some Indian scholars well versed in modern idioms, have been made to define Hinduism in terms of a religion but that is too narrow to cover other sections of community. They do a lot of exercises daily and feel that it is just to live and the people are living it without feeling any need of a definition. Everybody takes water but it is not needed to know how the water is made or what are the constituents of water. They have wonderful minds in the world but they never think about themselves, their potencies and their beauty, and accept all that what others say about Hinduism. A course in Hinduism includes several views and ways of life that is purity, honesty, knowledge, devotion, duty, morality, yoga, spirituality, obligations and responsibilities –individual as well as collective, local as well as global. How can them we define Hinduism.

We need to think how a Hindu born child learns his *Dharma* since birth. Parents teach speak 'the truth (*Satyam vada*), follow the path of righteousness and do your own vocation (*Dharmam Cara*), *mātr̥ devo bhava* (the mother is your deity), *pit̥r̥ devo bhava* (The father is your deity), *Ācārya devo bhava* (teacher is your deity), *atithi devo bhava* (guest is your deity) and whenever you have some doubt about your duty, go to the wise man nearby, ask and see, ask about your doubt and observe what he does in that case, you follow that' (Taittiriyaopaniṣad). This is basic Hinduism that parents impart to their children. When the child grows he learns the faith of his parents and societies and very later he knows that he/she belongs to a great Hindu tradition. He is a Hindu and the Veda is an eternal authority in the matter of conduct, that he believes in the sacredness of the cow, in the divinity of the mother and father, in Ganga (River), *Gītā* (book), *Gāyā* (place for the memory of ancestral importance) *Gāyatri* (mantra) and likewise. This is the second period that starts from following their parent's faiths. Only at a mature phase, he tries to find out the philosophy of Hinduism. *Sanātana* Hindus, have never been sectarian in principle and practice as well, it is always global conduct and thus Hinduism is a *dharma* and not a religion.

There is a difference between a religion and Hinduism. Hinduism, *Sanātana Dharma* believes that there is birth because there are some inborn debts to pay off. One is born because of the indebts he/she owes since last birth. The birth–rebirth chain continues till the debts are not completely paid off. One gets liberated when the debts are paid.

What are the innate debts? One is born in and here in this world only to pay off the debts. One needs to realize the beauty of the debts. Debts are the duties and responsibility one owes since birth. One's genetic body is borrowed from the parents, and so one has debts to the parents and with this body one has to pay off the parents' debt. To pay off this debt he has to marry and to get a baby born out of the socially sanctioned spouse. So this is the first kind of debts. The second is that one has debts to the seers and sages, teachers, neighbors and the surroundings and that can be paid of by learning and imparting knowledge to others. All our teachers from primary to higher level who have given so much to cultivate us; because of them we are growing, progressing and developing here. Suppose some scientist taught us how to make satellites, the bombs, and how to launch them. What is our duty to the teachers, to the society from whom we got knowledge? We are indebted to them. How to pay off the debts? It is possible by helping them, keep them safe, follow their ideals and help them to progress, to save their lives and make them grow. In this way only we can pay off the debts to them. If one is using the bombs against the teachers from whom he learns and his society only because they differ from his/her ideology, that leads to terrorism because there is missing of the understanding the value of debts to the teachers. The third debt concerns with the environment. We have our duty to pay off our debts to it. If I do not help then I am not paying off my debt. This debt is called *bhūtaṛṇa* (debts to the beings sentient and insentient). The nature in you and the nature outside are not different and the nature deserves our respect and we can respect them that is how we can pay off the debts throughout your life. If we feel that our life is a process of paying off the debts there is no fear for death. The death like life is an accident only. Both are involved in the process of life. Thus, we can enjoy our freedom of spirit. However, enjoying the extreme freedom of ego and disrespect to others can cause trouble; it isolates one and lastly it may lead us to chaos.

The other central philosophy of Hinduism that motivates a Hindu life, individual and social is the concept of *Purucārtha*. There are four *purucārthas* *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa*, through the scheme of *purucārthas*, all our desires are managed towards a great end. Living through this philosophy, a Hindu satisfies his desires of wealth, sex, obligations and responsibilities that lastly culminate in freedom from desires, from fear and finally attainment of liberation (*mokṣa*). The structure of Hindu life of different stages of *brahmacharya* (Celibacy), *gṛhastha* (household), *vānaprastha* (wanderer) and *sanyāsa* (renunciation) is also framed on this philosophy of *puruṣārtha*. It views that living your desires satisfied one may get freedom from the desires at renunciation. There is no sectarian, no bigotry of the religions in the *dharma* tradition.

What is the difference between religion and *dharma*? *Dharma* cannot be exactly translated into religion. Why? The term religion is popularly used for a religious sects that believe in

three popular dogmas i.e. a monistic God is a must, ii. A prophet through whom the God speaks and iii. a book that is revealed by God to prophet. The words of the book must be taken for the words of God absolutely perfect for all the time that is, past, present and future. These dogmas are must for religions. *Sanātana dharma* concerns with our duties and responsibilities. Is there any theological dogma in Hinduism? Hindus worship trees, the oceans, the rivers, animals, even snake they worship. They worship the devils also Rāvaṇa and Kansa even. Thus, there is no monotheistic, monistic and theistic dogma in *Sanātana* Hinduism. One may be an atheist, may not believe in God but he may be a better man than those who accept these dogmas. He/she performs his responsibilities in better way than he/she would have performed by accepting the dogmas. And if ever we ask about his faith in God, he/she may well say that there is god and the God is inside. And when he conveys Namaste to any he understands well that he respect the divinity inside him. Now in the same pattern of the religion some Sects of Hinduism have housed well some of these dogmas and have tried to authenticate the dogmas through the authority. Such sects are several and are flourishing everyday under the shelter of the Bābās who position themselves sometimes as Godmen, the Holiness and othertimes impose themselves as incarnations, organize the followers and the blind follower's project and organize the Bābās as God. This is not sanctioned in *sanātana* texts. In the first *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, Śruti clearly says that those who accept the human beings as God will never be redeemed⁵. Redemption is possible if one is not captive of imposing himself as God and lives his life according to his/her own experiences. Redemption is spiritual openness and for that elimination of all captives is a must. Therefore, Hinduism is the process of freedom from all captives one is imprisoned. So the philosophy talks about redemption from captives of any ideology or anything, openness of mind and thus, freedom from suffering, cultivating only that way life gets its meaning. Thus, Hinduism is a method of freedom. Karma, Jñāna, Bhakti, Yoga, Tantra and other ways for moral perfection leads to spiritual freedom, the *sumum bonum* of life.

Scriptures (*Śāstras*), the teachings of the Vedas and the Vedic literature contain the thought having global perspectives. Hindus are so global in their ideology that they consider Christianity, Islam, and others also as sects of respect like Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Kṛṣṇavism, Shaktism, etc. A Religion talks about a view and a way of life and insists that it is the only way to be followed by the all. But for dharma all views and ways of life are venerable if they are free from sectarian bigotries. One is free to live according to his own choice and preference. However, if I am asked to concentrate on any of the way and view my response is that Gita best represents the ways of life and the Upaniṣads are the culmination of the views of life and at the same time both talk about self experience, self realization. A philosopher may emerge in any who is not captive of the dogmas, confronts the problems, feels responsible to clarify the problem and

lastly reach to the resolve and wisdom that he/she has to impart to the coming generation.

Utility of Philosophy as Method of Analysis, Agreement and Resolve

Philosophical analysis different from grammatical, linguistic or syntactical analysis goes very deep into the very structure of a problem whether it concerns with science or religion. It analyses the problem into simpler parts to the extent of liquidating it. It helps in observing whether the problem is real or imposed. Analyzing the problem gives rise to further steps of universalizing and making agreement. There is no conflict on real and the philosophical enquiry liquidates it if it is unreal or imposed on real. For illustration, we are 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 'Ísvara' is the only God'. They stick to their belief about the cultural difference of the terms as the reality about the '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 Isa' and the fighting flames a communal riot. Philosophy can be employed for liquidating such fights. 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 '*Khudā/Ísa*'? Is it the God, the creator? Does God create the universe? Is the Universe a mixture of mind and matter? Is he a 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/Ísa*' as the reality that concerns with quarrel or the language you use to denote is the cause of quarrel? As two different communities separately use the two terms 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/Ísa*', 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, 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 which is not his own⁶⁷

There is difference between the concepts given and concepts revealed when presented so

by language. The flashing of the concepts serve as the cause of our ordinary communications and doings. Unless there is a concept and it is revealed by some manifestant, no understanding and hence no doing is possible, in case of absence of incentive. Subjects other than philosophy study these concepts on the basis of doings performed but Philosophy concerns with 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 expressed in the mind.

Philosophy Enhances and Encourages the Power of Questioning

To satisfy the rational hunger there is no science other than Philosophy that is attached inevitably with the cultivation of our questioning power. Since philosophy belongs to the higher level of knowledge where there is determination, broadness, purity from the confusion, inconsistencies, doubts and other limitations and freedom from being captive to any interest, a philosophically trained mind questions deep into the issues till the understanding about the issue is not clear. This means it cultivates the questioning power of the mind. Unless the problem confronted is not clear from its all sides questioning continues. Questioning may be to counter questions becomes philosophical if is not for seeking information or for question sake only but for removing doubts and conflicts and other defects to help the knowledge shines forth. This questing power makes one's life fit intellectually for determination and resolve of the problems as well. When we confront with problem about life and thought the questioning process starts and stops when the issue at hand is cleared to our understanding. Now, this questioning belongs to facts and our human aspirations as well that philosophy and only philosophy can cultivate. Questioning is not philosophy; it is just a helping tool to reach to the clarity of the problem. It has a limit and useful for convincing and making agreement and disagreement.

Therapeutic Utility of Philosophy: It is Cure of Illness of Thoughts

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 which cause all sorts of suffering; they are categorized as i. those pertaining to the body, ii. that concerns with language and iii. with the thoughts and the thinking. Āyurveda and different medical paths occupy with the cure of the disease of body; the philosophy of language and grammar engages with the cure of the abuses of language checking the corruption of language and for clarity of thoughts. Finally, the systems of philosophy serve 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 confused reasoning. Contemporary Phenomenological method emphasizes freeing our thinking and thought from different sorts of superstitions and allegiances we earn since birth. As a remedy of removal of ignorance and

consequent causes of suffering lying deep into one's very structure philosophy is covetously, a very practical discipline. Bhartṛhari in his Vākyapadīya has very nicely pointed out the defects and the cure against those defects in a way that the purpose of the learning of different disciplines becomes specified. According to the verse, whatever the impurities there exists, of body, of language, and of thoughts (buddhi), their purification is effected through the sciences of physical treatment with which Āyurveda and medical sciences occupy, of Grammar and of science of spirituality that is, philosophy respectively. Philosophy is the only cure against the ills of the thoughts and the thinking; it is a therapy that transforms the life and personality to a wise⁷.

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 core problems of Indian philosophy. In Buddhism, it is the first of the four fold truths (āryasat), 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 Āyurveda observe suffering as the basic problem, the eradication of which is the purpose of these philosophies. They believe 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.

Cure of Desires

Here the term 'cure' means satisfaction. Dissatisfied desires grow like a community of diseases. The other backbone of Indian ethico-philosophy that motivates a life, individual and social is the concept of *Puruṣārtha*. *Puruṣārthas* are management of desires, living the categories of desires from beginning stage of life (*brahmacarya*) moving to household (*gārhastha*), practicing non-attachment (*vānaprastha*) from household and lastly to get freedom from all the desires (renunciation). Satisfying the desires of *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa* gradually in a sequence one achieves liberation.. *Mokṣa* is the freedom from all the desires. all our desires are managed towards a great end. Living through this philosophy, one can satisfy his desires of wealth, sex, obligations and responsibilities that lastly culminate in freedom from desires, from fear of the circle of birth and death. The structure of life of hundred springs is management of living the desires and satisfying them one by one at different stages of life. Philosophy of *Puruṣārtha* meant for transform the desires into values because we exchange our desires through our duties and responsibilities to others and the culmination of all the values into freedom from desires.

Philosophy: A Cure of Family Quarrel

Several time people question about the use of philosophy in day to day life. Why there is family quarrel? How can philosophy help us in removing family quarrel? Family quarrel is

caused because of lack of a clear understanding in between the members of the family. There are family quarrels, quarrels between the husbands and wives, between the children and the parents. The question is why does a dispute take place between a wife and a husband? The husband thinks that he is a male and is privileged to dominate over the wife and children because they have subordinate value; they depend on him for their needs in so many ways. Wives also have the same sense.

They can also think that they are politically and economically independent and empowered more than the males. Even if both are empowered there is no surety that there is no family quarrel or quarrel will be less. Family is not run by political and economical power but an understanding and sharing among its members. I am of the view that for a good family life one must not play politics with its members. A member is a member of a family if he follows at least minimum requirements of being a member in the family. If understanding and respect to the individuals in a family are overlooked, there is a clash of powers. Confusions, doubts in the family take place on the place of harmony, cooperation and progress of the family. The basic ground of the privilege of the husband and so is of the wives is based on the ignorance. Likewise, the wife may think that she is superior and she is not supposed to be dominated by males. The difference between the two widens more and more because of not clarifying the issue of the difference. More distance is formed between them day by day and those results in a cultural gap, a family quarrel that culminates in divorce, suicide and murder. If any of the two invites the other on the issue of the problem between them for a talk on the tea table or if they sit together and put the problem for clarity, analyze the problem, and try to find out if the problem is real or imposed. Try to find out if a problem is real or imposed. We sure there can be no problem about real. If it is imposed philosophy can help removing that. They can sincerely share the problem on the table, analyze the points of problem. They can make an agreement on all the points and if they do not agree on certain point they may for the time being agree to disagree on that point and then, the quarrel of the family may change into the happiness of the family. Both are rational being, both are the members of the family having equal opportunities and the tendency to dominate each other on the basis of sexual discrimination is not a value for maintaining the family which is natural tie of both the sexes and thus, both will agree on this point and then there will be no struggle, no break up and less divorces. The problems between them will be resolved by dealing philosophically.

Philosophy is the Remedy Against Aggressiveness and Terrorism

Philosophy serves as a remedy against aggressiveness and Terrorism. In Indian philosophy there is a concept of inborn debt of what one learns (R̥ṣiṛṇa) that can be paid off if one imparts his learning for the welfare of others. Let us illustrate it with an example. Suppose two students learn the technique of making atomic bombs, satellites and the methods of its launching. One

think that he has learnt a great wisdom and therefore it is obligatory on his part to use it for the welfare of his society and country. On the other side the next one can also think that by acquiring great knowledge he is empowered enough to destroy all those who have a view and way of life different from him or to all those who do not respect and follow his views and ways have no right to live. Theism ideology gives rise to terrorism. But if he feels indebted to all surrounding in which he is grown and educated he will follow duties/obligations and responsibility as a way of paying off the debts he borrows from his surroundings. Terrorism and aggressiveness to other ideology are due to a specific ignorance, a blind faith in other's experience as only way of life that we impose in our very structure as the absolute and ignore our own experience, our duties and responsibility as human beings. Philosophy is the only cure.

Philosophy is the Remedy of Resolving the Problems

Those who have rational hunger not only confront with problems but that confrontation makes their minds self-aware or reflective. They reflect over the problem, analyze them, make agreement and disagreement, take a decision and lastly resolve the problem. If the problem is clear to mind it can be diluted by philosophical method of analyzing them, reflecting on them or universalizing or rationalizing them the problem is resolved. If it still persists we can make agreement one by one on the analyzed parts and even if there are some part on which agreement is not possible at a time, we should try the same process to make agreement and the point on which no agreement is possible because of some dogma they can make an agreement to disagree on that point and this decision makes the problem resolved. If the problem is clear but uncertainty about the future persists that is not a disturbing problem if the mind is clear about that problem.

Notes and References

1. Tiwari, Devendra Nath : *Language Being and Cognition*, Astha Publications, 2014, p.2.
2. Āraṇya, Hariharānanda : *Pātañjala Yogadarśana*, Sūtra-4, Vyāsabhāṣya, MLBD, Reprint 2007, p.12.
3. Tiwari, Devendra Nath : *The Central Problems of Bhartṛhari's Philosophy*, ICPR, New Delhi, 2008, p.1.
4. Bhartṛhari : *Vākyapadīya*, English Tr. with notes by Pillai Raghavan K, Canto I, Verse 10, MLBD, 1971, p. 2.
5. Athayo'nyamdevatāmupāsate, anyo'sāvanyo'hamasmp-tiveda..., *The Bīṛhadāra nyakopaniṣad*, edited with Eng. tr. by Swami Sivananda, Chapter 1-iv-10, p. 74.
6. Dayakrishna : *The Nature of Philosophy*, 1955. p. 233.
7. *Kāyavāṅgbuddhiviśayāyemalāḥsamvasthitācikitāśālakṣaṇādhyāmsāstraiḥṭeṣāmviśudhyah*.
Bhartṛhari : *Vākyapadīya*, English Tr. with notes by Pillai Raghavan K, Canto I, Verse 147, MLBD, 1971, p.33.