CHAPTER - I

PHILOSOPHY: AN ENQUIRY AND INTERVENTION IN HISTORY

Every system of thought is dependent on the civilizations from which they are derived and developed. It is not apart from the living ambiance and human conditions. Philosophy aims to provide a related description of the diverse attempts which have been made to resolve the problem of existence or to make understandable our world of experience. It is the development of human thought from its initial beginning to the present time. It is the study of the relation between one another. It is an attempt to trace the line of progress in the history of human speculation. It shows how the intellectual attitudes called philosophy arises, how the different problems and the solutions developed and within this condition novel questions and answers are aroused.

In the history of human thought the thinker who was considered as philosopher had to exhibit freedom to interpret the nature and culture without fear and prejudice. The enthusiastic intellectuals enquired about the essential problems of existence and sought to find out the answers for the human race on various stages of civilization. Such enquiry helps men to understand their own and other times. It spreads light on ethical, religious,
political, legal and economic conceptions of the past and present by enlightening the fundamental principles on which they are based.

Philosophy is not only significant to us to question how we should conduct our lives but also why human beings are thinking creatures and they have the capacity to revisit the knowledge, for which pure understanding is an end in itself. Finding out about the origin of the universe, or about the nature of consciousness, may make no difference to the way we behave, but it would run counter to human nature not to pursue such questions.

Philosophy has been playing a revolutionary and vitally important role in the creation of good life. Philosophy, as Aristotle said, begins with wonder at the marvels and mysteries of the world. It begins in wonder, in the pursuit of truth and wisdom, and ends in life lived in passionate moral and intellectual integrity. The term ‘philosophy’ literally means the love of wisdom, but it is a wisdom that results from the pursuit of knowledge of the most important fundamental questions.

Philosophy is love of knowledge in the sense that every rational approach belongs to it until each branch of knowledge developed as separate science. Hence while different branches of knowledge developed in to separate science philosophy had to broaden its approach. As a consequence, with the advent of modernity philosophy elaborated and
broadened its area of enquiry and thereby attained great status. As Herbert Spencer says when the philosophy begins science ends.

Philosophy is sometimes deviating from the mainstream process and the way of looking at things differently. Since philosophizing always involves questioning these accepted truths and it goes beyond what is being accepted in any situation. From Socrates to Deleuze or whoever belongs to this realm of philosophy in any part of the world argues not for public recognition but for knowing or revealing the ‘unknown’. So, such knowledge or understanding invites going beyond and hence need genuine quest for truth and knowledge. In this sense it is seeking wisdom or love of limited interest.

Philosophy goes against the stream of the majority because the majority opinion is often a composite of past intellectual struggle or pragmatic basis. There is often deeper truth, better and new evidence that disturbs the statuesque and that forces us to revise or reject some of our beliefs. Rational inquiry, which philosophy promotes, is liberating; feeling as from prejudice, self-deceptive notion, and half-truths. Philosophers clarify concepts, analyse and test propositions and belief, but the most important task is to analyse and construct arguments. Meanwhile philosophy becomes interpretation of nature and culture. As nature is essential aspect of human existences she is forced to interpret it as and
when she confronts it. Similarly as social being man makes certain culture based on his own interpretation.

The fundamental questions of philosophy from antiquity onwards focused on truth, beauty and justice. Almost all the question under the sun belongs to these three fundamental principles. The entire question related to society and polity is actually pertaining to the question of justice. In ancient Greek as well as in other schools of thought different Polities were discussed in order to find out which society is a just society. Justice is the fundamental principle around which almost all and social issues are being raised. Similarly the principle of truth itself became a big question before thinkers since the determination of truth and error is the inevitable aspect of our analysis. The quest for knowledge is actually the quest for knowing justice, truth and aesthetics. Whenever human beings began to live as community the question of knowledge also come up before them. Actually the communitarian life gave birth to language. As part of language the question of semantics and semiotics issues evolved. In such a situation philosopher like Aristotle not only wrote about the ethics or politics but also logic or different forms of syllogisms. In the same way as part of social life they had to analyse not only what is good and bad but also beautiful and ugly. Even the argument in theology such as whether God exists or not also had its roots in human quest for knowing the reason for just and unjust, good and bad, and truth and untruth. In this way a close examination of the
history of human thought would reveal that the whole enquiry is ultimately about justice, truth and beauty.

Greek thought began with an enquiry into the essence of the objective world. Greek philosophy is one of the best examples of the evolution of human thinking from simple mythological beginning to complex and comprehensive system. Greek philosophy is essentially an intellectual movement which originated and developed in the Hellenic world. Greece is famous for strong and active race, navigation and commerce; by their way of their mobility they got contact and connection with the outside world and its culture. The social condition of Greece also helped the emergence of philosophical thinking and the intellectual involvement. (Economic progress, development of commerce, industry and trade, the rise of cities, accumulation of wealth, division of labour and the leisure time). The social, political, intellectual and religious life of the Greeks and their world opens a new and richer civilization.

Men start to ask the stars not only for guidance on the sea but also for an answer to the riddles of the universe. According to Aristotle first philosophers were astronomers. “Proud of their achievements” “men pushed further afield after the Persian wars; they took all knowledge for their province and sought ever wider studies”.¹ Men grew bold enough to attempt explanation of process and events before attributed to supernatural agencies and powers; magic and rituals slowly gave way to science and
control; and philosophy began. At the initial stage the philosophy was physical in its whole approach (philosophy of nature). It looked upon the material world and asked what the final and irreducible element of things was. This line of thought was the materialism of Democritus. ‘In reality there is nothing but atoms and space’. Gradually Greek philosophy turns its eye, on man himself, or it become humanistic. For the philosopher of that time the first problem is about what nature is and its relation with man and then man to nature.

1.1 Truth (The Reality of Life, search for Knowledge)

The significant growth of Greek philosophy begins from the Sophists. For sophist Knowledge is perception. The mind of man is a significant factor in the process of knowing. The sophists’ turns its light on the knowing subject and concludes that knowledge depends upon the particular knower. Thus perception is the product of both the object moving towards the subject and the subject moving towards the object. This perception alone is knowledge. This knowledge is relative to different men at different times. Hence the famous saying of Protagoras *Homo Mensura*, i.e., man is the measure of all things. In other words, what appears to me is true for me and what appears to you is true for you. Hence there is no knowledge, which is valid and acceptable to all men universally.
1.1.1 Questioning Traditional Understanding of Knowledge

Socrates was one of the inspiring human beings to have lived and provided a new method of questioning. He spent much of his life in the market place of Athens, by questioning and arguing with his followers on philosophical issues like, truth, justice, friendship, self-control, piety, and virtue. Socrates claimed that real knowledge of justice, virtue, eternal ideas are already present in man. As a youth, he got attracted to the ideas of the physicalists. But finally he turned his attention away from natural sciences towards the problems of everyday life.

Socrates was assassinated for corrupting the youth of Athens. The teachings of Socrates give morale to the young generation of Athens and they began to ask questions and try to demolish the conventional beliefs. If they decided to put an end to his life, Socrates was not ready to stop his teachings of the basic philosophy of life. It was impossible for Socrates to give up philosophy. He expressed his commitment to the knowledge by the dictum, “the unexamined life is not worth living.” From his point of view, a life that was not enriched by philosophical reflection was no better than death. Socrates said, “One thing I know, and that is that I know nothing”.

Philosophy begins when one learns to doubt – particularly to doubt one’s cherished beliefs, one’s dogmas and one’s axioms. There is no real philosophy until the mind turns round and examines itself. Philosophers prior to Socrates, naturally give priority for the physics or nature of external
things, the law and constituents of the material and assessable world. Socrates said, “That is very good; but there is an infinity worthier subject for philosopher than all these trees and stones and even all those stars; there is the mind of man. What is man, and what can be become?” Socrates defends knowledge against the attack by the employment of logical method. His purpose was realistic rather than speculative; he was interested in the correct method of enquiring knowledge more than theory of such a method or approach. Socrates said, “it was mere a matter of asking the right questions. By knowing the proper questions when faced with a problem debate or issue, one can find good answers more easily than someone who starts off without such a foundation”.

The Sophist studied the psychological method for the reality, while Socrates had faith in a law of reason that determines the truth. His whole attempt was only a continuous invitation to his fellow citizens to help him in this search. He said this “I am wiser than they in this small respect: that I know that I do not know, whereas they think they know something when they really don’t”. Yet he demanded the same measure of self-knowledge also from others. For nothing more dangerous blocked the way of wisdom than that conceited affection of wisdom which the Sophist half-education developed in the majority of mind.
1.1.2 Knowledge is based on Reason

Plato’s chief aim is to attain reality, to know reality in all its phase-physical, mental and moral – to understand it in its unity and completeness. He knows that the knowledge – problem itself cannot be solved without an understanding of the nature of the world. Plato argued that, the concepts of sophist are quite right that there can be no genuine knowledge, if our proposition is derived from sense perception and opinion. The sense-perception does not reveal the true reality of things, but give us mere appearance. Accordingly opinion may be true or false; as mere opinion it has no value whatever; it is not knowledge; it cannot justify itself. So he does not give much value to the sense perception and opinion. It would be misrepresented, fabricated and half-truth; and not real in its perfect sense. For him genuine knowledge is based on reason.

According to Plato, Ordinary virtue is not better off; it too, rests on sense perception and opinion; it is not conscious of principles. In his verdict “we must advance from sense-perception and opinion to genuine knowledge. This we cannot do unless we have a desire, or love of truth, the Eros, which is around the contemplation of beautiful ideas: we pass from the contemplation of beauty to the contemplation of truth- the love of truth implies us to dialectics; it impels us to rise beyond sense perception to the idea; to conceptual knowledge, from the particular to universal”.
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Truth is the knowledge of reality, of being as such, of that which is. The world perceived by our senses is not the true world; it is changing, fleeting world one thing today, something else tomorrow, and it is a mere appearance of reality. True is being something permanent, unchanged, eternal. In Plato’s opinion the particular object which we perceive are imperfect copies or reflections of these eternal patterns; particular may come particular may go, but the idea or forms remains forever. Man may come and man may go, but the man type, the human race, goes on forever. There may be object or copies, but there is always only one idea of a class of things.

1.1.3 Knowledge is Impossible without Experience

Aristotle was a man with independent mind to recreate the system and to develop it into a more consistent and scientific manner. He developed his concepts and perspectives by examining and criticizing Plato, his teacher. Aristotle retains the changeless eternal form, the idealistic principles of Plato, but discards their transcendence. He brings them down from heaven to earth, so to speak. For him Form is not separate from things, but inherent in them; they are not transcendent, but immanent. Matter is not non-being but active; form and matter are not separate, but eternally together: matter realizes the form or idea of the thing, moves and changes, grows, or evolves forward. The world of sense, the phenomenal order, is not mere imitation or shadow of the real world; it is the real world, form
and matter is one, and the true object of science. Aristotle reconciles both empiricism and rationalism. Knowledge is impossible without experience; but truth derived from experience, by induction, would not be certain- they would yield probability only. Without experience, truth would never be known; without being implicit in reason. They would not be certain. He proposes a new logic to derive the knowledge, in his work known as Organon, i.e., is an instrument for attaining true knowledge. Logic of Aristotle deals with inference, division, definition and induction. Aristotle regarded that both deduction and induction are essential in attaining knowledge.

1.1.4 Medieval Philosophy

Medieval era is famous for ethical and theological discussions such as problems of man’s origin and destiny, his relation to God and the world and his fall and liberation from sin. The rise of Christianity as a new religion was the significant development in this era. The mediaeval philosophy established the largest part of the philosophy of the middle ages, or Christian philosophy, had for its aim the exposition, systematization and demonstration of the Christian dogmas- the creation of a theory of the world and of life on a Christian basis. The creation of the world is explained after the Greek models. God is the ground and purpose of all things: from him they come and to him they return. The logos, however, is pattern, or archetype, or prototype, of all created beings: which means
everything is created in the image of reason and by the power of reason or
divine intelligence. Creation is the result of God’s love and goodness and
for the benefit of man. The important thinkers in the medieval philosophy
were St. Augustine, St. Anselm and Thomas Aquinas.

1.1.4.1 Theories of Knowledge

In St. Augustine’s philosophy the most significant theological and
philosophical problems of his age are discussed, and a Christian world-view
developed which represents the culmination of patristic thought.
Characteristic of the spirit of the entire Christian age is the Augustinian
view that the only knowledge worth having is the knowledge of God and
self. All the other sciences, logic, metaphysics and ethics have value only in
so far as they tell us God. It is our duty to understand what we finally
believe, to see the rationality of our faith. “Understand in order that you
believe, believe in others that you may understand some things we do not
understand unless we believe”. Besides natural knowledge, faith in divine
revolution is a source of knowledge of God. Intelligence is needed for
understanding what it believes; faith for believing what it understands.

Augustine thought that the human mind to grasp eternal truths
implies the existence of something infinite and eternal apart from the world
of sensible object, an essence that in some sense represents the source or
ground of all reality and of all truth. He also accepted the Gospel story of
the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and believed that God took
on human form in the person of Jesus.

St. Anselm was among the first to evaluate the faith in Christian God
from a purely philosophical perspective, that is, from a perspective that
does not make religious assumption from the outset. Anselm never
interested the slightest doubt about whether God exists. He made no
difference between philosophy and theology, and he thought it impossible
for anyone to reason about God or God’s existence without already
believing in Him. He recognized the priority and primacy of faith over
reason. His slogan, which was ‘credo, it intelligence’ i.e., Let me believe
that I may understand. Without faith a man is blind to understand god who
is light. But he also held that one should try to understand as much as
possible the doctrines of one’s faith.

St. Thomas Aquinas chooses a life as a Dominican teacher. He
further perceived his purpose in life to be a harmonizing of the theology of
the church with the logic of Aristotle. He was called ‘the philosopher’, and
so fully were the scholars convinced that it satisfied God to allow Aristotle
to say that last word upon each and every branch of knowledge. That they
humbly accepted him along with the Bible, the church fathers, and the
canon and Roman law, as one of the unquestionable authorities which
together formed a complete guide for humanity in conduct and in every
branch of source.
Aquinas wanted to justify the function of the re-established secular authority of the church and its continued sacred authority. Aquinas, like philosopher before him, believed that man was a social animal intended to live in community. But man the social animal, capable of directing his actions by intelligence, was in danger of being victimized that the potential social unity of man be secured by political unity. The end, peaceful unity, was never questioned. The means were, by analogy, seemingly apparent; as only one hearts commends the functionally integrated body, so government rule by one person is presumably the best. An intelligent monarchy must rule in justice. A society structural like nature, which is ruled by God, will best function in unity through unitary leadership.

1.1.5 Renaissance and Modernity

The transitional period between medieval and modern times was the Renaissance. Through its emphasis on worldly experience and reverence for classical culture, the Renaissance helped and emancipated Europe from the intellectual authority of the Church. The modern period in history and philosophy and its interesting cultural and social development include among other things, the rise of nation states, the spread of capitalism, and industrialization, the exploration and settlement of the new world, the decline of religion, and their eventual domination of science as the most revered source of knowledge.
1.1.5.1 Descartes to Kant

Modern philosophy began with Rene Descartes. He made important contributions in various fields including psychology, physiology, optics and especially mathematics, in which he originated the Cartesian co-ordinate and Cartesian carves. Descartes' like Bacon, resolutely set his face against the old authorities and, like him emphases the practical character of all philosophy. “Philosophy is a perfect knowledge of all that men know, as well for the conduct of his life as for the preservation of his health and the discovery of all the arts”. Unlike the English empiricist however, he takes mathematics as the model of his philosophical method.

Rene Descartes, known as the Father of Modern Philosophy, employed a new kind of skepticism to defeat skepticism. He doubted in such a way that, he hoped, would pave the way for the end of doubt and the beginning of absolute certainty. He was a rationalist who believed that all truth can be known by the mind alone by inquiring within itself. He holds the doctrine of innate ideas (that the mind possesses knowledge at birth) which we know a priori - that is, prior to experience, through experience may be necessary to stimulate awareness of this knowledge. Regarding truth, Descartes says that if the idea of a thing is clear and distinct, it does not mean that the thing really exists (true); but all the ideas of existent things must be clear and distinct to be existent. Our judgments
should be based on this assumption, i.e., clarity and distinctness as the criterion of truth.

1.1.5.2 Knowledge began with Experience

Kant is considered at par with Plato and Aristotle as one of the most important philosophers in western culture. He was a product of crucial time between the continental allegiances to rational thought and British adoption of sense experience. He attempted a synthesis of these two themes and hereby changed the course of philosophy. He recognized the strength of the empiricist claims that sense experience is the source of all our belief but could not accept its skeptical conclusion that those beliefs cannot be justified. At the same time he rejected the rationalistic claim that factual truth about what does and does not exist can be conclusively established by the use of reason none. Accordingly his task as that of finding out whether it is possible to have metaphysical knowledge, that is knowledge of the soul and whether human have free will.

In *Critique of Pure Reason* he argued that we are confined within the world of our perception, with the realities that gave rise to our perception forever beyond our grasp. We understand our world only by imposing on it our own broad conceptual categories: time, space and causality. These concepts provide an essential element for our understanding of physical world. They are not derived from sense experience or observation but are, in Kant’s terminology, *apriori*. That is to say, they are fundamental
requirements of reason he argued that morality, too must be grounded in *apriori* reasoning, rather than in any appeal to authority or religion.

1.1.5.2.1 The Copernican Revolution in Philosophy

Kant called his most fundamental epistemological insight, the Copernican Revolution in philosophy. He said that the old assumptions that our ideas, to be traced, must certain to objects outside mind must be replaced with a new assumption: that object outside the mind must conform to that which the mind imposes on them in experiencing them. Kant argued with Hume that all knowledge began with experience. But it does not follow Kant maintained that knowledge must therefore arise from experience. Experience is the occasion for the awakening of the knowing mind, He said; but the mind, the awakened, is not limited in knowledge to what, it has found in experience.

Because the constituents of experience must themselves always be ordered and organized in certain ways even to counter as experience. And it is possible to have knowledge of the underlying principle by means of which the constituents of experience are ordered and organized. Because the knowledge is of the universally applicable preconditions of experience which is absolutely certain.

After Kant there was deep enquiry in the field of philosophy and it stretched as the major influence in thinking process. Philosophy as
mentioned travelled all over the world without any boundaries and the knowledge production developed as all. The particular conditions and the different approaches and the developed theories helped the new movements in thinking process.

1.1.5.3 Scientific approach in Philosophical Thinking

Science began with the scientific Revolution, which itself commenced when Copernicus (1473-1543) broke with long tradition and proposed that the earth is not the centre of the universe but it revolves, with the other planets, around the sun. The essence of these revolutions lies in several ideas: (1) It is important to understand how world works; (2) To do that you have to examine the world itself rather than read your Aristotle or consult scripture; (3) a fruitful way of examining the world is through experimentation - this is an idea expressed by most clearly by Francis Bacon and (4) The world is a mechanical system that can be described mathematically - this is an idea expressed most clearly by Rene Descartes.

Many European thinkers of the sixteenth century began to question established precepts and above all to question the accepted authorities as the spokesman for the truth. This tendency to question authority effectively set the stage for the scientific Revolution and modern philosophy, which are products of seventeenth century.
Philosophical reasoning is closely associated with scientific reasoning. Science and philosophy may be said to have had their origin in religion. In its initial stage the religion and the philosophy were one and have the same teachings. Mythology was a primitive attempt to understand the world. Man at first interpreted the phenomena on the basis of practical reason and his basic experience. In beginning, the philosophy and science are in an inseparable form, but in future they normally become two form of knowledge. Science tries to explore the laws behind the objects through observation, experimentation, using the materialistic research methods and with the theory of causation: while philosophy mainly focused on the analysis and enquired about the innermost character or plane of meanings by depending on inferences, thoughts and imaginations. Science also has the same intention to reveal the truth and reality of the character of human beings and the universe by examining the objects and its causation.

The scientists require an expensive laboratory with all sorts of experimental equipment’s. The laboratory of the philosopher is the domain of ideas: the mind, where imaginative thought experiments take place; the study where ideas are written down and examined; and wherever discussion or debate about the recurrent question take place, where thesis and counter-examples and counter-thesis are considered. The truth is that it is not easy to analysis philosophical theories as it is to test a mathematical theorem or a scientific hypothesis. Because philosophical problem are more exploratory
and metaphysical, one cannot prove or disprove most of the important thesis. The relationship of philosophy to science is more complicated than this subject, for somewhat theoretical scientist could do with justice to be called philosophy.

1.1.5.3.1 Nothing is beneath Science or above it

Francis Bacon, in many respects a typical representative of the new movement. He is known as the father of scientific thinking in philosophy. He is opposed to the ancient authorities to Aristotle and Greek philosophy no less than to the barren philosophy of the school. The eye of the mind, he tells us, must never be taken off from the things themselves, but receive their images truly as they are. The past had done nothing; its methods, foundations, and results were wrong; we must begin all over again, free our minds of transmitted and inherited prejudices and opinion, go to the things themselves instead of following opinions and dealing in words - in short, do our own thinking. For him, “As the sciences in their present state are useless for the discovery of works, so logic in its present state is useless for the discovery of sciences”. 10

The fruitlessness of science and philosophy in the past, Bacon thinks, has been due to the absence of a proper method. The unassisted hand and the understanding left to itself possess but little power. For overcoming this Bacon think that we must develop a new way of reaching knowledge, a new machine or organ for the mind, a new logic, a novum organuam. According
to him the old logic is inadequate for the discovery of the sciences. Bacon held that mankind must begin the work of science anew. It was natural, under the circumstances, that he did not offer a complete theory of the universe himself; his office was to stake out the ground and to point the way to new achievements. He said, “There are, and can be, only two ways to investigate and discover truth. The one leaps from sense and particulars to the most general axioms and from these principles and their settled truth, determines and discovers intermediate axioms; this is the current way. The other elicits axioms from sense and particulars, rising in a gradual and unbroken ascent to arrive at last at the most general axioms; this is the true way, but it has not been tried”.

He divided the field of knowledge, or ‘intellectual globe’, in to history and philosophy, according to the faculties of the mind (memory, imagination and reason). Philosophy is the work of reason; it deals with abstract notions derived from impressions of sense; and in the composition and division of these notions, according to the nature and fact, its business lies. In the former, we considered man separate, in the latter joined in society. Human philosophy studies body and soul and their connection. The human soul has a divine or rational part and an irrational part. The faculties of the soul are understanding, reason, imagination, memory, appetite, will, and all these with which logic and ethics are concerned. Logic treats of the understanding and reason; and ethics of the will, appetite, and affection; the
one produces resolutions, the other action. The art of logic are inquiry or invention, examination or judgment, custody or memory, elocution or delivery. The study of induction belongs to the art of judgments. Ethics describes the nature of the good and prescribes rules for conforming to it.

He said that nothing is beneath science or above it. Bacon moves from field to field, exploring various notions in every science. At the end of his survey he comes to the conclusion that science by itself is not enough: there must be a force and discipline outside the science to co-ordinate them and point them to a good. In *Novum Organum* he explains, “The things that have hitherto been discovered in the sciences all fit nicely into common notions; in order to penetrate to the more inward and remote parts of nature, both notions and axioms must be abstracted from things in a more certain, better-grounded way; and a more certain and altogether better intellectual procedure must come into use”. Science needs a philosophy or an analysis of scientific method, and the coordination of scientific purpose and results; without this, any science must to superficial.

Bacon proceeds to give an admirable description of the scientific method of inquiry. “There remains simple experience; which, if taken as it comes is called accident” (empirical), “if sought for, experiment… the true method of experience first light the candle” (hypothesis), “and then by means of the candle shows the way” (arranges and delimits the experiment); “commencing as it does with experience duly ordered and
delighted, not burning nor erratic and from it reducing axioms, and form established axioms again new experiments”.  

Bacon embodied new delight in the human intellect and its capability to know the world. It was acknowledged that man’s rational mind, purged of its bad habits and superstitions (idols) can understand the natural world and gains control of it in the interest of human needs. This new belief was a far turn from the traditional theological doctrine that man’s reason is corrupt and that man, on his own, can’t do anything right or good. Bacon saw himself as the ‘trumpeter of his age’, uniquely qualified to do battle against the fallacious thought system of the past. ‘I was fitted for nothing so well as for the study of truth’. Bacon set out to abolish the closed knowledge system of a stagnant tradition. His goal, he said, was to perform ‘a true and lawful marriage between the empirical and the rational faculty’. Unfortunately, he threw out the rational body with the theological bath waters; by concentrating on empirical fact-gathering he neglected the role of deduction in scientific method.

Bacon believed that the wrong-headed logic must be replaced by inductive scientific method. It is a way of thinking that begins by looking at the world, carefully observing singular events, and then trying these observations together with hypotheses that causally explain them and make them intelligible. Good scientific method requires a variety of a further logical technique, including testing hypotheses.
Bacon was the original philosopher of science, the first to describe not only the intellectual ambitions but also provided the characteristics of modern science. Like his contemporary Descartes, Bacon proposed a scientific method that suspended most conventional belief in favour of a project of establishing an inclusive new understanding of the world. Unlike Descartes, Bacon’s science would be based on carefully gathered observation and experiments and would involve the organized corporation of numbers of scientist. In his book *Novum Organum* (New Organ) Bacon describes his valuable ideas and philosophy. The most prescient of Bacon’s suggestions was that, to understand nature.

1.1.5.4 Russell

Science without philosophy, fact without perspective and valuation, cannot save us from havoc and despair. Science gives us knowledge, but only philosophy can give us wisdom. According to Russell “philosophy is like all other studies aims primarily at knowledge. The knowledge it aims at is the kind of knowledge which gives unity and system to the body of the sciences and the kind of results from a critical examination of the grounds of our convictions, prejudices and beliefs. But cannot be maintained that philosophy has had any very great measure of success in its attempt to provide definite answers to its question”.

Science seems always to advance, while philosophy seems always to lose ground. Yet this is only because philosophy accepts the hard and
hazardous task dealing with problems not yet open to the method of science. Problems like good and evil, beauty and ugliness, order and freedom, life and death. So soon as a field of inquiry yields knowledge susceptible of exact formulation is called science. Every science begins as philosophy and ends as arts; it arises in hypothesis and flows into interpretations. Science is the captured territory: and behind it are those secure regions in which knowledge and art build our imperfect and marvellous world.

He says, “Philosophy is to be studied, not for the sake of any definite answers to its questions, since no definite answers can, as a rule, be known to be true, but rather for sake of the questions themselves; because these questions enlarge our conception, and diminish the dogmatic assurance which closes the mind against speculation; but above all because through the greatness of the universe which philosophy contemplates, the mind also with the universe which constitute its highest good”. 15

1.1.5.5 Ahimsa: Desire is the course for Pain and Sorrows

Life is full of suffering. Suffering is due to desire or will-to–live. Will to live is due to ignorance. Ignorance is false knowledge of the impermanent as the permanent. It is delusion of individuality which is the root of the cycle of birth and death. It cannot be killed by philosophical knowledge. The Buddha adopts anti-metaphysical attitudes. There are ten interminable questions which are insoluble. Philosophical wrangling is
unavailing, for it generate self-conceit and skepticism. The Buddha’s teachings aim at the total extinction of suffering and attainment of nirvana here on earth. Nirvana is the cooling of passions, perfect peace and perfect enlightenment. The way to nirvana is the eight fold path of right conduct, concentration and insight. The delusion of individuality or egoism should be extirpated. When egoism eradicated, will-to-live or craving is destroyed. When craving is destroyed the round of birth and death is ended and nirvana is attained. Non-injury (ahimsa) in thought would and deed, is the corner stone of moral life. Religion of animal sacrifice, ritualism and ceremonies is condemned. The Buddha teaches neither Being nor Non-Being, but Becoming. He teaches neither self-indulgence nor self-mortification but the middle path-right view, right speech and right conduct. He teaches the religion of ahimsa and self-help.

The whole way of teaching of Buddha is assumed in the four noble truths: (1) there is suffering; (2) it has cause; (3) it can be stopped; (4) there is way to stop it. The first noble truth is suffering. Birth is attended with pain; decay is painful; a disease is painful; death is painful. Sensual pleasure is transitory and followed by pain. ‘Sorrow comes from merriment. Fear comes from merriment’. The loss of objects of sensual pleasure leads to sorrow. The second noble truth is concerning the origin of suffering. Desire which generates the cycle of birth and death is the cause of suffering. Desire or will to live are cause of suffering. All pain arise from
individuality which is due to ignorance (avidya). Ignorance is due to will-to-live, which is the root cause of suffering. The third noble truth is the way to the extinction of suffering. It is complete destruction of craving or will-to-live. Delusion of individuality, desire for mind-body-complex and egoism are the cause of suffering. The fourth noble truth is the way to the extinction of suffering. It is the eight fold path: (1) Right Belief, (2) Right Resolve, (3) Right Speech, (4) Right Conduct, (5) Right livelihood, (6) Right Effort, (7) Right Mindfulness, (8) Right Concentration. When the four noble truth are grasped, and craving or will-to-live is extirpated, there is no more birth.

1.2 Problems of Aesthetics

The term ‘aesthetics’ was first used in the eighteenth century by the philosopher Alexander Baumgartner to mention the cognition by the senses, sensuous knowledge. He later comes to use it in reference to the perception of beauty by the senses, particularly in art. Kant picked up on this use, applying the term of Judgement of beauty in both art and nature. It has succeeds not only judgements or evolution, but properties, attitudes, experience, and pleasure or value as well, and its application is no longer restricted to beauty alone. The realm of aesthetics remains broader than of aesthetically pleasing art works: we can experience nature aesthetically as well and it will take to value art works. The notion of aesthetic attitude, aesthetic properties, and aesthetic experience are inter-definable.
The history of beauty theory can be divided into two main traditions, according to the kinds of pleasurable experience that is recognized as evoked by beauty. Those who recognize the sober, contemplative kind of pleasure evoked by a certain state of formal relation as the only pleasure characteristic of an experience of beauty can be grounded in to the Pythagorean tradition. On the other hand, those who recognize the entire pleasure associate with the sense as evoked by beauty can be grouped in to the pleasure-principle tradition.

1.2.1 The Pythagorean Tradition

The Pythagoreans believed that the world is beautiful because there is a certain measure, proposition, under a harmony between its elements. They believed that the harmonious of music reveal the same harmonies that undermine nature. These harmonies according to the Pythagoreans can be reduced to number. In time, this conception of beauty was modified to accommodate the idea of moral beauty of intellectual constructs. Eventually, within this tradition, beauty comes to be understood as a relational property.

To see that something is beautiful yet the same time to claim to be unmoved, untouched by the experience, seems contradictory. Built in to the concept of beauty is the notion of pleasurable response on the part of the perceiver. On the other hand, judgements of beauty can be defined by pointing out the base properties within object from which the beauty seems
to emerge. Either knowledge of beauty is deeply embedded a priory in our mind or beauty is a characteristic of the divine which we come to know through our experience of its manifestation. Alternatively, we might have an inner sense or faculty of beauty which is fitted to respond to a certain constitution of parts in an object, and from which we derive our notions of beauty. According to the Pythagorean tradition in common there are two kinds of beauty, one relative and one universal or absolute. The two kinds of beauty are incorporated in to the one theory of beauty either by maintain that the relation is a manifestation of the absolute, or by postulating that both kinds of beauty are generated from different aspects of the inner sense/faculty of beauty.

1.2.2 The Pleasure-Principle Tradition

Beauty evokes a pleasurable response. While perceiving an object you do not experience pleasure you do not perceive beauty. While it does not necessarily follow that all pleasure evoked by perceiving an object is a response to an object’s beauty. Within the pleasure-principle tradition, all pleasurable response to the perception of an object are counted as response of beauty. They also include concepts of the objects when the object gives pleasure because we anticipate the personal benefits and would enjoy on owing or engaging in some way with the object. In other words, when all pleasures evoked by the perception of the object are counted as pleasurable response to beauty, beauty is collapsed in to the agreeably serous and the
good. The pleasure-principle tradition is the tradition of the Sophists and Epicureans. To the former, whatever, gives pleasure to the eye and. Or the ear is beautiful. In similar vein, the Epicureans believe that there is no difference between the good and the beautiful.

Beauty is an aesthetic asset generally thought of as a kind of aesthetic value. As such, it has been differently thought to be (1) a simple, indefinable property that cannot be defined in terms of any other properties; (2) a property or set of properties of an object that makes the object capable of producing a certain sort of pleasurable experience in any suitable perceiver; or (3) whatever produces a particular sort of pleasurable experience, even though what produces the experience may differ from individual to individual. It is in this last sense that beauty is thought to be ‘in the eye of the beholder’.

If beauty is a simple, indefinable property, then it cannot be defined theoretically and has to be apprehended by intuition or taste. Beauty on this account would be a particular set of aesthetic property. If beauty is an object’s ability to produce a special sort of pleasurable experience, as then it is necessary to say what properties provide it with the ability. Many of the great philosophers of the Western tradition have discussed art. Both Plato and Aristotle viewed art as first and foremost reproduction- an attempt of copy reality.
1.2.3 Imitation of Imitation

Plato’s works about the art play a basis role in the history of aesthetics, not simply because they are the initial significant impact to the subject. From a modern point of view it shows that Plato refuses to give autonomous value to art. For him there is a metaphysical and ethical order to the world which is philosophy’s task to discover by means of rational thought, and the arts can have true worth only if they correctly represent this order or help in aligning us with it. Plato initially considers the role of the art in education. The young, especially those who will be the Guardian responsible for the city’s well-being, must receive an education that properly forms their character.

In the *Philebus*, Plato argues that the form or essence of beauty is knowable, exact rational and measurable. He also holds that simple geometrical shapes, simple colours, and musical notes all have ‘intrinsic beauty’ which arouses a pure, ‘unmixed’ pleasure in the perceiver and is unaffected by context. Hence the pleasure experienced in response to such beauty can in principle be shared by anyone. Some have held, as that we apply the term ‘beautiful’ to things because of the pleasure they give us, and not on the basis of any specific qualities an object has.

Plato believed that the objects of our sense experience are themselves copies of some ideal former type- a table made by a carpenter is a copy of an ideal concept of a table; the artist paints a copy of an ideal concept of a
table; the artist paints the carpenter’s copy. So, it is twice detached from the reality. Plato viewed art as an inferior pursuit. He believes that the art is an imitation of the world of sense, which is itself a mere copy of the true essence of things; art, there for is an imitation of imitation.

Plato criticises mimesis in the visual arts by comparing it with holding up mirror in which the world mechanically reproduces itself. The points of the comparison are arguably that the painters make no real things, only an image. His products, when compared with the bed and the form of bed, is thus twice removed from reality. To make such an image requires no genuine knowledge, no knowledge of the real thing of which one makes an image.

Plato also wants to ban poets from his ideal state and allow only music with moral message or purpose- as citizens of Athens, he suggested uplifting martial music. For him, the state is an educational institution, the tool of civilization and as such it must have its foundation in the highest kind of knowledge attainable, which is philosophy. He begins with the content of the poetry used in early education. His censorship of the poets as school-books is in line with the practice of modern parents and school masters; but later it develops in to a more general attack on poetry. He recognizes the power of poetry over the human soul and intimates that he has full appreciation of its pleasure. It is not rough insensitivity that he rejects pursuit of the pleasure of poetic image making. It is because he has
an argument that shows we should resist these pleasures unless poetry or its lovers perform on philosophy’s home ground and present a good counter argument.

1.2.4 Art is an Imitation of Reality

For Aristotle fundamentally the form of art is an imitation of reality; it holds the mirror up to nature (De Anima 11). There is in man a pleasure in imitation, apparently missing in lower animals. Yet the main aim of art is to represent not the outward appearance of thing, but their inward significance; for this and not the external mannerism and detail; is their reality.

1.2.4.1 Theory of Catharsis

Aristotle gives nothing like theory of Catharsis; the word occurs in what service of the poets, once enigmatically in the definition of tragedy and once in an irrelevant context. He put Catharsis at the end of his definition, and that closing clause is his customary place for starting the purpose or goal of a thing. Moreover, in Politics VIII he speaks of the Catharsis that music and poetry bring, with the promise to say more in his work on poetry. And speaking pragmatically- the reader cannot ignore the quality of commentary that Catharsis has already inspired.

The function of art is Catharsis, purification; emotion accumulated in us under the pressure of social restraints, and liable to sudden issues in
unsocial and destructive action, are touched off and sludge away in the harmless firm of theoretical excitement; so tragedy “through pity and fear, effects the proper purgation of these emotions”.\textsuperscript{16}

Aristotle appears to equate the subsequent Catharsis with the essential tragic pleasure that pity and fear induce (Poetic). The text lends itself to more than once reading, or Catharsis was used in several different context before Aristotle, and those contexts started the word’s central meaning of a ‘cleaning’. Catharsis in a more rational context meant simply a clean-up or purgation of the emotions.

1.2.4.2 Mimesis

As the existence of the arts and technologies sprang from a shared human nature, Aristotle believed that these basic forms would also display similarities. Aristotle regarded the visual and dramatic arts as naturally mimetic, in some way representing something, whether in words, marble, or paint. He viewed the human interest in representation-picture, drama, poetry, statues-as an innate tending, and he was the first philosopher to attempt to argue, rather than simply assert, that:

“For it is an instinct of human begins from childhood to engage in imitation (indeed, this distinguishes them from other animals. Man is the most imitative of all, and it is through imitation that he develops his earliest understanding): and it is equally natural that everyone enjoys contemplating
the most precise image of things whose actual sight is painful to us, such as forms of the vilest animals and corpses”.

Aristotle’s frame of reference for generalization was specific to ancient Greek culture, but it is impossible to dispute the claim that children everywhere play in imitation of their elder, each other, even animals and machines. That such imaginative imitation appears to be a necessary, or at least normal, component in the enculturation of individuals. The other side of Aristotle’s mimetic naturalism holds that human beings everywhere enjoys to see, experience imitation; whether pictures, carvings, fictional narratives or play-acting. For him, the child’s fascination with a doll’s house with its tiny kitchen and table setting is not to be reduced to a desire for adult power, but in its imitative play is based in the instructive delight in representation as such.

Aristotle says, “Mimesis is natural to people from childhood”. He sees them as natural and pleasant propositions. Then he goes further. Mimesis is natural and pleasant because it is a way of learning, and human beings love to learn. Aristotelian mimesis capture something about acting and drawing, and in general the works that produce similarity to be discovered. A line drawing can show a thing’s contours better than the thing itself.

1.2.5 Medieval Aesthetics – God’s Beauty
Medieval aesthetics, much like medieval philosophy, remains peculiarly problematic and historically unavoidable as a consequence of its overriding concern with the conceptual relationship between creator and creation. Two leading figures of western Christian aesthetics, collected in a wide sense of ‘medieval’ are Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. Augustine offers the most ramified melding of Neo-Platonist philosophy and Christian doctrine that the western church achieved, and Aquinas the most ramified and authoritative melding of Aristotelian philosophy and Christian doctrine. The whole idea that the beauty of natural phenomena is rightly informed by God’s beauty— that is, that the beauty of complex particular things is informed by the individual beauty of God—is rather a pretty notion.

Augustinian treatment of symbolic beauty, like the interpretation of the sack of Rome in the city of God (1972), is certainly an expression of an impressive piety. But Augustine’s interpretive rule is committed to grasping the a historical indeed, the transcendent- truth of historical work and deeds; and that can hardly be compelling, even among Christians, in a world in which the corrective grasp of God’s beauty (or Goddess of Truth) is not entirely transparent.

Aquinas’s aesthetic of beauty and theory of art have almost nothing in common with the aesthetics of our detailed interest in the fine art, for instance the interpretation of the Gothic Cathedral. By distinguishing the good and the beautiful as between the appetitive and the cognitive (or what
is pleasurable when perceived), he is able to treat the discrimination of the aesthetic as unique to man “only man delights in the beauty of sensuous things as such”.19

In any case beauty and its perception and the pleasure taken in the thing perceived (or in the perceiving of it) are keyed to the formal essence of the things in question. This helps to explain his remarks, “Beauty demands the fulfilment of three condition; the first is integrity, or perfection, of the thing, for what is defective is, in consequence, ugly, the second is proper proportion, or harmony; and the third is clarity - this thing which have glowing colour are said to be beautiful”.20 The recovery of medieval aesthetics as part of a general ethos cannot be adversely affected by these and Aquinas belongs to a small company of gifted discussions.

1.2.6 Kant on Aesthetics

Immanuel Kant’s seminal work, *The Critique of Judgment*, published in 1970, is generally regarded as the fundamental treatise in modern philosophical aesthetic. Until the 1780’s Kant did not consider what we know today as aesthetics to be a legitimate subject for philosophy. He denied the possibility of principles of taste, holding that our judgments about beauty are based simply on pleasure, and being entirely subjective is only fit topic for empirical studies.
To begin with, two important points that Kant makes in his third critique’ are (a) that the aesthetic is to be distinguished from the useful, and (b) that the beautiful is without a concept. The points add up to the view that works of art are not to be viewed as object of utility, and that such work do not admit of any predetermined rules. In respect of work of art Kant develops his view of ‘genius’ which according to him, “is a talent for producing that for which no definite rule can be given; and not an aptitude in the way of cleverness for what can be learned according to some rule; and that consequently originality must be its primary property”.

The beginning section of the critique of Judgment is titled the ‘analytic of the beautiful’ which Kant says consists in an analysis of “what is required in order to call an object beautiful”. It is divided in to four ‘Moments’ corresponding to the heading of the table of judgments in the Critique of Pure reason: quantity, quality, relation and modality.

1.2.6.1 Disinterested Pleasure

The first moment (quantity) of the ‘Analytic of the Beautiful’ concludes that in order to call an object beautiful one may judge it to be “the object of an entirely disinterested satisfaction or dissatisfaction”. Thus when beauty is affirmed of the object there is additional content to this affirmation, namely the ability of the object to provide satisfaction to those who judge it dis-interestingly.
He initiates with the observation that the judgement of taste is an aesthetic judgment, of which he contrasts with a cognitive judgement. In judging something to be beautiful, what is aware of (a painting, a building, a flower) is referred “back to the subject and to its feeling of life, under the name of the feeling of pleasure or displeasure”. Thus, commonly, judgments of taste are a subset of that type of judgments that says something is pleasing to apprehend; they are therefore subjective rather than objective judgments. Kant differentiate the pleasure in the beautiful from other pleasure, by appealing that it is not based on any interest, but is “a disinterested and free satisfaction; for no interests, either of sense or of reason, here forces our assent”.

1.2.6.2 Universal Pleasure

The second moment (quantity) begins to make this closer, although the concept text is difficult because Kant goes far beyond simply analysing the judgement of taste, and anticipates justifying its legitimacy as a class of judgments based on a priori principle. Its conclusion that “The beautiful is that which pleases universally without a concept”. He argues for his universality thesis in two ways, first through the concept of disinterestedness. If one believes that pleasure is finding something beautiful is not owing to any interest, than one naturally concludes that the pleasure does not depend on any private condition but “must be regarded as grounded on what he can presuppose in every other person… consequently
the judgement of taste, accompanied with the consciousness of separation from all interest, must claim validity for everyone”. Secondly, Kant appeals to semantic consideration: to say “This object is beautiful for me” is laughable, while it makes perfect sense to say “It is pleasant to me”… not only as regards the taste of the tongue, the palate, and the throat, but for whatever is pleasant to anyone’s eyes and ear.

1.2.6.3 The Form of Purposiveness

The third moment (relation) purports to explain what is being related to in the judgment that something is beautiful, the content of the judgment of taste. Kant concluded that it is the form of the purposiveness or finality of an object, insofar for this is perceived in it without any representation of a purpose or end.

1.2.6.4 Necessary Pleasure

The final moment of the ‘Analytic of the beautiful’ is that of modality. Kant concludes, “the beautiful is that which without any concept is cognized as the object of a necessary satisfaction”, since when we find something beautiful we think that everyone ought to give their approval and describe it as beautiful. He says, “necessity is exemplary”, ‘subjective’ and ‘conditional’ and based on a “ground that is common to all”.
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1.2.6.5 Natural Beauty

Kant’s first characterization of natural beauty in *The Critique of Judgement* begins with the remark: “natural beauty…. Brings with it purposiveness in it’s from by which the object seems to be, as it were, pre-adapted to our judgement, and thus constitutes in itself an object of satisfaction”.\(^{32}\) Here seems to think that beauty is the examples of the ‘purposiveness of form’ that he earlier claimed was the basis of pleasure understanding the judgement of taste. The second discussion of natural beauty is reflected in Kant’s doctrines of “free and dependent beauties”\(^{33}\) in that we do not consider their (reproductive) purpose in viewing them merely as to thesis from. When they please themselves, our Judgment of their beauty are pure. This contrasts with judgments that attribute beauty and on an object’s realization of ‘a concept of its perfection’, how good a thing is of its kind, for example “human beauty…the beauty of a horse, one building (be it church, palace, arsenal or summer home”\(^{34}\). He implies that in judging a building to be a beautiful church, we consider its form a dependent on the purpose a church serves, where as in judging it as free beauty, we either do not know or do not consider its purpose. Nature provides us with the most accessible example of free beauty.

1.2.6.6 Fine Art and Artistic Genius

“Nature is beautiful because it looks like art can only be called beautiful if we are conscious of it as art while yet it look like nature”.\(^{35}\) The
beautiful in nature appears as if it was designed, made in accordance with rule of art. Fine art differs from nature since it is the product of human freedom; it must appear spontaneous although rules may be followed precisely in producing it. Arts differ from science in requiring skill in addition to knowledge; it differs from handicraft since its production requires more than following rules, Kant’s aesthetic theory is systematic and comprehensive relating our expressive and judgements of natural beauty and art to basic epistemological, metaphysical and ethical concepts. His doctrine of artistic creativity becomes the corner stone of Romanticising Fine art is the art of the artistic genius. Who has “a talent for producing that for which no difficult rule can be given”, something original and exemplary which serves as a model for others. Kant’s treatment of the fine arts concludes with cursory analysis of the individuals, on attempt to classify the fine art in terms of their relative worth in terms of ability to express aesthetic ideas, stimulate mental activity, and promote culture.

Thus Kant clearly maintains that making a work of art does not involve following some pre-given rule or formula. Creativity in the region of fine Arts is an activity of the orders that, far from being in line with imitation, is autonomous in the sense of being independent of any rule. The creative artist must produce something original, the like of which has not been done before, a work that may be copied, but is capable of inspiring
other artist to create along the same line. In first place, art involves human skill or making by human effort. As he puts the matter “Where anything is called absolutely a work of art, to distinguish it from a natural product, then some work of man is always understood”.

1.2.7 Hegel on Art and Aesthetics

Hegel varied from Kant in several respects. In specific, he believed that human acquire their grasp of the world and of themselves not only through prosaic cognition but also through art and religion: they are always of discovering the world and ourselves, not simply ways of beautifying or sanctifying what we have already discovered. He believed too that our essential categories or thought develops over history. Thus Hegel is concerned not only with formal features of art but with its content or meaning. He sometimes presents art, religion and philosophy as progressively satisfactory ways of grasping the ‘absolute’ or the nature of things. Art grasps the absolute in sensory intuitions, religion in pictorial imagination (vorstellung – a mental image or idea produced by prior perception of an object, as in memory or imagination, rather than by actual perception), philosophy in concept of thought.

1.2.7.1 The Role of Art

Art serves the development of mind. Thus Hegel concerned with the beauty of art, not the beauty of nature. Nature is to be mastered and
redeemed by mind, not contemplated for its own sake: “the torch-thistle, which blooms for only one night withers in the wilds of the southern forests without having been admired, and these forests, jungle themselves of the most beautiful and luxuriant vegetation. rat and decay equally unchanged. But the work of art is not so naively self-centred; it is essentially a question, an address to the repressive breast, a call to the mind and spirit”.

Art plays a relevant role in the development from infancy to adulthood. The child decorates its body to mark it as its own. It draws pictures of itself, of other and its environment. It produces effects in the world to contemplate the results of its own activity. Art provides material for contemplation and reflection in a way that purposive activity does not. But Hegel is more interested in art and its role in the development of mind over history. Humans have produced art from the earliest time, and art has commonly been associated with religion.

1.2.7.2 The End of Art

Hegel seems to have said the end of arts. “The form of art has ceased to be the supreme need of the spirit. No matter how excellent we find the status of the Greek gods, no matter how we see God the Father, Christ, and Mary so estimable and perfectly portrayed: it is no help; we bow the knee no longer”.
Art reached its peak in ancient Greece, with a perfect coincidence of message and sensory medium that can never be recovered. Greek art is supremely ‘beautiful’ in a narrow sense of ‘beauty’. In a wide sense of ‘beauty’, in which the word covers all artistic value, particularly the truth and profundity of the message expressed, Christian art is more beautiful than Greek. But Christian art is not a full, or the best, expression of the Christian worldview. The art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is inferior to medieval, let alone Greek art. One reason is this, art, does not promote morality in the sense of making bad people good. If this were its purpose, art would not be valuable for its own sake, but a means to an end which might be better served by others means. But art express and conforms, the on-going social morality or ‘ethical life’- the customs, codes, hierarchies, and festival - of the society it serves.

Occasionally, however, Hegel suggests, “the decline of art is a cyclical phenomenon, not its final end: in the case of every people when art points beyond itself”.

The suggestion that art had by his term done everything that art could do is invalidated by the art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in particular by new arts such as films, but Hegel’s thesis of the end of arts as significant vehicles of the human spirit is less easy to refute. He presents us with a dilemma. Either art has a serious message or it is entertainment. In either case art is disposable. Art may be
entertaining; but we have other ways of entertaining ourselves; in any case entertainment is trivial.

1.2.8 Nietzsche’s Concept of Aesthetics

In Nietzsche’s thought the relation between the ethical and the aesthetic remains good deal were stable than the relation between metaphysical and the aesthetic. As he notes in the mere reliable passage from the ‘attempt of self-criticism’ (Nietzsche, 1967 a, 1886), the birth of tragedy already set out to ‘tackle’ art in the perspective of life. To tackle art in the perspective of life, then is to seek to understand art as a particularly immediate index of the psychological economy, whether cultural or individual, that gave rise to it. He says, “regarding all aesthetic value I now avail myself of this main distinction: I ask in every instance is it hunger or superabundance that has become creative”.41

In order to understand what actually Nietzsche means by saying this, we have to look in to another passage, “what does all art do? Does it no praise? Does it not glorify? Does it not select? Does it not highlights? By doing all this it strengthens or weakens certain valuation… is this no more than an identical? An accident? Something in which this instinct of the artist has no part whether? Or is it not rather the prerequisite for the artistic being an artist at all… is his basic instinct directed towards art, or is it not rather directed towards the meaning of art, which is life?”42
Nietzsche’s later philosophy is engaged to the possibility of an affirmative evaluative stance towards life as lived in the real, non-metaphysical world of experience, embodiment and temporality. The artistry of self-realization then takes two forms, the first is transformative. Through the addition and removal of ‘second’ and ‘original’ nature the very materials of the characters are forced in to an aesthetic unity. The second is interpretive.

1.2.9 Formalism

According to formalism art work may be concerned with religious or political theme, moral education, philosophical world view, or material emotion. But so are many other things. Definitely, many other things, including sermons, pamphlets, newspaper editorials, and philosophical treatises generally do a better job of conveying cognitive and moral information and emotional cognition than does art. According to formalism, the really primary function of exhibiting significant form is a necessary condition for art status. But this cannot be right. Many of our greatest works of art were produced with patently different primary intentions, such as many military monuments whose primary function were to commemorate great victories.
1.2.10 Pragmatisms

One of the central features of Dewey’s aesthetics is its naturalism. Dewey aims at “recovering the continuity of aesthetic experience with normal procedure of living”. Aesthetic understanding must start with and never forget the roots of art and beauty in the ‘basic vital functions’, “‘the biological common places’ men share with ‘bird and beast’”. For him, all art is the product of interaction between the living organisms and its environment, an undergoing and a doing which involves a reorganization of energies, actions, and materials. Though human art have become mere spiritualized, “the organic substratum remains as the quickening and deep foundation, the sustaining source of the emotional energies of art which make it so enhancive to life”.

For Dewey, the aesthetic experience is the “experience in which the whole creative is alive”. “To aesthetic experience, than the philosophers must go to understand what experience is”. While he saw art as the qualitative measure of any society, analytic philosophers saw science as the ideal and paradigm of human achievement. He tries to deconstruct the traditional privileging opposition of science over art not only by reversing the privilege but by denying there is any rigid dichotomy or opposition between the two. He insists that “‘science is an art’, for ‘aesthetic quality... may inhere in scientific work’ and both enterprises perform the some essential function of helping us order and cope with experience”.
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Dewey’s aesthetic naturalism aimed at “recovering the continuity of aesthetic experience with normal processes of living” is part of his attempt to break the sifting hold of “the compartmental conception of fine art”. His aesthetic of continuity and holism, however, not only undermines the art/science and art/life dichotomies; it insists on the fundamental continuity of a host of traditional binary notions and genre distinction whose long assumed oppositional contrast has structured so much of philosophical aesthetic: form/content, fine/practical art, high/popular, spatial/temporal art, artist/audience, to name but a few.

1.3 Theory of Justice

The whole world comes to this important conclusion that what really connects the theme of law, rights, liberty and equality (including fraternity or co-operation), is the element of justice. In every organised community the ideals of law, rights, liberty and equality have their values and there must be something to bring them together so that we may understand the idea of a well-ordered community. Notice that Justice “is the reconciler and synthesizer of political values: it is their union in an adjusted and integrated whole: it is, in Aristotle’s words ‘what answers to the whole of goodness…. being the exercise of goodness as a whole…. towards one’s neighbour”.

The term justice has been assigned different meaning by different people at different time and different places. Not only this, its implications vary from man to man on account of their varying interpretations. Second
the idea of justice is a dynamic affair. As such, its implication changes with
the passage of time. Thus what was justice in the past may be injustice in
the present and vice versa; it is also possible that the justice of today
becomes the injustice of tomorrow and vice versa. However the justice as a
concept of philosophy cannot stop with the provisional notions.

The Greek word translated ‘justice’ is *dikaiosume*. It has a wider
application than the English word ‘justice’; and many passages in Plato’s
writings will sound strange and will be misleading unless this is remarked.
We think of ‘justice’ and ‘injustice’ primarily as qualities displayed in the
exercise of a judicial or administrative function. The just judge, for
example, is a man who declares the law impartially; an unjust judge is one
who inflicts punishment otherwise than in accordance with the deserts of
the offender. But the Greek extended the term ‘injustice’ to the fault in the
offender which made him deserving of punishment.

The sophists admitted that justice, or morality was essential to the
existence of political society; but they denied that a man had to limit his
individual activities and submit to regulation of his desires if it were to be
possible for him to live socially with other men; but they denied that he
become a better man by doing so. The sophist, Transymachusheld similar
position in the discussion concerning the nature of justice in the Republic
which he lays down his famous definition “that justice is nothing else than
the interest of the stronger”.51
The notions and emotional state of justice may be two-fold or three-fold or even more fold, in accordance with different systems of values to which we respond positively at different time, or even simultaneously justice in the light of personal, ideas is, or at least may be, a barrel with several bottoms. In order to solve this predicament Brecht divides justice in two broad categories:

1. Traditional Justice: It accepts the fundamental institutions which constitute the basic of our daily life, take them for granted, does not question them. In so far as these institutions have been established by the positive law.

2. Trans-traditional justice: It detaches itself from the existing institutions, either in whole or in part, and criticise them according to principles which are taken from a trans-traditional scheme of evaluation.

The different forms of government makes laws democratically, aristocratically, tyrannical, with a view of their several interests; and these laws which are made by them for their own interests, are the justice which they deliver to their subjects, and him who transgresses them they punish as a breaker of the law and unjust. And that is what means when say that in all state there is some principle of justice, which is the interest of the government; and as the government must be supposed to have power, the
only reasonable conclusion is, that everywhere there is one principle of justice, which is the interest of the stronger.

The best example of a philosophical interpretation of this term in the history of western political thought is, however, Plato’s theory of justice as contained in his *Republic*. Here justice has a purely metaphysical connotation implying a life of people conforming to rule of functional speculation. The original principle underlying it is that one man should practice one thing only and a thing to which his nature is best adopts it. Plato stresses the point that each individual should be put to the use of for which nature ‘intended him, one to one work and them everyman would do his own business, and the one and not many’.

1.3.1 Human Virtue; Bond with the State

It is Plato’s doctrine that justice as part of human virtue. This doctrine will appear less like a platitude if we perform on the term ‘virtue’, the same operation which was necessary with ‘justice’ and restore to it the meaning which it bore in Greek. Justice is for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond which joins men together in states. It is an identical quality which makes man good and fundamental principle of Plato’s political philosophy.

In *Republic*, Plato speaks about the concept of justice by connecting it with the life. He even speaks of an ‘art of justice’. He accepted Socrates
belief that there should be an art of living, analogous to the craftsman’s
knowledge and subsequent capacity to achieve a purposed end. A builder,
building a house, knows what he is setting out to do and how to do it: he
can account for all his actions as contributing to his end. The knowledge
and ability to constitute the craft embodied in the builder and his special
excellence or ‘virtue’, qua builders, similarly a man can live well only if he
knows clearly what is the end of life, real value, and how they are to be
attained. This knowledge is the moral virtue of man, qua man and
constitutes the art of living. If a man imagines that the end of life is to gain
wealth or power, which is valueless in them, all his actions will be
misdirected.

When Thrasymachus asked that, is ‘Justice as the interest of the
stronger’.

Plato hold that justice or right is nothing but the name given by the
men actually holding power in any state to any actions they enjoin by law
upon their subject; and that all their laws are formed to promote their own
personal or class interest. ‘Just’ accordingly means what is for the interest
of the stronger, ruling party. Right and wrong have no other meaning at all.

In his opinion, “In every cause the laws are made by the ruling party
in its own interest; a democracy makes democratic law, a despot autocratic
ones, and so on. By making these laws they define as ‘right’ for their
subject whether is for their own interest and they call anyone who breaks them a ‘wrong doer’ and punish him accordingly. That is what I mean is; in all state alike ‘right’ has the same meaning, namely what is for the interest of the party established in power, and that is the strongest. So the sound conclusion is that what is ‘right’ is the same everywhere: the interest of the stronger party”.52

According to Plato, a just man is a man in just the right place, doing his best and giving the full equivalent of what he receives. A society of just men would be therefore a highly harmonious and efficient group: for every element would be in its place, fulfilling its appropriate function like the pieces in a perfect orchestra. Justice in society would be like that harmony of relationship whereby the plants are held together in their orderly movement. And in individual too, justice is effective co-ordination, the harmonious functioning of the element in man, each in its fit place and each making it co-operative contribution to behaviour. Every individual is a cosmos or a chaos of desires, emotions and ideas: let these fall in to harmony, and the individual services and succeeds. Plato replies to Thrasymachus and Callicles that, Justice is not mere strength, but harmonious strength- desires and men falling in to that order which constitute intelligence and organization; justice is not the right of the stronger, but the effective harmony of the whole.
Justice thus becomes another name for the principle of ‘proper stations. It indicates ‘doing your own work and not meddling with what belongs to others’. From this statement it may be understand that justice, as conceived by Plato, has both individual and social aspects. The highest good of both the individual and the society is conserved if we take it for granted that there is nothing better for a man than to do a work that he/she is best fitted to do, there is equally nothing better for the society than to see that each should be filling the station to which he is best entitled by the virtue of the special element of his personality. It follows that, as in the state, which is the analogue and product of man’s mind, there are three elements, so in the mind of each man there are parallel to them, and the source of their existence, three elements of reason, spirit and appetite. And as the justice of the state means that each of the three elements retains its place, so the justice of the individual means that reason, spirit and appetite, all keep their proper bounds.

1.3.1.1 State – An Ideal Society

According to Plato, The Republic would not require laws and state if all men were rational and virtuous. A virtuous man is governed by reason, and not by external law. There are several classes in society, in his opinion, “Those who received philosophical training represent reason and ought to be the ruling class. The warrior class represents the spirited element or will; their task is defiance; the agriculturists, artisans and merchants represent
the lower appetites; and have as their function the production of material
good”.53

In the Republic Plato makes an attempt to construct a new model of
ideal society. The states arise due to the inability of individual men to
satisfy their requirements without outside help. The need to procure food,
build house, make for the existence of farmers, artisans, merchants, etc.
they constitute the lower class of society and shoulder the burden of
providing the material goods.

In his ideal society Plato upholds the view that every individual
ought to have some occupation, which should be that to which his natural
capacity is best adapted. In his concept of state, Plato opposes private
property and monogamous marriage and recommends the common position
of wife and children. The other relevant recommendations are the exposure
of weak children, compulsory state education, education for the children,
education for women for war and government, censorship of work of art
and literature. The perfect state is divided in to three parts, like the soul of
man. There are the producers, the warriors, and the administrators. The
perfection however of the entire state - its ‘virtue’ is justice that every one
may get his right justice consists in these three classes having their proper
distribution of power, while at the same time everyone achieves his own
peculiar task. Therefore the rulers must have the highest culture and
wisdom, the warrior an undaunted devotion to duty, and the people an obedience which curbs the appetites.

1.3.1.2 Virtues of the State

In his Republic Plato speaks about his concept of state and its rulers and their qualities. The original aim in instituting an ideal state was to find justice exemplified on a larger scale than in the individual. Plato now asks wherein consist the wisdom, courage, temperance and justice of the state or in other world of the individual composing the state in their public capacity as citizens. Wisdom in the conduct of the state affairs will be the practical prudence or good counsel of the deliberative body. Only the philosophic ruler will possess the necessary insights in to what is good for the community as a whole. They will have right belief grounded on immediate knowledge of the meaning of goodness in all its forms.

The courage of the state will obviously be maintained in the fighting force. Socrates had defined courage as knowledge of what really is, or is not, to be feared and he had regarded it as an inseparable part of all virtue, which consists in knowing what this are really good or evil. If the only, real evil is moral evil, the poverty, suffering and the so-called evils that others can inflict on us, including death itself, are not to be feared, since, if they are met in the right spirit, they cannot make us more men. This knowledge only the philosophy rulers will possess to the full.
Temperance is, not as we might expect the peculiar virtue of the lowest order in the state. As self-mastery, it means the subordination of the lower element to the higher; but government must be with the willing consent of the government, and temperance will include the unanimous agreement of all classes as to who should rule and who obey. It is consequently like a harmony pervading and unity of all parts of the whole, a principle of solidarity. In the laws, which stress the harmonious union of different and complimentary elements, this virtue overshadows even justice.

Justice is the complimentary principle of differentiation, keeping the part distinct. It has been before us all through the constitution of the state since it first appeared on the economic level as the division of labour based on natural aptitude. In Republic Plato says, “Doing one’s own work’ now has the larger sense of conclusion on one’s peculiar duty or function in the community. This conception of ‘doing and possessing what properly belongs to one’s is wide enough to cover the justice of the law-courts, assuming to each man his due rights. Injustice will mean invasion and encroachment upon the rights and duties of others”.

1.3.2 Lawfulness and Fairness

The philosophical interpretation of justice takes an empirical direction at the hands of Aristotle who says that ‘Injustice are treated equally’. For Aristotle Justice is a virtue, implying a relation to others, for
it promotes the interests of somebody else, whether he will be a ruler or a simple-citizen. Justice is taken in two sense, lawfulness and fairness. Laws pronounce upon all subjects with a view to the interest of the community as a whole or of those who are its best or leading citizens whether in virtue or in any similar sense. That is all virtues are included in the notion of justice, only that in this case they are regarded form the standpoint of the general welfare. The term justice is also used in the more usual sense of giving each man his due. He says, “When men are friends they have no need of justice, while when they are just need friendships as well, and truest form of justice is thought to be a friendly quality”.

The philosophical interpretation of justice has taken an empirical distinction at the hands of Aristotle who says that ‘injustice arises when equals are treated unequally and also when unequal’s are treated equally’. The important implication of Aristotle’s explanation is that justice is either ‘destructive’ or ‘corrective’ the former requiring equal distinction among the equals, the latter applying wherein remedy for a wrong is provided. In Nicomachean Ethics Aristotle illustrates, “The justice of a master and that of a father are not the same as the justice of citizen, though they are like it; for there can be no injustice in the unqualified senses towards things that are one’s own, but a man’s chattel, and his child until reaches a certain age and setup for itself, are as it were part of himself (for which reason there
can be no injustice towards oneself). Therefore the injustice or injustice of citizen is not manifested in these relations”.

1.3.2.1 State is to Produce Good Citizens

For Aristotle Man is a social being, who can realize his true self only in society and the state. Families and village communities are prior to the state in time, but the state is good for the evolution of human life. Social life is the goal or end of human existence. The aim of state is to produce good citizens. Society is composed of individuals and the purpose of society is to enable the individual citizens to live a virtuous and happy life.

He insisted that the form of the ideal state depends on and can change with circumstances. Unlike Plato, Aristotle did not set forth a recipe for the ideal state. A state he said can be ruled properly by one person; but it can also be ruled properly by a few people or many. Even though Plato’s ideal state has no slaves, Aristotle held that some people are by nature suited for slavery, whereas others by nature are suited for freedom, even freemen are equals. Aristotle too regarded that the state as an organism, as a living thing. He thought that the state as living beings exists for some and for some purpose, and he believed, is to promote the good life for humans.

The constitution of the state must be adapted to the character and requirement of a people. It is just when it concerns equal rights on the people in so far as they are equal and unequal rights in so far as they are
unequal. Citizens differ in personal capability, in property qualification. The concept of freedom and justice demand that they be treated according to these differences.

There are good constitutions and bad ones; the monarchy, the aristocracy and the polity (a form in which the citizen are namely equal) being good form and the tyranny, oligarchy and democracy as bad. As the best state for his own time, Aristotle regards a city state in which only those are to be citizens whose positions of life and education quality than for government that is an aristocracy. He justifies slavery on the ground that it is a natural institution; it is just that foreigner, and they alone composed the slave-class in Greek-being inferior to Greeks, should not enjoy the same right as Greeks.

The notion of natural justice was mixed up with the myth of divine sanction with the advent of Christianity. What the Stoics and the Romans meant by ‘nature’ becomes ‘God’ to the Church Father. The result was that religious canons become handy instruments to distinguish between the just and unjust. St. Augustine linked up the idea of justice with the precepts of Christian religion. St. Thomas ruled that in case of the civil law was contrary to natural law, it was not binding on the ‘consciousness of the ruled’. In this way, theological basis ‘provided absolute ideal of justice at the beginning of society. It was also starting point of the inductive and inspirational ideal of justice. Later on, the scholastic philosophy and its
non-scholastic development were responsible for the growth of absolute and universal elements in justice. In other words it signified that nature ‘is not, in this context, a source of justice which is distinct from religion and from ethics: it is rather a combination and fusion of religion and ethics’.

The philosophical or metaphysical concept of justice reared a setback in the medium period of with the growth of ‘new learning’. The conversion of the idea of natural justice into ‘transcendental idealism’ is conceived by Immanuel Kant. The notion of natural justice, though quite abstract on account of its philosophical or metaphysical connotations, has been a source of inspiration to the man of liberal jurisprudence. The philosophical as well as natural theories of justice may, likewise, be accused of being too abstract to easily graft into the premise of positive jurisprudence.

1.3.3 Natural Theory: Justice as an Ultimate End

The natural theory of justice should be understood as an extension of the philosophical theory or this subject in that first pronounced by the stoics and then borrowed from them by the Roman lawyers, it treated justice as an ideal of absolute value whereby the right order could be established. What the stoics meant by nature was that the ruling principle in the universe was ‘reason’. Their idea of living in agreement with nature was therefore fundamentally a canon of living according to the norm which man ought to realize.
The idea was lent by the Roman lawyers who took justice as an ultimate end. The distinctive contribution of the Roman lawyers, however, lies in their integration of the idea of ‘natural justice’ with the positive law of the state. With result of that jus civile (civil law) and jus gentian (law of nations), as they called it, were insisted upon to be in conformity with the law of nature. According to the Digest “justice is a fixed and binding disposition to give to every man his right. The precepts of the law are as follows: to live honourably, to injure no one, to give to every man his own. Jurisprudence is knowledge of things, human and divine, the science of the just and unjust.”

1.3.4 Marxist Theory: Class Concept of Justice

Viewed from an ideological stand point, the idea of justice may be divided into two categories – liberal and Marxist. It takes justice in terms of law is pronounced by the state through its accredited government, including the organs of legislature, executive and judiciary. Moreover, justice is not mere performance according to law; it has an overriding effect two in case the administration of law leads to manifest injustice either due to violation of principles of natural justice or due to the exercise of unfettered conscience of the person administering justice.

Essentially the Marxist view of justice integrates the ideal of justice with the doctrine of class war. If the state is an instrument of exploitation and oppression by one class over another, naturally the systems of law and
justice are originally board up with it. According to the view, the laws are needed by the bourgeois class to keep itself in power by hook or crook. Obviously after the successful revolution, the whole system is changed. In the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat, laws are needed to affect the transformation of the bourgeois society into a socialist order.

1.3.5 Social Justice: Predominance of the Interest of the Community

Social justice relates to the balance between an individual’s right and social control ensuring the fulfilment of the legitimate expectations of the individual under the existing laws and to assure him benefits there under and protection in case of any violation or encroachment or his rights, consistent with the unity of notion and needs of the society. Certainly the idea of social justice requires the sacrifice of certain rights of an individual at the altar of, what is known, the general interest. However viewed in a broader perceptive the idea of social justice not only aims at the proper reconciliation of the interest of an individual with the over-all interest of the community or prevalence of the latter over the former in the event of any conflict. It also constitutes an essential part of the great complex of social change, for which something may have to be sacrificed for greater good.

It is evident that the notion of social justice is a very wide term that covers with its fold everything relating to the norm of ‘general interest’ ranging from the protection of the interests of the minorities to the
eradication of poverty and illiteracy. It not merely relates to the observance of the principle of equality before law and independence of judiciary, it also related to the eradication of massive social evils.

1.3.6 Justice as the Principle of Right Order

Justice in Indian philosophical thought has been identified with the *Dharma* having its English equivalent in the idea of ‘righteousness’. As such, it not merely implies what is covered under the word ‘religion’, it also implies all what comes within the fold of a righteous way of life. Dr. U. C. Sarkar refers to four senses in which the term ‘Dharma’ may be used: (1) It means religion in the category of theology. (2) It means virtue as opposed to vice in the category of ethics. (3) It means virtue in the category of jurisprudence. (4) It means duty in the category of action. Accordance to Hindu jurisprudence, *Dharmamaya*, meaning equality and justice, is given precedence over Dharma meaning law, whenever there is any conflict between the two. It prevails; generally speaking, there is no separation between law and religion as both are treated interchangeably.

As above mentioned, the concept of truth, justice and beauty are the three relevant areas where the notion of philosophy developed. It is never be limited in to philosophy, it give way to the new thinking and ideas about the society and its culture. Culture is actually a social practice by men and the community. So naturally the prevalent philosophy would effect and influence the culture in a great sense. Culture itself will become a
philosophy in its progress concerned. Socrates first questions the world with a new vision of approaching the prevalent truth and reality, Plato was his disciple with his new notion of state and its ethical justice and Aristotle with his materialization of ideas. It suggests that in an enquiry everything is relevant and everyone has a role to play whether it is philosophy or culture. So naturally we move to enquire the form of social knowledge or culture.
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