

Academic Programmes held 2015-16

1st April 2015 – 31st March 2016

S.No.	Programme	Period	Resource Persons/Coordinator
1.	Seven Days Workshop on Advaita Siddhi	July 13 – 22, 2015	Rajaram Shukla, Prahaladachar, Mani Dravid
2.	Five Days Orientation on Research Methodology	August 31 to Sept. 4, 2015	Bindu Puri, Lourdunathan, Priydarshi Jetli, A.D.Sharma
3.	Makers of Modern Indian Philosophy series on “Prof. K.C. Bhattacharya” by Prof. N.N.Chakraborty	September 2, 2015	N.N.Chakraborty
4.	Three Days Symposium on Democracy & Education	September 14- 16, 2015	Rakesh Chandra
5.	Hindi Pakhawara राजभाषा हिन्दी पखवाड़ा	September 15- 30, 2015	
6.	Five Days Orientation on New Mental Turn in Philosophy	October 6 – 10, 2015	Amita Chatterjee, Madhuchhna Sen, R C Pradhan, Geeta Ramna
7.	Seven Days Workshop on Navya-Nyaya	Oct. 28 – Nov.3, 2015	P.K.Mukhopadhyaya G. Anjneya Shastri Navjyoti Singh, Ram Pujan,

			Ranjan Mukhopadhyaya, Ramesh Swaroop, Vishwanath Dhital
8.	Basic Course on “Sanskrit for Philosophy” Prof. V.N. Jha	Nov.23 – Dec.5, 2015	V.N.Jha, Ujjwla Jha
9.	Essay Competition – cum-Young Scholars’ Seminar on “The Idea of India”	January 18- 19,2016	Pradeep Gokhale, Oinam Bhagat, Rakesh Chandra
10.	Rajbhasha Sangosthi “क्या जनसंख्या बढ़ोतरी की समस्या का राजनीतिकरण उचित है?”	February 26, 2016	
11.	Rajbhasha Sangosthi “हिन्दी एक-सम्पर्क भाषा के रूप में”	March, 26, 2016	

Workshop on Reading *Advaitasiddhi*
(With special reference to *Prapancha-Mithyatvam*)
13-22 July, 2015

A ten days Workshop on Reading *Advaitasiddhi* was organized at the Academic Centre of ICPR, Lucknow from 13-22 July, 2015. Professor Raja Ram Shukla, BHU was the co-ordinator of this workshop. Professor Mani Dravid, Chennai and Professor Prahladachar, Bangalore were the resource persons along with Professor Rajaram Shukla. Around the various Universities/Colleges/Institutes various scholars participated in this workshop.

The workshop was focused upon the text “*Advait Siddhi*” and dealt various issues contained in it. In Indian philosophical tradition, polemical literature started with the polemics between Buddhist logicians and *Nyaya* logicians. Then, it spread to Vedanta and the other systems of Indian Philosophy. The *Advaita* Vedanta had to enter into polemics with *Nyaya*, *Samkhya* etc. before the advent of *Dvaita* school of Vedanta. The major concepts of *Advaita* Vedanta viz the concept of निर्गुणब्रह्मन्, अविद्या, अध्यास, जगन्मिथ्यात्व, भेदमिथ्यात्व, सत्तात्रैविध्य, प्रमाणानाम् अविद्यावद्विशयत्व etc. were not acceptable to the other systems of Indian Philosophy. They challenged these concepts and initiated polemics on these issues.

Shri Madhvacharya takes up the above *Advaita* concepts for a review and makes strong counter formulations on the basis of *Shruti*. With this background of the development of *Dvaita-Advaita* dialectics the rise of *Nyayamrita* of Shri Vyasatirtha marks the Himalayan highs of the *Dvaita-Advaita* polemics. The first important task achieved by *Nyayamrita* has been to bring together the scattered material on *Advaita* thought and put it in a systematic form. Right from *Padmapada* to *Chitsukha* different definitions of *Mithyatva*, *Ajnana*, *Adhyasa* etc. were proposed.

The concept of *Mithyatva* is very vital to *Advaita* since the doctrine of *Advaita* could be established only by pointing out the *Mithyatva* of *Dvaita*. Therefore, eminent *Advaita* writers have offered a number of definitions of *Mithyatva* and deduced a number of syllogistic arguments to prove *Mithyatva*. This workshop is organized with intention to conduct the line by line reading of *Mithyatva* portion of *Advaitasiddhi* and have a vital discussion from the various points of views.

Programme concluded with valedictory session in which participants shared their experience of the workshop and ended by Vote of Thanks given by Dr. Sushim Dubey, Programme Officer and In-Charge of Centre. Around 31 participants participated in the workshop.

ORIENTATION PROGRAMME ON RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

31ST AUGUST 2015- 4TH SEPTEMBER, 2015

Indian Council of Philosophical Research has been organizing seminars/workshops/conferences every year on various themes and topics to promote teaching and research in Philosophy. A five days Orientation Programme was organized for M.A., MPhil, & Ph.D Scholars on Research Methodology from 31st August- 4th September 2015 at ICPR Academic Center, Lucknow. The workshop aimed to orient postgraduate students and research scholars in methods of research that can be employed in the field of Philosophy and Social Sciences. The course endeavored to ensure interactions between participants and experts. The programme included guest lectures to help scholars familiarize themselves with critical uses and applications in research methodology. It aimed to synthesize deliberations on various components deemed essential in research.

RESOURCE PERSONS:

- 1.Prof.Bindu Puri-Delhi
- 2.Prof.Priyadarshi Jaitly –Mumbai
- 3.Prof.Lourdnathan- Madurai
- 4.Prof.Ambika Datta Sharma – Sagar

OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP:

The workshop intended to make scholars learn to:

- Understand some basic concepts of research and its methodologies
- Identify appropriate research topics
- Select and define appropriate research problem and parameters
- Prepare a project proposal
- Organize and conduct research in a more appropriate manner
- Write a research report and thesis

- Write a research proposal

WORKSHOP METHODOLOGY:

The workshop methodology included special guest lectures and discussions, written assignments, group and individual activities pertaining to research in philosophy and social sciences. Participants included representatives from various Universities and IITs across India and were mostly students of MA,,M.Phil and Ph.D. scholars working on varied areas in philosophy. Total 39 participants attended the programme.

INAUGURAL/OPENING REMARKS:

The programme was Inaugurated by Professor Rakesh Chandra who welcomed the guests (resource persons) Prof. Priyadarshi Jaitly and Prof Lourdunathan and all participants to the five-day workshop and shared with them the prestigious history of ICPR as being the only Council in the world to be funded by the State. While delivering the welcome address, he shared the objectives of the workshop and need for organizing the Workshop and asserted the need for quality research and appropriate skills and knowledge of relevant methodology. He mentioned that scholars possess analytical mind and skills but often lacked ability to formulate problems. He stated that the orientation programme was organized to address to the needs of research scholars and provide through illustrations, the trends and ways of research in philosophy and social sciences. Prof. Jaitly remarked that such a workshop would be beneficial to the students of MA, MPhil and Ph.D scholars for research.

Day 1

RESOURCE PERSON: Prof Lourdunathan

The first session of the workshop was on **Basic Research Methods in Social Sciences**, where **Prof. Lourdunathan** introduced participants to different kinds of research from purely academic to applied research. He also outlined the particular needs of research, areas of cross-learning and the suitability of various methods. Prof.Lourdunathan began the session by stating that Research Methodology may have some guidelines but it is the ability of the individual to ascertain a right approach towards his/her research. He affirmed his session to be an interactive one which would

engage sharing of ideas between the resource person and participants and engaged the participants in a set of activities.

Key features of the discussion: -

- i. What is meaning of the term 'Research'?
- ii. Research Methods in Social Sciences
- iii. Selection of Topic
- iv. What is Philosophical Analysis?
- v. Importance of Reading- Thematic Reading: three types- Preview, In-view and Review reading
- vi. Epistemic Tenability

Activity 1: As the first activity, he asked participants to sit in pairs and speak about their partner's research area and two major research problems in his/her topic. The participants carried on the activity with much enthusiasm. The purpose of such a task was, as stated by Prof. Lourdunathan was to enable a researcher to communicate to others his research area, theme and question.

Activity 2: The session continued with the discussion over the meaning and definition of the term 'Research'. He encouraged the participants to define research according to their own understanding in relation to their research topic. The participants were made to submit their write-ups which were later compiled and distributed as handouts to identify and record the key features of research. The discussion lead to the role and importance of text and context in research and how the two can be merged.

Activity 3 : What makes you a good researcher? The participants were made to rate themselves on a grade scale on the basis of their responses to 20 questions put forward relating to Research.

Activity 4: Research Explorable Features. This activity like the earlier one required the participants to rate themselves on a grade scale based on questions pertaining to their reading habits.

Activity 5: The participants were made to listen to the names of the participants present and recall their names in the correct order.

OUTCOME: the participants indulged in various activities which enabled them to build a better understanding of their research interests and also probe into their analytical skills.

General Recommendations of Day 1:

Based on discussions on issues related to research, the following ideas were recommended:

- research is an ongoing activity which may not be a repetition but can be a reproduction and reviewing of and recontextualizing the issue.
- there can be no singular definition of research. It is a continuous search and quest in form of questioning.
- Philosophy involves Conceptual cum contextual approach to study.
- Three types of reading- Preview, In-view and Review.

DAY 2:

Resource Person: Prof Lourdunathan

The session on the second day of the workshop commenced with discussion on different kinds of Research in Philosophy and the recent trends in Philosophical Research. Professor Lourdunathan drew attention of the scholars towards the three major paradigms of research in social sciences and philosophy-

- i. Positivism (scientific)
- ii. Interpretivism (anti-positivism)
- iii. Critical Theory/Post Modernism

A detailed discussion on Hermeneutics followed highlighting the key areas:

- i. What is Hermeneutics?
- ii. Traditional understanding of Hermeneutics
- iii. Modern understanding of Hermeneutics
- iv. Intentional/contextual theory of meaning

The post lunch session of the day was dedicated to issues relating to the Phenomenological method.

Key points of discussion were:

1. Phenomenology as a Method of Social Science Research

2. How Phenomenology stands against Positivist Objectivity
3. Phenomenology propels the idea of objectivity by positivism
4. Husserl's argument against the claim of objectivity of the positivist sciences.
5. Issues relating to Phenomenological research methods.

DAY 3:

RESOURCE PERSON: Prof Jaitly

Prof. Jaitly continued the next session on the **Selection of Topics in Research and What is Philosophical Analysis**. He discussed the typical issues and challenges of writing an academic paper.

Key points of discussion:

- i. How to write a research proposal?
- ii. Research in Philosophy and Social Sciences and the emerging trends in Interdisciplinary Research
- iii. How to formulate a research problem?
- iv. The publication of articles and their authenticity
- v. How to avoid Plagiarism ?

DAY 4:

RESOURCE PERSON :Prof.Ambika Datta Sharma

The fourth day of the workshop focused on Indian Philosophy and changes witnessed in research emerging in this area. Dr.Sushim Dubey and Prof. Rakesh Chandra warmly welcomed Prof. AmbikaDatta Sharma with a bouquet. Prof. Sharma stated that the main objective of the session was to discuss how one could do a philosophical research on Contemporary Indian Philosophy. He remarked that young scholarship has been severed from the traditional background of Indian Philosophy, classical as well as contemporary. He further stated that often scholars are misled in their research on works of philosophers like Aurobindo and Vivekananda as they end up paraphrasing instead of giving it a new dimension.

Key Points of discussion:

- i. Emerging trends in classical Indian philosophy and contemporary Indian Philosophy.
- ii. Growing problems of disconnect with Indian sources of research.

- iii. Need for course revisions and reviewing in colleges and universities to encourage and promote research in Indian philosophy.

RESOURCE PERSON: Prof. Priyadarshi Jaitly

The second half of the day was engaged by Prof.Jaitly who dealt with the problems related to writing of a research proposal and discussion on Research Areas in Logic and Western Philosophy.

Key Points of discussion:

- i. How to write a research proposal?
- ii. How to avoid plagiarism and maintain intellectual honesty
- iii. Differences between citations, footnotes, references and bibliography.
- iv. Consistency in style of references, correct use of words and grammar.
- v. History of Logic
- vi. History of Western Philosophy

General Recommendations of Day 4:

- i. Plagiarism should be avoided and references should be made where necessary acknowledging borrowed ideas.
- ii. Importance of the H index in publications

DAY 5:

The last day of the workshop began with Prof.Bindu Puri's lecture on Indian social and political Philosophy.

The key points of discussion were :

- i. Research Methodology in contemporary Indian social and political Philosophy- "Gandhi's Truth".
- ii. Research methodology in contemporary Indian social and political Philosophy- Debating Bilgrami.
- iii. Nature of research done in Social Sciences and Philosophy
- iv. Gandhi's concept of Truth
- v. How Bilgrami interpreted Gandhi's concept of truth?

VALEDICTORY SESSION :

The valedictory session held in the last day of Workshop. The resource persons and participants gave their suggestions and feedback on the five-day workshop. Prof.Rakesh

Chandra proposed the vote of thanks and expressed gratitude towards the resource persons and participants for their efforts in successful completion of the workshop. He thanked the Chairman of ICPR, Prof. Mrinal Miri for granting permission to hold this workshop and encouraging research activities. He further suggested that the universities, teachers and guides should encourage students to undertake research in philosophy. Dr. Sushim Dubey in his remarks expressed his appreciation on the successful completion of the workshop. He thanked to the authorities of ICPR and Professor M.P.Singh, Member Secretary, ICPR for their kind guidance. He opined that ICPR would conduct further workshops to assist scholars to indulge in erudite discussion on research and development in Philosophy.

SUMMARY /CLOSING REMARKS OF THE WORKSHOP:

The primary aim of the workshop was to provide scholars with insights and tools to conduct relevant research that would aid in contributing to the body of knowledge in various areas of philosophy and social sciences. The idea behind the workshop was to equip them with basics of research.

In various sessions over five days, the resource persons shared practical ideas and insights on a range of topics, from raising interesting research questions and setting research objectives to research methodology. The workshop also looked at ways to provide effective follow-up to strengthen collaboration between ICPR and potential researchers.

Around 38 participants participated in the Workshop.

Makers of Indian Philosophy Lecture Programme

Lecture on “Kalidas Bhattacharya” by

Professor N.N. Chakraborty

2nd September, 2015

ICPR Academic Centre organized a Lecture on Kalidas Bhattacharya on 2nd September, 2015 from 2.00 p.m. – 4.00 p.m. This lecture was part of the series of lectures “Makers Of Modern Indian Philosophy”. Lecture was delivered by Prof. N.N. Chakraborty from Rabindra Bharati University, Kolkata. The main objective of the lecture was to draw a discussion on the philosophical contribution of Kalidas Bhattacharya as Makers of Modern Indian Philosophy. Professor Chakraborty in his paper has discussed

elaborately about the life, works and contribution of Kalidas Bhattacharya. The key areas of deliberations in his lecture were: Nature of Philosophy according to Kalidas Bhattacharya. Professor Chakraborty further presented the views of Kalidas Bhattacharaya Philosophical contribution related to key issues like:

- i. Philosophy is the a priori discovery of the metaphysical structure
- ii. The notion of alternation to explain the bipolarity of any knowledge situation.
- iii. Disjunctive unity
- iv. Application of methodology of alternation to aspects of mental life- cognition, feeling and connotation.
- v. K.C.Bhattacharya's reconstruction of classical Indian Philosophical systems: Naturalists and Transcendentalists.

Programme was inaugurated on 2:00 p.m. by welcome note by Dr. Sushim Dubey, Programme Officer, ICPR Academic Centre, Lucknow introducing the invited speaker to the audience and welcoming all in lecture programme. Lecture Programme was chaired by Professor Rakesh Chandra. Professor Chandra elaborately commented on the paper of Professor Chakraborty indicating significant aspects and contribution of Kalidas Bhattacharya to the Modern Indian Philosophy. Question and Answer session followed after the Lecture by the participants. Programme ended by Vote of thanks by Dr. Sushim Dubey, Programme Officer and In-Charge of the Centre towards successful organization of the programme. Around 44 participants participated in the programme.

Symposium on “Democracy and Education”

14th – 16th September, 2015

A Symposium programme on Democracy and Education was held at ICPR Academic Centre during 14-16 September, 2015 under the co-ordinatorship of Professor Rakesh Chandra.

Democracy and Education are two of the most important issues of our living together as humans. As an increased space is taken by the market discourse how do we talk about the citizen as a knower in quest of a deepening self? Human beings are essentially and constitutively evaluational we see ourselves as bearers and creators of value and may see it as our responsibility to inculcate values in the future generations. Most liberal democracies have prioritized respect for plurality, tolerance, secularism,

equal respect for gender differences as fundamental. But though laws and constitutional provisions have favoured equality custom still seems to favour hierarchy. How do educational institutions respond to the state commitment to egalitarian values from primary to higher education? How is the state to be made answerable, accountable and obligated to create educational institutions without controlling them? From international history to our own local experience we have often emphasized that academic institutions need to nurture an independence of spirit which can come only in a free atmosphere where we study, analyze and interrogate prejudice. Some scholars argue that western university reflected the mind of the city while the Indian civilizational heritage was more associated with the forest. The sage was not interested in domination but in realizing and enlarging his consciousness by ground with and into the surroundings. Tagore creatively thought of an integrated free expansive education of rural urban, tribal non tribal engaged selves in close communion with nature. Debates on language and privileging of Modern Science and its instrumentalism have been often rehearsed in India from the time of Raja Ram Mohan Roy to the knowledge commission and we have academically always pronounced our respect for the local and the regional both in content and form. However the social prejudice continues to err in favour of English language, modern commerce of consumer manipulation and increasing technicized understanding of science. Education institutions are now graded in terms of the employability of their product and how well they are adjusted to the market. Large scale studies are conducted and projected to demonstrate the employment failure of our education system. Philosophers from Plato to John Dewey, Tagore, Radhakrishnan & Gandhi have thought about education.

Serious questions need to be asked about our concepts of education and democracy. How do we conceive our democracies- only as saying our ayes and Nayes to who our rulers shall be or taking charge of every aspect of our lives in dialogue and discussion? Are we aspiring for a market or a moral democracy? If our commitment is to create critically conscious socially responsible active citizens how do we conceive our educational institutions? How do we debate curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation budgets and outcomes? If education is not to be seen only as training and instrumentally as a means to economic development what are its terms of reference to accountability? How do we look at both autonomy & accountability of educational institutions?

India has as of now a very large system of education from primary to higher education with many challenges of inclusion. How do we address questions of plurality of language, culture, religion, region caste and class? There are critical areas to be addressed in terms of quality, quality and quantity. How should educational excellence include equity at all levels? This symposium proposes to share some of our learnings from philosophy, planning economics, education and other areas of practice and research to throw some light on the exciting debates on education and democracy. Discussions were focused on the following themes:

- Philosophy and Education
- Education for Democracy
- John Dewey & Plato's idea of Democracy & Education
- Democracy and Equality in Education
- India's primary education and inclusion
- Friere and Pedagogy of the oppressed
- Mother tongue and other languages in education
- History and contested identities in educational practice
- State funding and autonomy of education
- Gender, caste and class – inclusion, separation & integration
- Local & global experience of liberatory education
- Sciences and humanities – is there a contest?
- Private schools and universities – an opportunity on threat
- Politics of education & education of Politics
- Indian Cultural heritage – a pluralistic view
- Training & Education – a complementary view
- Higher Education a Humanist commitment.

Around 25 participants participated in the programme.

Five Days Orientation on New Mental Turn in Philosophy

6th – 10th October, 2015

The last two days of the orientation on 'New Mental Turn in Philosophy' comprised of sessions conducted by Prof. Amita Chatterji and Prof. R.C. Pradhan.

On October 9, Prof. Pradhan delivered a lecture on John McDowell's Mind and World. Calling the problem of how mind knows the world as the most perplexing in philosophy, Prof. Pradhan located McDowell's book in a Kantian tradition. He explained McDowell's concept of *space of reasons* and the role it plays in substantiating McDowell's larger metaphysical doctrine which requires two kinds of naturalism – one that can be known by scientific laws and another which explains how the space of reasons in the human mind comes to acquire or appropriate the world so that the world is always available to us in an interpretative way. By arguing for this McDowell distinguishes himself from reductive naturalists as well as non naturalists.

The second session on the same day involved Prof. Chatterji introducing the participants to Husserl's phenomenological method and how that has come to be increasingly adapted by contemporary naturalist researchers who are studying consciousness. Prof. Chatterji explained that the key problem in consciousness studies is the *explanatory gap* which exists between third person and first person understanding of the conscious experience. The *hard problem* of explaining the first person conscious experience, so called because we don't even know how to begin tackling the issue scientifically, can be fruitfully studied from a phenomenological perspective, which has developed a method independent of introspective as well as scientific accounts. By stressing on the common structure of our phenomenal experience, Prof. Chatterji stressed this method gives us an account of subjective experience, and not a subjective account of experience as has been alleged by some earlier analytical philosophers.

On the final day of the orientation, Prof. Pradhan used the first session to guide the participants through a tour of the various philosophical stances on the issue of realism. He explained metaphysical realism and the commitments it entails on the grounds of semantics, ethics etc. He then explained Putnam's idea of internal realism, and contrasted it with relativism as well as anti-realism. The session saw enthusiastic participation and many questions were asked, including on whether McDowell's advocacy of *re-enchanting* the world, to account for human attribution of meaning to the world, can result in losing some of the political and ethical benefits which have accrued from the Enlightenment tradition and the *disenchantment* it engendered.

In the second and final session, Prof. Chatterji spoke on embodied cognition and how it is radically different from Cartesian, computational and sandwich model views of cognition. She held the audience enraptured when she introduced the need for theories of embodied cognition by showing a series of drawings done by a blind child about how she perceives the world. This approach highlighted the extent to which our bodies guide our cognitive experience. On popular demand, Prof. Chatterji also spoke briefly about consciousness and self consciousness. On this she introduced the participants to false belief tests in psychology.

All sessions witnessed a lot of back and forth questions and answers between the participants and resource persons, and these interesting engagements seamlessly spilled over into the tea and lunch breaks where the resource persons freely mingled with the participants.

The Mentalistic Turn in Analytical Philosophy: Consciousness and language

Dr. Geeta Ramana (Handout)

1.1 Analyzing The Conscious Cogito

- A. The concept of mind understood as mental states in its relation to consciousness, self, problems of identity, language, rationality, action and its largely interdisciplinary setting.**
- B.** The turn initiated in 1990's by Francis Crick and Christof Koch's "Towards a Neurobiological Theory of Consciousness" also resulting in redrawing of lines between the conceptual and the empirical.
- They studied the neural basis of consciousness (using the black box method-manipulating the input variables while observing the output of the system)
 - Consciousness relating to some degree of complexity of any nervous system.
 - Language system (human) not essential for consciousness
 - Assuming that self-consciousness a special case of consciousness.

- Where (neocortex and paleocortex associated with olfactory system)
- Consciousness requiring neuronal activity and connected with 'special type of activity of perhaps a subset of neurons in the cortical system'.
- In neural terms binding means the temporarily correlated firing of the neurons involved. And this is done by using oscillations.
- Essential features of visual awareness mapped where the unity required 'takes the form of the relevant neurons firing together in semi synchrony, probably at a frequency in the 40-70 Hz range. That is, 40 Hz oscillations (variability 35-70).

C. What would count as criteria of consciousness to demarcate the domain of the conscious from the unconscious?

- **Ontological Difficulties:** (**Where** is consciousness or **What** is the locus of consciousness, **Who** can be conscious, McGinn-**How** 'water' of physical brain turns into 'wine' of consciousness, **Why** is there consciousness, what is its function) ;
- **Epistemological Difficulties:** How do I know about it?

D. Mapping the territory.

E. Disentangling Mind and Consciousness: Are all mental states conscious mental states?

In **one** sense of creature consciousness, it is a general property of beings that are 'not asleep' or 'knocked out'. As Rosenthal states, in the **first sense** 'we describe a person or other animal as being conscious if it is awake and if it at least some of its sensory systems are receptive in the way normal for a waking state'. In a **second more relational and transitive sense**, conscious phenomena are said to relate to an object. For instance, 'when a creature senses something or thinks *about* some object, we say that the creature is conscious of that thing' (Ibid.). In the **third sense**, we ascribe consciousness as a property of mental states such that it is possible to distinguish between mental states that are

conscious and mental states that are not conscious. (Rosenthal, 1993, "State Consciousness and Transitive Consciousness", 355-363)} .

F. The First Person and the Third Person Approach Towards Consciousness:

- **The First person** approach towards consciousness –consciousness as it ‘seems’, describing conscious experience in terms of how it is (qualitatively) for me.
- **The Third person** approach towards consciousness –consciousness is as consciousness ‘does’, publicly observable (quantitative) aspects of experience.

G. Explanatory Gap: (Joseph Levine in ‘Materialism and Qualia-The Explanatory Gap): We have no conception of our physical or functional nature that allows us to understand how it could explain our subjective experience.

H. Various Theories of Consciousness responding to the Gap: Identity, Functionalism, Naturalism, Transcendentalism and so on.

I.

1.2. Chalmers and Searle on the Problem of Consciousness

Chalmers: The legitimacy of the Ontological Question.

1. Distinction between the hard and the soft problem of consciousness.

Soft/ Easy problems explicable on computational or neural mechanisms and concern explanation of behavioural and cognitive functions.

For example: (See Facing up to the problem of consciousness, p. 618)

- The ability to discriminate, categorize and react to environmental stimuli.
- The integration of information by a cognitive system.
- The reportability of mental states.
- The ability of a system to access its own internal states.
- The focus of attention.
- The deliberate control of behavior

- The difference between wakefulness and sleep.

The hard problem is the problem of experience.

2. Consciousness resisting a materialist explanation: We see three arguments

A. Explanatory Argument :

1. Physical accounts explain almost structure and function.
2. Explaining structure and function does not suffice to explain consciousness.
3. No physical account can explain consciousness.

B. Conceivability Argument:

1. It is conceivable that there be zombies.
2. If it is conceivable that there be zombies, it is metaphysically possible that there be zombies.
3. If it is metaphysically possible that there be zombies, then consciousness is non physical.
4. Consciousness is non physical.

C. Knowledge Argument:

Frank Jackson's argument in 'What Mary did not know'. Mary the brilliant neuro scientist is an expert in colour vision. Brought up in a black and white room (or colour blind) and never experienced colour (red/green).

1. Mary knows all the physical facts.
2. Mary does not know all the facts.
3. The physical facts do not exhaust all the facts.

General argument based on this by Chalmers.

1. **There are truths about consciousness that are not deducible from physical truths.**
2. **If there are truths about consciousness that are not deducible from physical truths then materialism is false.**
3. **Materialism is false.**

Final Epistemological argument against Materialism.

- 1. There is an epistemic gap between physical and phenomenal truths.**
- 2. If there is an epistemic gap between physical and phenomenal truth, then there is an ontological gap and materialism is false.**
- 3. Materialism is false.**

Type A Materialism, Type B Materialism, Type C Materialism, Type D Dualism (Interactionism), Type E Epiphenomenalism considered to fall short of adequate explanatory power.

Chalmers preferring Type F Monism (Panprotopsychism) : Integrating phenomenal and physical properties.

- Consciousness is constituted by the intrinsic properties of fundamental entities which serve as the ultimate categorical bases of all physical causation.
- Phenomenal or protophenomenal properties underlie physical reality itself and are located at the fundamental level of physical reality. (Intrinsic properties of the physical world constitute protophenomenal properties).
- Nature consists of entities with intrinsic (proto) phenomenal qualities standing in causal relations within a space-time manifold.
- Phenomenal/ protophenomenal properties are ontologically fundamental and yet retains duality between structural –dispositional properties (those directly characterized in physical theory. If physical terms refer to underlying intrinsic properties then these can be seen as physical) and intrinsic protophenomenal properties (those responsible for consciousness).

“This view fits with the letter of materialism and shares the spirit of antimaterialism” (Chalmers).

- In its protophenomenal form we see a kind of neutral monism. There are underlying neutral properties (protophenomenal properties) such that they are simultaneously responsible for constituting the physical domain (by

their relations) and the phenomenal domains (by their collective intrinsic nature).

- **All in all Consciousness has a fundamental place in nature.**

Searle: The real problem is ontological. What real features exist in the world?

We need to understand what is required for an ontology of mental states. The actual ontology of mental states is a first person ontology that is irreducible.

(That is, there is always an 'I' - a first person that has these mental states.

Searle on the four features of the mental phenomena that seem impossible to fit in our scientific conception of the world and making the mind-body problem difficult to resolve.

1. Consciousness: Consciousness is an irreducible intrinsic feature of certain biological systems like that of humans. {Consciousness only when experienced and so consciousness and experience of consciousness same thing}
2. Intentionality: In general mental states have intrinsic intentionality. {Intentionality logically irreducible property; but probably ontologically reducible}
3. Subjectivity of mental states: A plain fact of biology.
4. Mental causation: Something mental makes a physical difference.

- **So, there are mental states; Some are conscious; Many have intentionality; All have subjectivity.**

Searle's solution in Biological Naturalism:

- Consciousness is a real (and emergent) property of the brain that can cause things to happen. Both are causally real. Brains cause minds.
- Mental phenomena are higher level features of lower level (neuronal) phenomena.
- All mental phenomena (conscious or unconscious) are caused by processes going on in the brain.

- Macro level and –Micro level analogy in Physics used to explain relation between mental and physical phenomena. Macro level surface features **caused** by behavior of elements at the micro level as well as **realized** in the system that is made up of micro elements. For example liquidity and solidity of water (higher level features) made up of lower level elements, molecules. Similarly consciousness a higher level feature caused by synapses, neuronal connections.
- Liquidity and Solidity not a feature of any single molecule. Similarly consciousness not a feature of any single neuron. So brains conscious not that this neuron in pain.
- So mind-body problem not solved; but not a mystery.

2.1. The Language of the Mental : Speech Acts

Language of the mental as a *primary* rather than a derivative of the physical, naturalistic or functional descriptions

A. Austin: Proposition /statements/sayings-constatives having truth value vs
Utterances /performatives-doings that lack truth value.

Basic unit of analysis an act (not a proposition)

Very soon realized that utterance **is** the act; saying **is** the doing.

And so all utterances as performatives and performatives can also have truth-value as in the issue of warnings.

Basic Model of Speech Acts

Locutionary : The act **of** saying something : The door is open.

Illocutionary: The **in** saying something: The train is coming. **(Force)**

Perlocutionary : By doing x I was also doing y : By making a joke I also managed to insult someone. (intentionally /unintentionally). **(Consequence)**

B. Grice: Intention based semantics

Distinction between 1. Natural meaning : ‘These spots mean measles’ or ‘Dark clouds mean rain’ . If A means that p, it follows that p

2. Non-natural meaning (Means_{NN}): Two rings of a bus means ‘stop’. (‘Three rings’ mean ‘don’t stop’. No entailment from A means that p to p. Conductor could be mistaken or Driver unable to read meaning off the rings.

Grice’s account of speaker meaning_{NN}: “A meant_{NN} is (roughly) equivalent to ‘A intended the utterance of x to produce some effect in an audience by means of the recognition of this intention’ and we may add that to ask what A meant is to ask for a specification of the intended effect”.

So not just intention of A to induce a belief in audience but also intend that B recognize the intention behind the utterance.

For Grice it is important to separate:

1. Meaning (what Φ means) –Sentence meaning (conventional)
2. What A said by uttering Φ on a given occasion. – Intention based semantics
3. What A meant by uttering Φ on a given occasion. – Intention - audience based semantics and pragmatics

We see divergence of saying (what words say or imply – that is meaning or semantics) and meaning (what **we** imply in uttering them- pragmatic effect

C. Searle:

1. **Indirect speech acts** which uses the Austinian basic model of speech acts and Grice’s cooperative principle to show how the speaker communicates to hearer more than what is actually said (by ways of relying on their mutually shared background information (linguistic & nonlinguistic) together with general powers of rationality and inference on part of the hearer).

- This is called illocutionary displacement where one illocutionary act is performed by another illocutionary act and called an indirect speech act.

For example: Can you reach the salt (Request)

I want you to do it (Order)

2. Distinction between Illocutionary acts and Performatives:

- How does the saying constitute the doing?
I can't make bread by saying 'I hereby make bread' (unlike 'I promise')
- Distinction between **implicit** performatives like 'I intend to come' and **explicit** performatives like 'I promise to come'.
- Only explicit performatives as speech acts having the force of declaratives, have a self guaranteeing character and in virtue of their literal meaning are statements with truth-values.
- They are not indirect speech acts.

1.3. A Unified theory of Language and Mind : Searle

A. Speech Acts have an articulated structure and linguistic phenomena deriving its intentionality from intentionality of mental states. Philosophy of language a branch of the philosophy of mind.

B. Intentionality as representation: The speech act model.

- That is, intentional states represent objects and states of affairs in the same sense of 'represent' that speech acts represent objects and states of affairs.
- Assertive class of speech acts (statements, descriptions, assertions) supposed to match an independently existing world and to that extent true/false.

Word-to World direction of fit. (If statement is false, fault of statement, not the world)

- Directive class of speech acts (orders, command, requests) and Commissive class of speech acts (promises, vows, pledges) are not supposed to match an independent existing reality but supposed to bring about changes in the world so that the world matches the propositional content of the speech act and to that extent obeyed/disobeyed, fulfilled, complied with, kept or broken.

World to Word direction of fit.(If promise broken, it is fault of the promiser).

- Direction of fit to indicate responsibility for fitting.

With respect to intentional states similar direction of fit.

- If my beliefs turn out to be wrong, my beliefs at fault and not the world.

Responsibility of belief to match up with the world. Beliefs like statements can be true or false and so there is a **mind to world fit direction of fit.**

- Desires and intentions cannot be true or false but can be complied with or fulfilled and can be said to have the **world to mind direction of fit.**

- Some intentional states may have the null direction of fit (sorrow, pleasure)

- The performance of the speech act is *ipso facto* an expression of the corresponding intentional state. If I make a statement p then I express a belief ; If I make a promise to do 'a' then I express an intention to do 'a'; If I apologise.....i express regret/sorrow); Of course possible to be insincere in the speech act.

- The notion of 'conditions of satisfaction' or 'conditions of success' apply to both speech acts and intentional states where there is a direction of fit. So statement true if and only if it is true and promise satisfied only if and only if it is kept.

C. Intentional mental phenomena are part of our biological life and history and like other biological phenomena are real intrinsic features of certain biological organisms. There are intrinsic mental states, some conscious, some unconscious, some intentional and some nonintentional.

- Logical structure of causal relations involving intentional states. The essential feature of **intentional causation** is that the intentional state itself functions causally in the production of its own conditions of satisfaction.

If I have a strong desire to drink a cup of coffee and I act on that desire so as to satisfy it, then the desire (that I drink a cup of coffee) causes the very state of affairs, that I drink a cup of coffee. Here the desire represents the very state of affairs that it causes. (The internal connection between reasons for actions and actions is just this).

- **In any explanation, propositional content of explanation specifies a cause. But in intentional explanation the cause specified is itself an intentional state with its own propositional content.**

- All states that are teleological have the world to mind direction of fit and the mind to world direction of causation. For example an animal is moving through tall grass. Explanation of behavior could be in terms of it its being, hungry, wants to eat and intends to follow the beast in order to kill/eat it. Its intentional states represent possible future states of affairs and are satisfied only if those states of affairs (**world to mind**) come to pass; and its behavior is an attempt to bring about those states of affairs (**mind to world direction of causation**).

A fact that human beings have desires and goals, intentions and purposes, aims and plans, and they play a causal role in the production of their behavior.

Around thirty participants participated in the workshop.

Seven Days Workshop on “*Navya-Nyaya*”

28th October - 3rd November, 2015

A seven days workshop was organized at ICPR Academic Centre, Lucknow on *Navya-Nyaya*. Professor P.K.Mukhopadhyaya was the Co-ordinator of this workshop.

This workshop was the third in a series of Workshops on *Navya-Nyaya* conducted by P.K.Mukhopadhyay on behalf of ICPR. The theme of the workshop was ‘The Theory and Practice of *Pariskara* in *Navyanyaya*’. It belongs to an advance area of *Navyanyaya* and it is quite technical and difficult.

In fact there were a number of related objectives to achieve and these determined the structure and content of the Workshop. In the first place there was need to emphasize that *Nyaya* does not mean just a few Sanskrit texts which are usually taught to the learners through little more than dead translation. The Workshop sought to establish and highlight that *Nyaya* is also and primarily a living traditions of philosophical thinking. The Workshop in words and deed demonstrated how *Navyanyaya* should be and could be approached philosophically and not merely textually. Secondly since text study is absolutely a necessary corrective to talks about *Nyaya* in vague generalities relevant portions of advanced *texts of Navyanyaya* was taught in the Workshop each day for one hour by Brahmachari Ramesh Swarupji, a traditional scholar of *Navyanyaya* who learnt the subject from the celebrated scholars like Visvanath Datar, when he latter was alive and thereafter from Pandit Vasista Tripathi, who is the senior most and the

greatest among the living Naiyayikas of Varanasi today,. Simultaneously each day there was provision for two hours of *lectures* in which *philosophical discussion* was conducted with reference to *Navyanyaya* literature in the original on different key concepts of *Navyanyaya* and examples of *Navyanyaya* analysis. The distinctive feature of this workshop has been that technical concepts and analytic entities were not discussed in isolation or at random as is found in extant and standard texts of the subject, but *as necessitated by the very nature of Nyaya on the one hand and by certain abiding philosophical problems and concerns of Nyaya philosophers*. Rarely this has been done in any extant text of *Nyaya* literature. In addition to this there was provision for one hour *discussion* both on lectures delivered and texts taught. Lastly three quarters of an hour every day was preserved for *presentation* by the participants. After lunch participants had one hour each day for library work. The general philosophical issues and concerns, against which the continuity and development of *Nyaya* from the earliest period to Late *Navyanyaya* days are to be understood, as well as introduction and use of *paribhasika* sabdas and *padarthas* were discussed. Some of the topics discussed are: ‘*Sarva samsayavada and Nyaya*’ (‘Skepticism and *Nyaya*’), ‘*Jnanatadvisayor paramarthikatvavada and Nyaya*’ (‘Realism and *Nyaya*’) etc. The specific *paribhasika* padas/arthas that were discussed included Definition of *samanya* as distinct from that of *jati*; defence of the *Navyanyaya* and *Vaiyakarana*) definition of *sambandha* (relation), *Paryapti sambandha* – its *svarupa* and *prayojana*; Definition of *Tadatmya* (*svasrayavrttitva svapratiyogvrittiva ubhaya sambandhena Bhedavistatanydharmaiva*), response to the objection of identifying *Visesatakyavisayata* and *samsargatakyavisayata*; Paradoxes like ‘the white hand is not white’ etc. and the problem of negative existential.

The second objective was to make it possible for the participants to hear and be acquainted with some of the greatest pundits and scholars working creatively in the field of *Navyanyaya*. On earlier occasions since the budgetary sanction was more and the duration of the Workshop was ten days and not seven days as it has been this time, we could invite as resource persons greater number of pundits and scholars and from more distant places like Bangalore or Madras. This time we could invite only five scholars three of them were Pundits from Varanasi. Ultimately however Vasista Tripathiji had to cancel his visit at the last moment when he met with an accident. However Professor of

Nyaya and the Dean of the Faculty of SVDV of BHU, Professor Anjaneya Sastri and Pundit Rampoojan Pandey, the Head of the Department of *Nyaya* of Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, delivered respectively the inaugural and Valedictory address. Both of them spoke on some technical aspects of *Navyanyaya*. It was also our purpose to acquaint the participants with some scholars of others fields as well as to demonstrate to them how we can enrich the discipline of *Nyaya* including *Navyanyaya* and *Vaisesika* through interdisciplinary collaboration at a higher level of research. We could secure the presence and talk of Professor Navjyoti Singh, the founder and Head of CEH of IIIT, Hyderabad, who is working in the field of the emerging new discipline of knowledge, Formal Ontology and is engaged in demonstrating the relevance *Vaisesika* insights and doctrines for this Ontology. Professor Ranajan Mukhopadhyay of Visvabharati University, *Santiniketan* spoke on the notion and operation of quantifier of modern logic and the notion of *avacchedakatva* of *Navyanyaya*. Professor Singh and Professor Ranajan Mukhopadhyay also coordinated the discussions during the discussion sessions and chaired the sessions in which participants made their Presentations. Contributions of all these four resource persons enriched the Workshop immensely. Even after day's schedule participants had opportunities of discussing with these scholars (particularly the last two scholars) and gained from acquaintance with them. Participants were so enthused by the teaching of Brahmacari Ramesh Svarup that many of them approached me with the request that ways may be found out so that they can learn from such scholars some original texts of *Navyanyaya*. Since the participants were not from the same background and their level of acquaintance with *Nyaya* was not the same the Workshop started by Power Point Presentation of an overall picture of *Nyaya*, *Vaisesika* and *Navyanyaya* by Dr. Visvanath Dhital of Varanasi.

Professor Mukhopadhyaya appreciated the participants for their valuable presentationsa namely Dr. Jaymaniky Sastri, Nitesh Dvivedi, Swati Bhattacharya, Govinda, Tusi, Tamoghna, and Dr. Shivani Sharma.

Around 21 participants participated in the Workshop.

Basic Course on “Sanskrit for Philosophy”

23rd November – 5th December, 2015

A eleven days Basic Course on “Sanskrit for Philosophy” was organized at ICPR Academic Centre, Lucknow. Professor V.N.Jha was the director of this workshop. Professor Ujjvala Jha was resource person along with Professor V.N.Jha.

The Workshop was focused on bridging this gap and facilitating the learners of Philosophy to have a direct access to the original texts on Philosophy in Indian traditions.

India has fortunately inherited a huge literature on Philosophy. But all this is available in Sanskrit language. Hence it is not easily accessible to the students, scholars and teachers of Philosophy. The learners, therefore, have to depend on the translations which have limitations, as we all know, in providing access to the original thoughts of the philosophers.

The Method Adopted

Here the **Direct method** of learning a language was adopted. This **Direct method** of learning language would prove to be more beneficial and attractive to learners of mature age, since the learners will be introduced to the philosophical thoughts and the structure of the Sanskrit language in which those thoughts are encoded simultaneously.

The Structure of Sanskrit Language

For introducing the structure of Sanskrit language to the learners, the Model of Description of Sanskrit by Panini had been kept as the base. The teachers teaching this course would see that the learners acquire the knowledge of this structure. The philosophers of language in Indian tradition developed arguments on the basis of the structure of Sanskrit language as described by Panini. This approach of learning Sanskrit language, therefore, automatically introduced the learners to the rich debate on philosophy of language advanced by Indian realists and idealists too.

Method of Instruction

Language Used to Grammatical Rules. Texts of different Philosophical systems were read in the class and grammatical rules were be pointed out.

Course Structure key areas were:

(A) Introduction to the Basic Structure of
Sanskrit Language : Sandhi (Arrangement of
Sanskrit sounds from micro-level to macro-level;

Orthography).

(B) The Structure of a Sanskrit Sentence as described by Panini : Syntactic structure; Active and Passive Construction.

Texts for Reading : portion of following were texts were taken into discussion.

1. Rigveda 1.1.1
2. Ishavasyopanishad
3. Sundarakanda of the Ramayana
4. The Gita : 15th Chapter
5. Patanjali Mahabhasya (Paspasahnika)
6. Tarkasangraha of Annambhatta
7. Karakachakra of Bhavananda
8. Pancatantra

Around 20 scholars participated in the workshop.

Essay Competition Cum Young Scholars' Seminar

“Idea of India”

18th -19th January, 2016

Essay Competition-Cum-Young Scholars' Seminar was organized by Indian Council of Philosophical Research at Its Academic Centre Lucknow. This programme is organized by inviting the entries from young scholars under the age group 25 years. Programme is opened for participation to all subjects' group scholars.

Every year's a topic is decided for the programme and this year topic was “*The Idea of India*”. Topic with brief of programme was circulated in various News Papers at national levels, by letters to the Registrar of the University and Head, Philosophy Departments.

Around 91 entries were received and scrutinized out of which 81 were sent for evaluations meeting the eligibility criterion, which was the first part of the programme.

Professor Oinam Bhagat (JNU) and Professor P. Gokhale (Varanasi) and Professor Rakesh Chandra (Lucknow) were the evaluators cum judge of the Programme.

Second phase of the programme was personal presentation by the Young scholars who were invited on 18-19 January 2016 at ICPR Academic Centre. Participants actively took part in giving their presentations and onward discussions on the theme.

As decided by Judges, following were the winners of the Programme: First prize (jointly shared) Ms Shambhavi Tripathi, Mr. Sandipan Mitra, Second Prize (jointly shared by) Mr. Aishwary Pratap Singh, Ms. Liza Shree Hazarika. Third Prize (Joint) Ms. Gurnoor Kaur Mutreja, Ms. Hamsini Hariharan.

Programme ended with the distribution of participation certificate to scholars, announcement of results and thanking the judges by Dr. Sushim Dubey Programme Officer and Centre In-charge of Academic Centre.

Vediography – Meet the Philosophers

14-16 December, 2016

RPC decision of 18.06.2015 and the last RPC's decision of Audio Visual Recordings of Living Philosophers Series were approved. As a first step, three distinguished Professors were short listed for interview programme. Professor Rajendra Prasad was one of them. Vediography of Professor Rajendra Prasad was organized by ICPR Academic Centre, Lucknow. Professor P.R. Bhat (Mumbai) and Professor P.K. Mohapatra (Bhubaneswar) interviewed Professor Rajendra Prasad.

Vediography programme was interactive and revolved around the various question regarding philosophy of Professor Rajendra Prasad like, How he look at Indian and Western Philosophy?; His view on Ethics in General like nature of ethics and ethical theory in general?; areas of applied ethics; logic i.e. Dharmakirti's theory of Inference; views on logic especially on Indian Logic, etc. Specific discussion were recorded on questions areas related with -

- Philosophy of Language,

- Some specific problems of Indian Ethics to be detailed like Purusartha: Moksa in particular, Nishkamakarma, Philosophy of Bhagavad Gita, Professional/Business ethics in Indian Philosophy.
- Some crucial concepts which scholars need to rework.
- Approach to tradition.

संक्षिप्त रिपोर्ट

राजभाषा हिन्दी पखवाडे का आयोजन भारतीय दार्शनिक अनुसंधान परिषद, नई दिल्ली मुख्यालय द्वारा जारी प्रस्तावित कार्यक्रम रूपरेखा के अनुसार संलग्नित परिणाम सहित दिनांक 15-9-2014 से 30-9-2014 के मध्य आयोजन किया गया । पखवाडे के दौरान विभिन्न प्रतियोगिताओं का आयोजन में अकादमिक केन्द्र के कर्मचारियों द्वारा सहभागिता की गई । कार्यक्रमों में आमंत्रित वक्ता एवं निर्णायक के रूप में प्रो० शिशिर कुमार पाण्डये, अध्यक्ष, हिन्दी विभाग एवं संकाय, राष्ट्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान, लखनऊ परिसर एवं प्रो० अवधेश कुमार चौबे तथा डा० पवन कुमार दीक्षित रहे । कार्यक्रम के आयोजन का प्रभार सुश्री प्रीति चन्द्रा एवं श्री आर० पी० सिंह द्वारा किया गया । संयोजन केन्द्र प्रभारी डा० सुशिम दुबे द्वारा किया गया । हिन्दी पखवाडे प्रतियोगिताओं में निम्नलिखित पुरस्कारों का वितरण हुआ :—

अहिन्दीभाषी सुलेख प्रतियोगिता

क०सं० प्रतिभागी का नाम श्रेणी धनराशि प्राप्त के हस्ताक्षर

1— श्रीमती रेचल जोसफ प्रथम 700

हिन्दी भाषी चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारियों की सुलेख प्रतियोगिता

1— श्री रामनक्षत्र प्रथम 500

श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला द्वितीय 300

2— श्री अषोक कु०तिवारी तृतीय 200

टिप्पण प्रतियोगिता

1— श्री पंकज रस्तोगी प्रथम 500

2— श्री कृष्ण कुमार द्वितीय 300

3— श्री अषोक कुमार तृतीय 200

अहिन्दीभाषी सुलेख प्रतियोगिता

क०सं० प्रतिभागी का नाम श्रेणी धनराशि प्राप्त के हस्ताक्षर

1— श्रीमती रेचल जोसफ प्रथम 700

हिन्दी भाषी चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारियों की सुलेख प्रतियोगिता

1— श्री रामनक्षत्र प्रथम 500

श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला द्वितीय 300

2— श्री अषोक कु०तिवारी तृतीय 200

टिप्पण प्रतियोगिता

1— श्री पंकज रस्तोगी प्रथम 500

2— श्री कृष्ण कुमार द्वितीय 300

3— श्री अषोक कुमार तृतीय 200

अस्नातक निबन्ध

1— श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला प्रथम 500

2— श्री रामनक्षत्र द्वितीय 300

3— श्री अषोक कु०तिवारी तृतीय 200

स्नातक निबन्ध

1— श्री पंकज रस्तोगी प्रथम 500

2— श्री कृष्ण कुमार द्वितीय 300

3— सुश्री रितिका विष्ट तृतीय 100

भारतीय दार्शनिक अनुसंधान परिषद
लखनऊ

४

शैक्षिक केन्द्र में आयोजित हिन्दी पखवाड़े में निम्नलिखित पुरस्कारों का वितरण हुआ :—

अहिन्दीभाषी सुलेख प्रतियोगिता

क०सं० प्रतिभागी का नाम श्रेणी धनराशिप्राप्त के हस्ताक्षर

1— श्रीमती रेचल जोसफ प्रथम 700

हिन्दी भाषी चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारियों की सुलेख प्रतियोगिता

1— श्री रामनक्षत्र प्रथम 500

श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला द्वितीय 300

2— श्री अशोक कु०तिवारी तृतीय 200

टिप्पण प्रतियोगिता

1— श्री पंकज रस्तोगी प्रथम 500

2— श्री कृष्ण कुमार द्वितीय 300

3— श्री अशोक कुमारतृतीय 200

अस्नातक निबन्ध

1— श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला प्रथम 500

2— श्री रामनक्षत्र द्वितीय 300

3— श्री अशोक कु०तिवारी तृतीय 200

स्नातक निबन्ध

1—	श्री पंकज रस्तोगी	प्रथम	500
2—	श्री कृष्ण कुमार	द्वितीय	300
3—	सुश्री रितिका विष्ट	तृतीय	100
4—	श्री घनष्याम	तृतीय	100

काव्य पाठ प्रतियोगिता

1—	श्री कृष्ण कुमार	प्रथम	250
2—	श्री पंकज रस्तोगी	प्रथम	250
3—	श्री सुरेश दत्तषुक्ला	द्वितीय	150
4—	श्रीमती तोपी	द्वितीय	150
5—	श्री अशोक कुमार	तृतीय	100
6—	श्री घनष्याम	तृतीय	100

वाद विवाद प्रतियोगिता

विपक्ष दल ब

1—	श्री कृष्ण कुमार	प्रति प्रतिभागी	रु0285—71
2—	श्री घनष्याम		
3—	श्री रामतिलक		2000 / —
4—	श्री एस0डी0षुक्ला		
5—	श्री तोपी		
6—	कु0 रितिका विष्ट		
7—	श्री मुकेश चन्द्र		

विपक्ष विजेता दल अ

1—	पंकज रस्तोगी	प्रति प्रतिभागी	रु0166—66
2—	श्री के0एन0मिश्रा		1000 / —

- 3- श्री सी०के०मिश्रा
- 4- श्री अषोक कुमार
- 5- श्री रामनक्षत्र
- 6- श्रीमती मुन्नी देवी

अन्ताक्षरी प्रतियोगिता

पक्ष अ प्रथम

- 1- श्री कृष्ण कुमार प्रति व्यक्ति 333-33
- 2- श्री रामनक्षत्र 2000/-
- 3- श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला
- 4- श्री के०एन०मिश्रा
- 5- श्री सी०के०मिश्रा
- 6- श्री रामतिलक

पक्ष ब द्वितीय

- 1- श्री पंकज रस्तोगी प्रति व्यक्ति 166-66
- 2- श्री घनश्याम 1000/-
- 3- श्रीमती तोपी
- 4- कु० रितिका विष्ट
- 5- श्री मुकेश चन्द्र
- 6- श्री अषोक कुमार

क्षणिकाए

- 1- श्री एस०डी०षुक्ला प्रथम 700

रिपोर्ट: राज भाषा संगोष्ठी

हिन्दी का स्वरूप सम्पर्क भाषा के रूप में का आयोजन मुख्यालय दिल्ली के वित्तीय सहमति बजट स्वीकृति एवं 30 मार्च 2015 के अन्दर आयोजन कराने के निर्देशानुसार दिनांक 26 मार्च 2015 के शैक्षिक केन्द्र में किया गया । संगोष्ठी के विषय पर शैक्षिक केन्द्र के अधिकारी एवं कर्मचारियों ने उत्साह पूर्वक सहभागिता की तथा अपने विचार प्रस्तुत किए संगोष्ठी में निर्णायक के रूप में प्रो० शिशिर कुमार पाण्डये, संकायध्यक्ष, हिन्दी विभाग, राष्ट्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान, लखनऊ परिसर से आमन्त्रित थे । कार्यक्रम की शुरुआत डा० सुशिम दुबे कार्यक्रम अधिकारी एवं केन्द्र प्रभारी द्वारा हिन्दी एक सम्पर्क भाषा पर विचार प्रस्तुत किया इसके उपरान्त प्रो० पाण्डये ने अपनी बात हिन्दी के स्वरूप एवं सम्पर्क भाषा पर बिस्तार से कही । उक्त संगोष्ठी में प्रथम द्वितीय एवं तृतीय पुरस्कार का वितरण क्रमशः इस प्रकार रहा

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---------|------------|
| 1— | श्री पंकज रस्तोगी | प्रथम | रु० 1000/— |
| 2— | कुमारी रितिका बिष्ट | द्वितीय | रु० 700/— |
| 3— | श्री कृष्ण कुमार | तृतीय | रु० 500/— |