

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY  
PESHAWAR UNIVERSITY, PESHAWAR

*Dr. Intisar ul Haq*

It is an happy indication that we are gathered here to discuss the present and future of philosophy in Pakistan. We in general suffer from self-deception because of our once-upon-a-time glorious culture. Many of our people look to our glorious past as something ideal, fit for recapturing and imitating, something sacrosanct and something very especial. They forget that roots of our decadence also originate from this special era. Many of us look to our old scholars and mystics, to name a few: Al-Farabi, Ibn-i-Sina, Al-Ghazali, Shah Waliullah, as if they were acme of wisdom without looking at their historical perspective and relevancy to the present-day scientific culture. In philosophy it is all the more lamentable to get enamoured of them. One consequential intellectual drawback is that we fail to put in adequate efforts to study and appreciate present day philosophical problems with scientific background. It is urgent and important to remind always that we need to look to our philosophical past essentially as history, understanding the then prevalent conceptual framework and weltanschauung. If any nation's past is riddled in superstitions, idolatrous attachments, personality cults and hero-worshipping, should she go on sticking to it simply because it is her past? Certainly not ! With these remarks I proceed to present the ideas of the teachers of our Department.

Our department of philosophy is very fortunate to have four foreign Ph.D. teachers out of the existing five permanent teachers. I start with Dr. Ashraf Adeel (1954 - ) who has recently returned from the University of Hawaii USA., with his Ph.D. with

distinction on "*Underdetermination and Language : A Critique of Empiricist and Realist Views*". He worked under two well-known American logicians, I.M. Copi and Lary Landen. Although his special fields are Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Science, and Logic, he is quite competent in other divisions of philosophy like Ethics, Epistemology, Muslim Philosophy, History of Philosophy, Philosophy of Religion. He stood First Class First in his M.A. Philosophy at the University of Peshawar and to his great credit he obtained perfect grade point average in the course-work for his Ph.D. at the University of Hawaii USA. He has been teaching Philosophy at the University of Hawaii and has been delivering lectures on both philosophical and non-philosophical topics. He has been President of Khyber Union at Islamia College, Peshawar University during 1974-75 and has been President Muslim Students Association Hawaii U.S.A during 1984-86.

Dr. Adeel's dissertation falls in the area of contemporary Philosophy of Language and Science wherein he examines critically the views of W.C. Quine and Donald Davidson. He concentrates on Quine's thesis of underdetermination and its relationship with other Quinian positions. The thesis of underdetermination is the claim that alternative theories of the world can be constructed on the basis of the same empirical data. In other words, the given empirical data is not uniquely explainable by any one particular theory. Dr. Adeel points out that this is essentially the same claim as Duhem-Quine thesis of Robust Holism *which provides an argument for Quine's thesis of Indeterminacy of Translation*. According to Robust Holism, hypothesis in Science cannot be treated individually. This means that an hypothesis is always tested along with a lot of auxiliary assumptions. Thus, in the event of adverse evidence we can revise the hypothesis or some auxiliary assumption (s). Now, different revisions would lead to different and logically incompatible theories. Hence Robust Holism leads to saying that on the same evidence we can build logically incompatible alternate theories, that is, to Quine's thesis of under-determination. Dr. Adeel skillfully argues that this Quine's thesis is self-referentially incoherent, because the thesis itself cannot, on his grounds, have unique significance. Furthermore this thesis does not harmonize with Quine's Naturalism

and his Empiricism. Quine's Naturalism obliges us to hold that truth is not extra-theoretical, that truth relates to theories and assumptions. Again, his empiricism is linked with evidence i.e. with extra-theoretical entity and hence there is some unique determination. Now, his Naturalism and his Empiricism both together cannot harmonize with his Robust Holism. He must either give up naturalism or empiricism. But giving up empiricism undermines Quine's entire view of language which is empirical through and through.

Dr. Adeel points out that one consequence of incoherency of the thesis of under-determination leads to rejection of his thesis of indetermination of translation because the latter is just an instance of his thesis of under-determination and involves the same incoherence.

Dr. Adeel also distinguishes two varieties of Holism i.e. Minimal Holism and Trivial Holism and argues that neither of them is philosophically tenable. Minimal holism claims that individual hypotheses statements can be formulated (or make sense) only in the context of an overall theory and these hypotheses stand in a unique relationship with each other. Minimal holism is the same thesis as the thesis of incommensurability developed by Thomas Kuhn. The thesis amounts to the claim that individual hypotheses do not make sense outside their unique theoretical context. This means that two languages embodying two theories of the world would not be mutually translatable either partially or completely. Trivial holism is rejected simply because of its triviality: it wavers from one position to other.

In Part II of his dissertation Dr. Adeel discusses Davidson's Semantic Program, which is essentially Tarski's theory of levels of truth. But Davidson also insists that person's speech can be carried out only holistically. Dr. Adeel argues that Davidson's criterion of languagehood conflicts with the fundamental principles of Tarski style theories of truth. Tarski style theories of truth bar the complete translation of a metalanguage into its object - language. But Davidson's criterion of languagehood is translatability and there is no such thing as complete or partial failure of translation between

languages. Again Dr. Adeel points out that in order to avoid relativism which follows robust holism he expediently shifts to minimal holism. But the two types of holism conflict each other. Dr. Adeel also compares Kripke's interpretation of Wittgenstein's (later Wittgenstein) with Quine's thesis of under-determination. Dr. Adeel's criticism can profitably be applied to other philosophers like Kuhn and later Wittgenstein.

Dr. Adeel wrote papers on Wittgenstein's Tractatus, on Substitutional Quantification, on Dummett's Antirealism, on Kripke's Interpretation of Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations. I hope, they will soon be published in philosophical journals. He also writes literary criticism on Urdu Literature and is himself a poet in Urdu and English.

The next I want to take up is Dr. Khursheed Anwar . He did his M.A. Philosophy from our Department and after teaching philosophy at Government College Mardan he proceeded for higher studies in Belgium. He got his Ph.D. from the Free University of Brussel on the thesis entitled "Iqbal's Epistemology and His Concept of Ego". He says therein that Iqbal bases his epistemology on the Quran and admits the sources of knowledge as Sense-Perception, Reason and Religious Experience, and tries to harmonize all these categories. He regards that all these sources of knowledge taken together can lead us to ultimate reality. On the other hand, Iqbal distinguishes Intellect from Intuition – Dr. Khursheed calls the knowledge gained by former "Human No-Divine Knowledge" and the latter "Human Divine Knowledge". This distinction is made to emphasize that according to Iqbal intuition alone leads to ultimate reality and that reason alone cannot comprehend it. This is clear inconsistency in Iqbal's thought. Iqbal doubts the certainty in source of reason as was the case with Al-Ghazali, Hume and Kant.

Iqbal stresses that ego is a mental state based on sense, intellect and intuition (–intuition is called "Love" by Iqbal). Ordinary ego ascends higher and higher to attain perfection. The ego or conscious-

ness starts from mental states to sense-perception, to intellect, to intuition, to religious experience, to prophetic experience. But Iqbal fails to convince us how the gaps are filled up. Dr. Khursheed specially discusses Iqbal's concept of ego from the point of its perfection, its freedom and its immortality. Iqbal, being a staunch believer of Islam, adheres to the finality of prophethood. Now, is Iqbal's perfect ego equal to the ego of prophet Muhammad? If so, whither goes the finality of prophethood? Can a man attain the position of perfect ego? Related question emerges: Can ordinary ego become perfect ego without being specially graced by the superior power, God. Iqbal himself rejects cosmological argument on the ground of illegitimate concept of uncaused cause. Why is there then the perfection and why not have simply higher and higher stages of ego without perfection? Iqbal says that ego is always on the move but change and newness is not eternal and perfect.

Dr. Khursheed opines that Iqbal has failed to give a satisfactory account of freedom of will. If man's will is in the hands of Allah; how we men attain ego's perfection which implies freedom. Dr. Khursheed says that Iqbal holds that there are ego-sustaining acts and ego-dissolving acts. Personal immortality is not our right but by personal efforts our ego after death may 'survive' to have another life of higher ego. But Dr. Khursheed is against this view and says that the Quran says that resurrection and immortality are rights of human ego. For Dr. Iqbal hell and heaven are simply our mental states and not places. It is again the matter of levels of ego. Dr. Khursheed again points out that Iqbal holds that only a few who attain perfect ego become the vicegerent of God on earth. Dr. Khursheed is against this view and holds that verse of the Quran applies to every human being i.e. to all mankind. Thus Dr. Khursheed criticizes Iqbal's views on ego's perfectionism, on prophethood, on immortality, on special holy status of a few persons. Dr. Khursheed has written and published several articles e.g. Iqbal's Theory of Knowledge, Iqbal's Human Divine Knowledge, Iqbal's Ultimate Ego.

The next in my list comes Dr. Muhammad Saleem, who is Associate Professor at our Department. After doing M.A. Philosophy

(1963) in First Class First he joined the Department of Philosophy, University of Peshawar. He went abroad on East-West Scholarship and obtained his Ph.D. from the University of Hawaii (1980). Before doing his Ph.D. he enjoyed fellowship at Harvard University. Dr. Muhammad Saleem is interested in such philosophical fields as epistemology, ethics, socio-political and religious philosophy and philosophy of mind. His doctoral thesis was : "The Theory of Imagination in the Philosophy of David Hume". He points out that many philosophers have wrongly confined the role of imagination to Hume's epistemology; rather it covers all his philosophy and plays the fundamental role, and other faculties such as senses, memory and understanding or reason are dependent on it. He shows similarities of views of Hume and Kant on the theory of causation; rather Humean view is more plausible because it includes beasts as well. While examining the role of imagination in Hume's concept of self and self-identity he asserts, contrary to common view, that self is the centre and capital of his entire thought. Again, contrary to the traditional interpretations, he holds that Hume is not an hedonist, an utilitarian, an egoist or emotivist; rather Hume's moral philosophy (— of impartial spectator) tends towards absolutism and perfectionism. Hume unites both reason and sentiments, facts and values. In this connection he criticizes Ayer, Stevenson, Hare. Hume combines the role of self-love, benevolence, sympathy to ensure peace and happiness. He combines both moral sense and utilitarianism. In conclusion he remarks that Hume is a mitigated empiricist and mitigated sceptic in all spheres, whether morals, politics, religion or aesthetics, and cannot be forced into one-sided interpretation by his critics. Dr. Saleem has written several articles e.g. 'Ethical Justification of Family Planning' (— Islamic Studies 1969); 'Hume and Stevenson on Moral Language' (—Sectional Presidential Address at the Pakistan Philosophical Congress Session (1981); 'Hume and Self-Identity' (Journal of English Literary Club, English Department Peshawar University). Since his return with his Ph.D. from USA he is mostly busy with the practical religious side after current Islamic trends in the country and presently he is busy in writing a book on 'Islamic Theory of Knowledge'.

Now I come to myself. Well-knowingly that self-praise is no recommendation, I would cautiously and modestly state some facts and express some personal views. This is in fact the very soul and purpose of the present exercise. Dr. Intisar-ul-Haque is presently Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy, University of Peshawar. After doing his M.A. from the University of the Punjab he went to London University and after doing B.A. Honours there he joined the Department of Philosophy, University of Peshawar in 1962 and since then he is serving the same Department. While availing a research scholarship of the University of Edinburgh (U.K.) he completed his Ph.D. in 1966 on the Logical Paradoxes. He critically examines the views of Cantor, Poincare, Russell, Ramsey, Tarski, Brouwer etc. He argues that Russell's 'Vicious Circle' principle is not a logical principle or intuitively obvious, and it does not necessarily lead to meaninglessness, systematic ambiguity, or contradiction; it is just an ad-hoc device for avoiding contradiction in paradoxes. He regards that there cannot be an absolute distinction between "Syntactic" and "Semantic" paradoxes. All paradoxes are ultimately "Semantic" in the sense that some element of meaning is involved in them. From the study of some standard paradoxes he comes to conclude that the major fallacy in them is the "*dependence fallacy*" i.e. treating independently an entity which cannot by its inherent nature be treated independently. He argues that through semantic clarification paradoxes can be resolved. For instance, he does not accept for want of logical rigour the Cantor theorem that the set of all subsets of a set must have a higher cardinality. Likewise he does not accept Cantor's proofs for the indenumerability of real numbers by 'diagonal argument' or by argument from 'nested intervals'. But he offers his own for it. Dr. Intisar makes an important distinction between a natural language and a rigid formal system — one having an indenumerable number of sentences because sentences have contextual significance and the other having a denumerable number of formulae. And thus he resolves Richard's paradox. Through his researches he comes to distinguish between Universal Mathematics and Particular Mathematics and argues that former should be constructed step by step, with each step forward, well-argued and rigorously reasoned. Dr. Intisar thus concludes that so far only two

transfinite numbers viz denumerably infinite and other indenumerably infinite are well-reasoned-out and well-justified, and the theory of an infinite number of transfinite numbers, having higher ascending cardinality, is unjustified.

In his book "Percept and Object" Dr. Intisar discusses epistemological problems of perception, particularly those of perceptual object. The arguments which prove or suggest the non-existence of external object, theories of phenomenalism and neutral monism, are critically examined. The distinction between Sensation and Perception and Intensional Act and Intensional Object are brought into focus. It is concluded that we do not need sensations and perceptions in the sense of sense-data (— however vaguely used but distinct from external object) in order to be aware of physical objects: directly come into contact of them. Furthermore perceptions, whether real or hallucinatory, requiring intensional objects and scientific investigations can be of help to solve the perceptual riddles. In the article "The Person and Personal Identity" (— published in an American philosophical quarterly "Philosophical and Phenomenological Research' 1968) Dr. Intisar has argued against the concept of person in terms of pure soul as proposed by religious persons. The question of personal identity is closely linked with the question of what is a person and with the logical problems of individuation. The concept of disembodied ego suffers from the defects of Cartesian dualism and the criterion of spatio-temporal continuity for the reidentification of material bodies cannot be extended to it. The argument from analogy presupposes the knowledge of the existence of other egos rather than explain it. Personal identity solely in terms of bodily identity is also unacceptable for there is frequent disharmony between physical and mental characteristics. The concept of person integrates conceptually the abstracted bodily and mental characteristics. Therefrom its both "bodily" and "mental" identities follow. So for the individuation of a person the spatio-temporal continuity is necessary, but this does not mean that a person is only material. The body-mind dualism has also its roots in the unjustified concepts of space, time and matter. This last point has also been taken up in another article "Extra-sensory Perception and Religious Experience".



Modern researches have brought the "physical" nearer to the "spiritual" and vice versa, and the old problems arising out of old concepts of "physical", "mental", "time", "space" etc. either do not come up or take up a quite different shape. The parapsychical phenomena should be treated scientifically and still has no direct bearing on religion except that it would widen our weltanschauung. In another article "Time and Philosophy" McTaggart's arguments against motion have been refuted, Einstein's contributions have been recognized and it is argued that both rational and scientific approaches to the concept of time are essential. Incidentally the function of philosophy has been discussed to include "analytical philosophy" and to combine both rational and scientific methods to evolve major scientific principles. Philosophical analysis is defended even if no ulterior motive to create metaphysics is there. In the article "Dr. Iqbal's Approach to Religious Experience" the concept of mystic intuition as separate source of Knowledge is completely denied. In another book "Wittgenstein's Logical Mirror" the superiority of Wittgenstein's later views over his earlier ones have been highlighted. Earlier Wittgenstein's views on Proposition and Ideal Language based on the concept of Logical Forms and Picture Theory of Meaning have been critically examined, and his way from extensional to contextual view was appreciatively discussed. The key-concept that there cannot be precise definition of any concept (— against Socratic tradition which prevailed for over 2000 years) is recognized as the overriding feature of Wittgenstein's later philosophy. The concept of logical necessity and compulsion is discussed at length. The article "Wittgenstein on Number" (— published in an American philosophical quarterly 'International Philosophical Quarterly') brings home the point that numbers do not exist or subsist in some Platonic universe but have roots in nature, in our socio-anthropological history. Going beyond Wittgenstein the author argued that 'Logic' and 'Mathematics' have the same basic logical roots. In the book "Philosophy of Religion" (to be published soon) such topics as God, Intuition, Free-will have been critically discussed from logico-philosophical and analytical point of view. In several of his recent unpublished articles Dr. Intisar critically examines our socio-religious beliefs and structural set-up. He has taken the stand

that religious sentiments have been misdirected and misused for other ulterior socio-economic and political motives. He opines that our so-called religious Ulema have corrupted vision and thus corrupt the society religiously, morally, socially, economically and politically and we should not pay heed to them for the construction of glorious Pakistan. He opines that there is no "religious knowledge" as claimed by our religious clergymen and ulema as there is no magic, and not only our common innocent people but also university educated persons are misled into their trap of having some superior religious knowledge.

Dr. Intisar-ul-Haque has written many philosophical articles which have been published both in Pakistani and foreign philosophical journals. He has been Senior Alexander Von Humboldt Fellow in W. Germany and also a Senior Fulbright Fellow in USA. He was selected by UNESCO to represent Pakistan in Bangkok to present his Country Report on 'Teaching and Research in Philosophy' in 1983.

We have also Mr. Sher Wahab who joined our Department after obtaining first class first in M.A. Philosophy. I need to mention also here our old colleague Mrs Umme Kalsoom. She recently returned with her Master's Degree in Philosophy at the University of Hawaii, USA. She focussed her studies on Comparative Philosophy and Ethics. She wrote articles in Chinese and Indian Philosophies as well as in Islamic and Western Philosophy. In her paper 'Truth and Freedom in Spinoza's Ethics, she develops inter-dependence of Spinoza's concept of Truth and Freedom. She wrote articles e.g., on Moral Metaphysics of Ching - Yung and on Taoism, and Comparison Between Buddha's and Hume's Views on Causality. In her paper "On Nagel's Ethical Internalism" she argues for ethical internalism and shows that Nagel's position on altruism succeeds in ruling out ethical externalism. Ethical internalism is the view that presence of a motivation for acting morally is guaranteed by the truth of ethical proposition. Externalists hold that additional psychological sanction is required to motivate our compliance with moral laws.

I must mention another dedicated student of philosophy, Mian Muhammad Shah, who is presently Professor, Director and Dean of the Institute of Education. He did M.A. Philosophy from the Punjab University but later did M.A. in Education from the University of Illinois USA in 1966. He argues that soundness of philosophy is based on the soundness of its epistemological foundations. The title of his M.A. thesis is : 'A Comparative Analysis of the Philosophies of Education of John Dewy and H.S. Broudy'. The two philosophers of education represent two schools of educational thought viz Pragmatism and Realism respectively. Broudy is an advocate of classical form of realism which is traced back to Plato and Aristotle. While making a comparison Professor Mian points out that the differences in these two philosophers follow from their differences in epistemological standpoints. Professor Mian has also submitted his thesis entitled "Marxism and Instrumentalism" for his Ph.D. at the University of the Punjab. He observes that both Marxism and Instrumentalism owe to Heracleitus, and both are benefitted from the achievements of modern science and have adopted the very method of science. Both schools have been shown to be similar in their views regarding the nature of object known and how knowledge is conditioned by the attitude of knower, but dissimilar in making use of Hegelism. In his sectional presidential address entitled "Islamic Educational Policy" he discusses that God has given some knowledge to man. And knowledge given by the Quran appears to Heart (i.e. *Qalb*) and can only be transferred from Heart to Heart. This gives real conviction and practical wisdom. There are stages of Heart between perfect faith and perfect unfaith. There are hurdles to acquire knowledge – hurdles being our worldly selfish involvement. He regards prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) as the greatest teacher and through following his excellent examples we can attain knowledge. Only deed and character can impart knowledge from one Heart to another one. Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) got knowledge explicitly through the Quran and through implicit revelation i.e., through *Wahi Khafi* and *Jali*. So Professor Mian ultimately bases sources of knowledge in Quran and its interpretation in *Ahadis*, and through impartation of knowledge by Sufis. He rejects European Philosophy of satisfying basic desires and wants and goes beyond it to acquire religious elation.

Now I come to the last of my candidates for discussion, though not at all the last in merit. Mrs Azra Matin is associate professor of philosophy at Jinnah College for Women, University of Peshawar. She topped in M.A. Philosophy examination at the University of the Punjab in 1957 and since then she is teaching philosophy. She has been abroad in USA alongwith her husband serving Pakistani cultural interests. She has published ten articles of philosophical interests bearing on Ethics, Psychology, and Religion. In her article entitled "*Behaviour Causation and Divergent Conduct*" she differentiates three behavioural patterns viz. (a) following reason (b) moral deviants (c) ordinary folk with egocentric urges and lacking strong convictions. She concludes that despite all safeguard in the technique of experimental design, conclusive proof for causal relationship is hard to establish. Rather, man's daily decisions, both routine and strategic, are subject to his judgment, evaluation, reasoning and will and this lead to a strong sense of responsibility. In another article "Free Will" she points out that free will does not entail absence of uniformities. Factors like heredity, environment do not uniquely determine action. Man's awareness of freedom, reason, self-identity are guide in the art of living and leading a meaningful life. In her article "*Human Volition and Responsibility*" she further says that volitional ability is at the heart of responsibility and moral order. Responsibility diminishes where individual suffers from defect of reason or impairment of will and then he cannot distinguish between right and wrong. Conditioning influence, and moral education, exposure of ethically sound ideas and practical examples of virtuous people, do socially commit us to higher values and accountability. In the article "*Islamic Shaping of Human Conduct*" she discusses the problem of freedom from Muslim historical perspective. She takes the side of *Qadariya* against *Jabariya* and says that the Quran uses the word "*Taqdir* تقدیر" in three senses (a) will of God i.e. *Fitratullah* فطرت الله (b) consequences of free-will exercised by man (c) inevitable impact on our life resulting from the deeds of fellow-beings. In the first two senses *Taqdir* implies human freedom and responsibility. In her article "*Learned Self-direction*" she says that man's distinguishing mark is that he is self-governing and she suggests psychological means like rewarding and punishing, observing and imitating, upbringing and socializing to

make a man more and more self-directive. Same sort of remarks are made in her article "*Psychology of Volition*", while discussing the various opinions of psychological schools. In her sectional presidential address at the Pakistan Philosophical Congress session on '*Philosophy of Religion*' she takes the view that God is innate in us although about his exact nature we cannot say definitely. Our awareness of God's presence in the form of Supreme Being through our intuitive feeling and religious spiritual experiences of all ages certify our faith and commitment. The saintly experience is potentially present in all of us. 'There is Divine or God in man' and mystic experience is witness to it. Majority of us derive meaning, purpose and value from religion. In her article on '*Shah Abdul Latif Bhittai*' read at the session of Pakistan Philosophical Congress session she points out the heavenly origin of our soul and our soul's yearning to unite with God's Soul and thus to achieve religious Summum Bonum. In her article on "*Sayyid Ahmad Khan*" she points out that this great Muslim reformer had a deep common-sense and insight and approached the Quran from practical and common-sensical point of view for the improvement of Muslim nation particularly of the Muslims of the Indo-Pak subcontinent.

I have briefly sketched out the philosophical contributions made by our teachers connected with our University of Peshawar. This contribution is diverse: some of it relates to religion and ethics, some of it relates to the past Muslim thinkers and to Iqbal, some of it relates to modern activities in the field of logic and methodology of science, epistemology and metaphysics, analysis and analytical exercises pertaining to certain particular problems. All these fields and problems are interconnected and interwoven, and concepts of one field cannot independently survive. We need to take interest on all these fields. When we say that we need to evolve our own national outlook in philosophy, in one sense it is highly misleading. In one important sense there cannot be a Pakistani or Muslim Physics or Biology or Chemistry and likewise there cannot be Pakistani or Muslim Epistemology or metaphysics or philosophy of Logic or Methodology of sciences. They are universal matters. Present day

culture has to be supra-national, supra-racial, supra-territorial. Of course, when both in number and in quality, our researches in philosophy gain momentum we may be able to evolve a certain viewpoint or several viewpoints by mutual discussion, by learning from each other's thoughts. At present we are not rich qualitatively in our philosophical pursuits. Again I note with regret that the future of philosophy is not happy one, not only in Sarhad but throughout Pakistan. Voices are heard that philosophy is useless. If so, conclusion follows that it should wither out as astrology and magic. But I do not think so. It only means that our idea and direction of philosophy need change and improvement. In Pakistan, as it is obvious, every philosophy teacher at the departments and also at the different organizations have their own plans. But theirs are stray efforts and not properly directed. I particularly emphasize that we should devote much of our efforts to the teaching of philosophy of science, philosophy of different sciences, say, of biology or of physics, philosophy of analysis, logic, philosophy of religion particularly with reference to Islam. The trouble is that neither we have qualified staff for such an undertaking nor proper books on them. This is a general problem all over. For example, few among us can adequately throw light on the implications of relativity theory or on biological problems having philosophical significance. It will have to happen, though the process will take long time. In this connection we in Pakistan face particular difficulties where subjects are in general divided into Arts and Sciences. The fact is that philosophy cannot be regarded purely as an Art subject and a student without sufficient scientific orientation would fail to appreciate philosophy. For the sake of proper integration of knowledge, philosophy should be conjoined with most of the sets of subjects offered to the students.

Now I come to what is sometimes called Muslim Philosophy or Islamic Philosophy or Islamic Metaphysics or Islamic Ideology. Probably this is in general what is meant when we talk about developing our own philosophy. This matter pertains to our faith as well. Although what we learn and teach at the colleges and universities includes (the topics above mentioned) hardly one-sixth of the whole

syllabi, yet the impact of this is overriding because of attachment to our old cultural heritage and to our accepted faith. We read European philosophy but while tackling problems we stick to our old religious beliefs, to old, what are so-called, "Islamic Traditions". The maxim 'the old is gold' never so aptly applies as it does here! We want to wake up; but soon slumber under the toxic and intoxicating old traditional influences wittingly or unwittingly. The result is that we view present-day European philosophy with prejudiced glasses which do not fit to a 20th century man and which blur, twist and mar our clear vision and understanding. My recommendations in this connection are as follows :

I strongly recommend that we should concentrate our researches in the history of Muslim philosophy which have particularly anti-classical Greek thoughts. Again our faith in the Quran is that it is the word of God. We need appreciation and understanding of the Quran. But our meagre knowledge of Arabic comes in way. Again in this connection I must mention the name of Mr. Ghulam Ahmad Parvaiz, who is in some ways a rare phenomenon in the whole of Muslim world. Although he is not trained in philosophy but his writings have bearing on our thoughts on Islam and Muslim or Islamic philosophy. He asserts with sufficient relevant evidence and rational argumentations that the present translations or versions of understanding of the Quran are extremely misleading. For certain historical reasons and under foreign hostile influences soon after the emergence of Islam the Quran started to be understood and interpreted as ordinary 'religion' in the sense of matters of worship and other-worldliness. So priestly and mystic or sufistic classes emerged, which claimed to know the Quran in a proper and better way through certain study of the sayings of the prophet and through certain writings of earlier Muslim jurists and saints, or through certain mystic experiences etc. Thus Mr. Parvez says that these factors led to the misunderstanding of the Quran. He says that for understanding the Quran (the divine words) we need to understand the meaning of the words or idioms as prevalent during Muhammad's (peace be on him) own time. Secondly due to certain peculiarity of Arabic language, viz, from one root-word we may derive about 100 words, we are again on safer grounds to

determine the real meaning of the word. Thirdly words are usually repeated in the Quran and hence we may have access to the real meaning of the words by usage they are put to in various contexts. Fourthly, the Quran as it is recited has certain order (—not the chronological order of the revelation) and this guides us how one theme or words are connected with the others. The third and the fourth points lead us to the point that the Quran interprets or explains itself. Fifthly the meanings of the Quran becomes clearer with the advancement of knowledge or sciences. This means, other things remaining the same, that a person living a few centuries earlier could not understand the Quran better than a 20th century man or scientist. Both by inner appreciation of the Quranic words and by outer scientific knowledge we can understand the Quran. One consequence of Mr. Parvez's views is that the present Muslim priests or learned 'theologians' do not and cannot know the Quran and the real learned scholars of the Quran can only be learned scientists and philosophers of science etc. Priestly class thrive on the view that they have special knowledge other than knowledge derived from various social and natural sciences. Such a claim may be profitably compared to once-held 'magical' knowledge. As there is no special knowledge, priests thrive on the ignorance of the masses as magicians, astrologers, palmists used to. A scientist may obtain guidance from the Quran by thinking deep into the Quranic verses. For example, Mr. Parvez himself convincingly shows by quoting Quranic verses in favour of theory of biological evolution. In understanding the meanings of the Quran his books "Lughat-ul-Quran لغات القرآن" i.e. Dictionary of the Quranic words, "Mafhum-ul-Quran مفهوم القرآن" i.e. verse-wise meaning of the Quran, "Matalibul Furqan مطالب الفرقان" i.e. verse-wise explanation of the Quran are very relevant. But such an undertaking is really beyond the capacity of any single individual and some organization is needed for this task. Moreover this task is continuous process and with scientific advancements revisable. Next century may have better interpretation of the Quran. This task is more important than creating a metaphysics, because a Muslim cannot but base his metaphysical speculation on the Quran. Moreover this appears to be the only legitimate way for constructing a metaphysics. And the



proper appreciation of the Quran is impossible without the above task.

I have given some lines on which our concerted efforts should be directed. Unfortunately there is a great dearth of trained philosophers on the above lines. But I do hope certain compulsory education for certain section of students in Arabic and in different sciences will make the task easier for future Pakistani philosophers. I may once more emphasize that philosophical work makes a network and no branch of philosophy is independent of the other ones, and creating metaphysics is no exception: rather we need here more logic and analysis, more scientific knowledge and philosophy of science, more wisdom and ethical insight etc.

Towards this goal once I suggested to the then UGC Chairman, who presumably showed much interest in philosophy, that philosophy teachers and students should be sent abroad for higher training for specific purposes e.g. training in philosophy of science, in logic, and philosophy of logic. This will be of much more use than sending teachers on scholarship and fellowships for stray and un-directed courses. But it appeared that like other thoughts it went unheeded because, I think, our high-ups are more interested in persons rather than in actual work. With this last remark I end my report.

