



## Editorial

*Tattva – Journal of Philosophy* seeks to facilitate critical study and in-depth reflection and analysis of issues, problems and concerns of human life, in order to further the directions and transformations human society needs to evolve into. It targets philosophers, educational institutions, research centres, social scientists, policy makers and any individual interested in and committed to human welfare. This issue brings together five articles that ask questions that engage with ontology of institutions and ideologies, criticism and its epistemological scope, metaphysical realities and contrariness of dual positions.

Tattva is one of the few journals that has remained committed to sharing philosophical reflections in current times. While addressing issues in varied sub-disciplines of Philosophy, the individual articles are connected by their shared anguish – the anguish of discrete, isolated existences, whether of conceptual entities, imagined beings, marginalised “others”, citizens, or plural voices, and the conception of harmony. Addressing concerns broadly classified under the sub-disciplines of metaphysics, ontology, ethics, and epistemology, this issue presents a dialectic of fragmented imaginations and possibilities of harmony.

Sahana Rajan, in *Fundamentality and Conditionality of Existence*, writes on how in metaphysics, fundamentality emerges as a central theme. The relation between part and whole, the role of the whole in compositions and the ontological significance of the parts become significant elements of analysis in her article. The paper attempts to show “the inadequacy of the object-oriented notion of conditionality by pointing out that the parts and wholes possess varying conditions of existence. By alleging that only the parts are ontologically significant is to conflate such conditions and neglect the spectrum of conditions which exist in our world. A proposal for a revised notion of compositionality in terms of structural relatedness is also put forward.”

Delfo C. Canceran writes on how Critique emerged as a modern construction during enlightenment. Enlightenment celebrated reason as a valid means of understanding, acknowledging, and

claiming authority and legitimacy in order to achieve their goal towards emancipation and sovereignty. There has been a debate regarding whether reason stands in contrast to tradition. The author argues that “to have legitimacy, the government and church must have passed the test of critique.” The article, *Critiquing critique* relies on ‘permanent critique’ conceived as a dynamic process that “opens space for alterity”. Extending the argument, the author argues that spaces need to be democratised for creation and alterity, thereby allowing the possibilities of spaces for transformation and inclusivity.

Simran Raina in the article, *Knowledge and Action in Non-Dualistic Vedānta: The Incongruity*, articulates her conceptual argument regarding the positions adopted by the non-dualistic Vedanta who insists on knowledge rather than action. Similarly, non-dualistic Vedānta understands that the individual is ignorant that the “Self is none other than the *Brahman* and gets involved in the chain of transmigration. Knowledge of the Self leads to liberation and for that nothing else is required”. The debate between non-dualistic Vedānta and Mimāmsā School of thought is presented through the central position – could knowledge be considered as mental action?

Sulagna Pal, in *Monism and Pluralism – A Conceptual Analysis of their Mutual Interactions within Discourses on Religion*, examines critically and specifically the debates around monism and pluralism within the field of religious discourses. More importantly, she provides a process to intervene in the debates that have ethical considerations.

In *Libertarian Paternalism or Paternalistic Welfarism – NUDGES Viewed through the Orwellian Looking Glass* by Jaison John, the conception of Libertarian Paternalism is critiqued through its connotative and denotative implications and rhetoric. More specifically, the State’s intervention, the curtailing of the right to choose under the garb of providing a worry-free simplistic lifestyle based on models of efficiency is critiqued using an analogical framework of George Orwell’s dystopian world.

We invite our readers to read, examine, and deliberate!

**Rolla Das**

Issue Editor