

ACQUISITION OF SIMILARITY PREDICATES IN EARLY BILINGUALISM

Dr. Rukmini Bhaya Nair, IIT-Delhi, Visiting Professor at the Institute during August, 1993, delivered three lectures on the 'Mind, Maxims and Metaphor'. Dr Nair summarises her presentation as follows:

In his survey of research on metaphor, Ortony (1987) made two distinct points. First, that "most investigators agree that three year old children cannot understand metaphor"; and, second, that, "as a research strategy, the examination of similarity statements may be the best way to uncover the differences between the literal and the metaphorical". Using the classic Aristotelian research route suggested by Ortony, she had investigated data produced by three to six year-olds bilingual in English and Hindi. It is argued that metaphorical utterances corresponding to the prototypical adult figure of metaphor are indeed notably absent in the younger children's productions but that this is because children's metaphorical predications differ radically from adult predications in terms of their formal as well as pragmatic properties. The interactional criterion of corrigibility is applied to systematically distinguish between the 'pseudo-metaphors' of childhood, often instances of over-exertion, which have the form but not the force of metaphor, and the relatively rare 'true metaphors' based on perceptions of similarity. "Pseudo-puns" or malapropisms, which arise from

mishearing are likewise differentiated from the rare 'true metaphors' based on perceptions of similarity. "Pseudo-puns" or malapropisms, which arise from mishearing are likewise differentiated from the rare 'true pun' via corrigibility. In the realm of understanding, literal interpretations by children of frozen adult metaphors are related to their frequent production of unintended or 'pseudo puns' and metaphors. It is observed that literal interpretations, over-extensions (pseudo-metaphors) and malapropisms (pseudo-puns) are cluster of phenomena, that can be (a) operationally distinguished from their genuine counterparts using corrigibility as a rule-of-thumb (b) analysed as having broadly comparable developmental functions, characteristic of early perceptions of similarity; these phenomena are gradually replaced by different cognitive preferences in the categorization of aural, visual, tactile or olfactory likeness. Finally, it is noted that a bilingual environment during early childhood seems to facilitate rather than inhibit the use of metaphors and puns as a linguistic device to learn about the world.

DEVELOPMENT PARADIGMS

A series of lectures was delivered by Dr. Arun Ghosh in May 1993. What follows is a summary of these lectures.

Development economics may be stated to have begun with Adam Smith's pioneering work titled *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Though Smith's successors, in particular David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill, did not pursue the Smithian quest for enquiring into the causes of the growth of output and of a material welfare, Ricardo did focus on the causes of capital accumulation which, with the promotion of free trade, could lead to greater economic prosperity.

Karl Marx developed and combined the Ricardian labour theory of value with the Hegelian concept of the dialectical process of progress. Marx founded an entirely different school of thought where in the capitalist system — which initiated economic growth — ultimately paved the way to a transformation of the production and distribution system into a socialist form of organisation. It was partly as a refutation of Marx and partly as a

result of the Benthamite philosophy of 'utilitarianism' that the Jevonian Revolution in economic thought emerged in the 1870's, with its counterpart in Europe developed by Carl Menger, Bohm-Bawerk and Leon Walras. The Walrasian concept of general equilibrium marks the beginning of neo-classical economics, where in the study of economics is no longer concerned with economic development, but the optimum allocation of 'given' resources. It is essentially this concept, with diverse variations, which has informed economic thinking in the twentieth century.

Joseph Schumpeter stands somewhat alone, as a colossus, with his concept that 'innovation', leading to 'Creative Destruction' leads to economic development, which is necessarily cyclical.

John Maynard Keynes questioned the classical theory insofar as the

equilibrating effect of the interest rate and of wage rates is concerned, the classical theory emphasising that changes in their prices necessarily bring about an optimal allocation of all resources. More than Keynes — who was concerned primarily with short-run problems — Michal Kalecki extended and developed Keynesian theory to indicate that sustained economic growth could be achieved (both in a capitalist as well as a socialist framework), with macro-economic stability, full employment and a production pattern calculated to meet mass demand. For many developing countries, agrarian development was to be the starting point of such a process.

After the second World War, many neo-classical economists have sought to find explanations for the diverse levels of economic development observed in different countries; and have sought to find diverse solutions for different countries, though

all of them within the capitalistic framework of social organisation and as an extension of neo-classical economics.

The experience of four countries (in forging economic development) after the second world war — namely, South Korea, Taiwan, Peoples Republic of China and India — is briefly discussed. It is contended that for India, with a large (under developed) agrarian population, the solution to the problem of economic development cannot be found within the framework of neo-classical economics as it has developed of late, but with macro-economic balance and stability, coupled with a fundamentalisation of both economic decision making — for rural development — and for the Indian polity... with a thrust for agrarian development, and a Kaleckian programme of production calculated to provide both full employment and production geared to meet mass demand.

ORGANISATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

(24-26 October 1994)

The Indian Institute of Advanced Study proposes to hold a Seminar in connection with its project *Socio-Religious Movements and Cultural Networks in Indian Civilization*. Without ignoring the ideological aspects of religious movements, on which considerable work has been done in the past half a century, this project seeks to break fresh ground by posing 'sociological' questions about individuals and communities drawn into the movements like the Shaiva and Vaishnava Bhakti in the South, the movements initiated by Chaitanya, Vallabhacharya, Kabir, Guru Nanak and Dadu, and the work of the Sufi Orders like the Chishti and the Naqshbandi. To study the working of religious movements in tangible terms, one can turn to important centres of spiritual and cultural congregation, like Tirupati, Madurai, Puri, Mathura and Varanasi, or the Sufi centres, like Ajmer, Gulbarga and Delhi, or the centres of Sikh pilgrimage, like Amritsar. The centres and the movements mentioned here are only illustrative and not exhaustive. With the broad objectives of the project in view, a Seminar on the "Social Dimensions of Religious Movements" was held at the Institute in May 1993, and now we propose to hold a Seminar on the organizational and institutional aspects of religious movements.

Every religious movement, from the outset, is marked by a peculiar mode of worship linked directly

with its ideology. Sooner or later, this mode of worship is institutionalised. With the passage of time, such institutions may proliferate and also get modified in more or less significant ways. This institutionalization and proliferation cannot take place without some kind of organisation. Furthermore, it becomes necessary to meet the needs of large congregations of followers and visitors on 'auspicious' occasions as much as for conducting the routine worship. This can give rise to yet another institution. Places associated with the lives of the protagonists of the movements generally develop into centres of pilgrimage, becoming institutions in their own right. The new movements may evolve new ... and ceremonies related to birth, marriage and death. All these aspects of organisation and institutionalisation can be studied by social scientists in a short or large historical perspective. The social, economic and cultural dimensions of these phenomena are expected to be as important as their ideological roots. They may have political ramifications too. They certainly have implications for social issues in the present. It should, therefore, be worthwhile to study the organisational and institutional aspects of religious movements in relation to their initial ideas and their later developments.

This short note is meant only to give some idea of what we expect from the Seminar. We shall feel satisfied if the main focus of the Seminar is kept in view.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION

The Seminar on the theme of Social Justice and the Indian Constitution was organised in collaboration with the Literary Criterion Centre, from February 10-14, 1994, at Dhvanyaloka, Mysore. Prof. C.D. Narasimhiah, the Director of the Centre, inaugurated the seminar, while Prof. Mrinal Miri, the Director of the IAS welcomed the participants and the other invitees. Prof. Narasimhiah cautioning against the misuse and abuse of the concept of 'Social Justice', pleaded for a more complex and complicated understanding of the phenomenon.

In the first session which followed the inauguration, chaired by Dr. B.K. Roy Burman, Shri Ajit K. Bhattacharjea presented his paper. He explained the overall purpose of the Seminar, its framework and its hopes.

In the afternoon session, two papers were presented. In the first presentation, Prof. Rafeeq Ahmed argued for a periodical revision of the Constitution, a virtual re-negotiated arrangement, which would respond to the changing needs of the people. Dr. Sandeep Shastri's paper focused on the structural relationship between the electoral process and social justice. He drew attention to the fundamental chasm between formal commitment to the ideal of social justice enshrined in the Constitution and the constant violation of social justice in our practice of it as indicated by electoral politics which involved a systematic instrumental use of the Constitutional provision by a ruling power elite to promote their own class interests. Hence, he questioned the need for a second look at the Constitution.

The morning session on the second day was chaired by Dr. K. Raghavendra Rao. In the first presentation, Prof. Amal Ray maintained that the country was governed by a coalition of upper-class power elites through the mechanism of power brokerage handled by a large mercenary class. He thought that both the Constitution and its working did not pay serious attention to the ideals of equality and justice. He advocated a mass movement to challenge the elite dominance to bring about constitutional reforms to promote genuine social justice.

In the second presentation, Prof. V.K. Nataraj focused on the relationship between the Constitution, Social Justice and Development. He suggested that no Constitution could automatically absorb the impact and challenge of social changes, and

hence the issue should be taken to the domain of political process on the basis of a consensus on what is social justice through the participation of marginal groups.

The second presentation by Prof. G. Hargopal argued that the Constitution itself was textually wedded to the goals of democracy and social justice, but its political practice had violently drifted away from the original vision of democracy and social justice. He saw the recent moves to liberalise and globalise the economy and initiate moves of 'structural adjustment' as a culmination of this history. Part IV of the Constitution, which embodied these ideals, was now abandoned in the name of structural adjustment. Hence, there was a challenging task for the people to restore the original vision of the Constitution.

The third presentation by Shri Kannabhiran discussed the institutional crisis generated by the politics based on a rejection of the ideals of social justice constitutionally mandated. He demonstrated how the inequalities and injustices built into the socio-economic structure systematically nullified the constitutional goals.

In the afternoon session, chaired by Dr. Jagannath Pathy, in the first presentation Dr. K. Raghavendra Rao drew attention to the fact that the Constitution was a text, and like all texts it would speak only if human beings made it speak and yield its message. Therefore, the crucial problem was how to contextualise and politicise the Constitution so that its content could be translated into political praxis.

In the second presentation, Dr. V.K. Nataraj focused on the relationship between the Constitution, social justice and development. Arguing that no Constitution could automatically act, he held that the problem was to shift the Constitutional ideals into the domain of politics. This implied the need for a political process of negotiation between marginalised groups and the dominant groups to arrive at a consensus on the content of Social Justice.

In the third presentation, Prof. R.C. Vyas situated the question of social justice in the contested terrain of Fundamental Rights versus Directive Principles of State Policy, as enunciated in the Constitution. But, he argued, that there is no real conflict between the two and that both conjointly have contributed to the promotion of social justice. He also suggested a linkage between social

justice and political stability.

The morning session of the third day was chaired by Prof. G. Hargopal. In the first presentation, Dr. K. S. Subramanian focused on the administrative realities underlying constitutional practice. In his view, not only did the Constitution contain basic contradictions, the attempts to promote social justice enshrined in it through the instrumentality of a colonially entrapped bureaucracy had also been negative. Even so, what little social justice could be achieved under bureaucratic auspices would be lost under the new liberalisation policy of privatisation. Shri K.S. Dhillon also focused on the bureaucracy, but more sympathetically. The fault lay more in the politicisation of the services, than in the services themselves. On the whole, he thought that we were reaching a "flash point" of systematic breakdown, and hence a second look at the Constitution itself was in order.

In the third presentation, Prof. V.S. Prasad explored further the question of the bureaucracy to be riddled with contradictions due to the copresence of diverse and even incompatible values and norms—democracy, impartiality, efficiency and social representatives. The contradictions were of two types — the endocentric contradiction stemming from normative diversity and the exocentric contradiction arising from the disjunction between a Weberian bureaucratic ideal and an inegalitarian social structure encrusted by colonial distortions. There was, thus, need for a new framework.

The afternoon session was chaired by Prof. C.D. Narasimhiah. The first presentation by Prof. D.P. Pattanayak revolved round the issue of language as an issue of constitutional mandate and social justice. He argued that the constitutionally mandated goals of equality and social justice had never been genuinely on the agenda of formal politics. Hence, inequalities and injustices proliferated. He took a critical look at the constitutional provisions, specifically relating to language — Articles 120, 210, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350 and 351, as well as the VIIIth Schedule. His main critique was that these provisions ignored 'the multilingual reality' of India and simply copied the monolingual liberal Western democracies.

In the second presentation, Dr. Prem Singh raised the crucial question of how social justice must in-

clude linguistic justice. In particular, he made a trenchant attack on the political dominance of English, which had resulted in the dominance of the elite class.

In the last presentation of the day, Dr. Jagannath Pathy stressed that one of the major groups in dire need of social justice was the scheduled tribes. After examining the history of the final incorporation of the special privileges and protections of the tribes into the Indian Constitution, Dr. Pathy described the tragic consequences of state policies towards these groups under the constitutional auspices. He referred to a crisis arising out of 'the uncritical imposition of individual proprietorship, the onslaught of opprobrious development, and the strategies of nation building...' Though let down by the Constitution and the nation-state system, he argued, the tribal people had managed to preserve their cultural self-identity, anchored in their own specific philosophical world-views.

The morning session of the fourth day was chaired by the Chief Justice of India, Mr. Justice Venkatchaliah. In the first presentation, Prof. Roy Burman raised a number of critical questions about the relationship between social justice, social activism and the state process in India. He examined the two historic-philosophical sources of the notion of social justice — Western liberalism, and the nineteenth century tradition of social reform led by persons like Jyotiba Phule, located in the experience of the untouchables and other low castes. He also emphasised the threat to social justice radiating from the international environment dominated by the rich capitalist nations.

In the second presentation, Prof. S. Seshiah focused on the economic thought of Ambedkar—arguably the most seminal and central figure in Indian discourse on, and the politics of social justice. He emphasised the crucial need for learning from Ambedkar's penetrating understanding of Indian socio-economic reality in order to work out a new agenda for a political battle centering on social justice.

In the second paper, Prof. Gopal Guru gave a sharp account of Ambedkar's theory and practice of social justice. He emphasised the point that for Ambedkar more crucial than political or legal justice was socio-economic justice. He drew attention to a major contradiction both in our Constitution and in our political life between formal political

(Continued on the next page)

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION

(Continued from last page)

equality and socio-economic-cultural inequality, most vividly exemplified in the plight of the untouchable groups.

The session concluded fittingly with presentation by the activist Shri V.T. Rajasekhar. Presenting a 'view from the bottom of the society', he argued that India should belong to the indigenous people who were none but the Bahujana Samaj, comprising the SC, ST, BC, and the segments from these groups who have converted to Christianity, Islam and Sikhism, and he extended the concept of Akhand Bharat to include, besides the Bahujana Samaj, the populations of Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. He pleaded for a political restoration of this idea of Akhand Bharat. Until then, there could be no social justice,

The afternoon session was chaired by Dr. C. Parvathamma. In the first presentation, Dr. S.R. Jalote examined the contemporary Dalit Theatre, focusing specially on Marathi Dalit plays, and attempted to bring out the Dalit concept of and concern with social justice.

In the second presentation, Dr. S.N. Chaudhury took a critical look at the plight of the Muslims of Madhya Pradesh from the perspective of human rights. He demonstrated that both the Central Government and the Madhya Pradesh Government had implemented, and continue to implement, several schemes to promote the welfare of Muslim community — yet the plight of the community was not getting better.

On the last day in the first presentation, Dr. A.S. Narang surveyed the situation relating to the question of justice for the minorities under the Indian constitutional framework and political dispensation. He argued for a more honest and committed approach to the question of social justice, and suggested that India's plural nature must be given proper scope in our constitutional arrangements and political operations. This implied the need for greater democracy and participatory scope for all groups, and a more genuinely federal political functioning of the system.

In the second presentation, Dr. Papiya Ghosh discussed the issue of enumerating the groups by the political system in order to bring them within the purview of a policy of social justice. She showed, through detailed historical analysis, that Indian public space was given by a fundamental contradiction between

the national ideal of a caste less society and the perpetual intervention by caste groups to assert their specific identities and collective interests.

In the third presentation, Dr. Meena Mahishi brought the seminar close to the present by raising the issue of the creamy layer. Analysing the relevant Supreme Court Judgement and the report of the Expert Committee of Creamy Layer set up by the Government of India, she drew attention to the theoretical and operational problems involved in identifying the creamy layers.

In the last presentation of the Seminar, Dr. Jakka Parthasarathy surveyed critically the steps taken by the Tamil Nadu Government to prevent the exploitation of the tribal peoples in that State. He focused on the constitutional framework of this policy and suggested that much more needed to be done to bring social justice to the tribals in the State.

The seminar concluded with three summations by Prof. Mrinal Miri, Dr. D.R. Nagaraj and Prof. K. Raghavendra Rao. Prof. Miri felt satisfied with the overall results of the Seminar, though he thought that sufficient attention had not been paid to the theoretical and moral issues surrounding the questions of social justice. Dr. Nagaraj drew attention to the fact that marginal groups and historically invisible categories should have been more sharply and passionately implicated in the discussions. Dr. Rao felt that more attention should have been given to the question of collective inter-group justice, as against partial group justice. He also suggested that a more explicit political position should emerge from academic discussions.

National Seminars (1993)

1. "Social Dimensions of Religious Movements" (3-7 May 1993). In this Seminar, twenty-three presentations were made. The proceedings of the Seminar are being edited.
2. "From Tribe to Caste" (8-12 November 1993) In this Seminar, twenty-nine scholars from disciplines of history, sociology and social anthropology participated and presented their papers. Dr. Dev Nathan who coordinated the Seminar has been entrusted with the responsibility of editing its proceedings.

GANDHI AND THE PRESENT GLOBAL CRISIS

The Seminar, held at Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi from 22 to 24 March 1994, opened with a welcome address by Prof. Mrinal Miri, Director of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study. Explaining that the Seminar was a prelude to a possible Team Project on Gandhiji, he suggested that a focus on the Gandhian mode of rationality would help understand better, and hence tackle more confidently, the multiple crisis that plague the modern world, structured by its own rationality. The Gandhian critique of "modernity" should prove a source of theoretical and intellectual strength in an effort to confront the contemporary global crisis, itself a historical product of a civilization founded on non-Gandhian or even anti-Gandhian presuppositions. Prof. S. Gopal, who formally inaugurated the Seminar, also referred to the increasing relevance of Gandhi to our troubled times, all the more remarkable against the back-drop of the declining relevance of other world-figures like Stalin, Lenin and Mao.

The morning session centred on the themes of 'Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*' and 'Violence, Counter-violence and Non-violence'. Prof. Amlan Datta chaired the session.

In the first presentation, Prof. K.J. Shah argued that the foundations of Gandhiji's thought was the classical Hindu-Indian theory of the *Purushartha*. He illustrated this by considering the notion of non-violence as a foundational Gandhian category. He suggested that this Indian theory needed to be de-linked from its Hindu, even Indian, context and proposed as a universal human framework. In that case it could be compared with other universal frameworks like liberalism, Marxism etc. He suggested that Gandhi's relevance to today should be worked out, not just assumed. In particular, he held that Gandhi's notion of legitimate group interest is worth examining as a mode of conflict-resolution.

In the second presentation, Prof. A. K. Saran affirmed the universal nature of Gandhi's mission in life and thought. He argued that for Gandhi, Western civilization was not simply an alternative to Indian civilization, but that it was not a civilization in the true sense. He suggested that Gandhi was not for self-government for its own sake — to him, the crucial question was good government.

In the third presentation, Dr. D.N. Nagaraj explained that his methodology was not that of a social scien-

tist, but that of a man of literature. This meant that images and metaphors and symbols were more crucial than dry logical arguments. He drew attention to the force and 'violence' of Gandhian non-violence, and suggested that Gandhi's non-violence was rooted in unimpeachable and unshakeable moral courage, involving physical courage as its derivative. He criticised the current readings of Gandhi as inadequate because they failed to represent the full power of his life and thought. In fact, his thrust was to radicalise Gandhi in terms of concrete action.

In the afternoon session chaired by Prof. Thomas Pantham, Dr. Raghuram Raju in his presentation attempted to situate the Gandhian discourse in the context of the present, and then reformulate his critique of modernity in the light of this situational exercise. He surveyed some recent attempts at locating or situating Gandhi — A.K. Saran's, Ashish Nandy's, Partha Chatterjee's, Richard Lennox's or Bhiku Parikh's and argued that these writers distort Gandhi by giving attention to one aspect as primary, whereas Gandhi's strength lies in making nothing primary, and letting all of them play with one another. Gandhian discourse did, however, have a centre — the traditional doctrine of *Dharma*. Finally, he suggested that the historical processes of modernity in the West itself can be illuminated by a creative use of Gandhian critique of modernity.

The morning session of the second day was chaired by Prof. Ramashray Roy.

In the first presentation, Prof. Thomas Pantham argued that Enlightenment modernity had two strands — the theory of universal rights leading to a contractualist doctrine and the utilitarian theory. Gandhi rejected the first strand outright but retained the second to support his moral-political philosophy. He concluded by saying that Gandhi joined 'a deontological morality of non-violence' to 'an hermeneutical-ontological morality of love and caring' as a recipe for a post-colonial modern civilization.

In the second presentation, Dr. Mira Sinha Bhattacharjee focused on a comparison between Gandhi and Mao. She held that both Gandhi and Mao were united in articulating historically an alternative modernity, a modernity securely anchored in two great Asian civilizations. This did not mean that the two were identical or had no real difference.

GANDHI AND THE PRESENT GLOBAL CRISIS

(Continued from the previous page)

The first presentation in the afternoon session, chaired by Prof. S. Gopal, was by Dr Raja Ramanna. It brought the question of science and technology into the Gandhian discourse. He argued for a more realistic and practical approach to the issue of science and technology, and not a simply dismissive one under the spell of a naively idealistic Gandhism.

In the second presentation, Dr. Surjit Mansingh drew attention to the issue of Gandhi's relevance to contemporary international relations. She suggested that the Gandhian method of non-violence should be considered seriously as a method of conflict-resolution at the international level.

In the last presentation of the session, Dr Ramchandra Guha discussed Gandhi's relevance to the issue of environmental degradation. He suggested that Gandhi, though not a direct environmentalist in theory and practice did imply genuine concern for environment.

The last day morning session of the Seminar was chaired by Prof. K. J. Shah.

In the first presentation, Prof. Amlan Datta argued that modern civilization was, at core an industrial civilization. Another dimension of modern civilization was consumerism. But all these dimensions – industrial, military and consumerist – create enormous and often impossible demands on resources. It is in this context that the Gandhian emphasis on limitation and scaling down becomes crucial. This relevance can arise only if we translate Gandhian ideas into a new global language.

In the second presentation, Prof. Raghavendra Rao examined the universalization of Gandhian thought by analysing its content. He charac-

terised the global crisis in terms advanced by a recent historian, Paul Kennedy. He held that a truly Gandhian approach would mean that the global crisis should be tackled as a crisis already mirrored in the local context.

In the third presentation, Prof. Ramashray Roy talked about a return to Gandhi in understanding and solving the present global crisis. By a return to Gandhi he meant a return to the first principles that regulate individual and collective life. This itself involved self discipline and self-control, the discipline of subjecting the passions and desires to the control of the eternal principles of morality, derived from the presence and experience of God in our everyday world and life.

The last presentation of the day was by Prof. C.D. Narasimhaiah on 'Gandhi's Relevance to the Global Crisis.' He suggested that the Gandhian model and Gandhian ideal can be universalised by individuals first purging themselves of untruth and selfishness.

In the summing up afternoon session, Prof. Ramashray Roy felt gratified that the Seminar had accomplished, even if on a modest scale, the task it had set for itself – an examination of Gandhian heritage in the context of contemporary global crisis as a prelude to a team-based research project. In the second summing up, Prof. J.D. Sethi drew attention to the missing dimensions – especially a clearer understanding of Gandhi in his own terms, involving a hermeneutical sliding into the heart of Gandhian vision. He also corrected the misunderstanding that Gandhi was an unqualified opponent of industry, science and technology. He merely opposed their modern incarnations. The session was chaired by Prof. Ram Bapat.

BIO-SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF POVERTY

A National Seminar on 'Bio-Social Dimensions of Poverty' was held under the joint auspices of Indian Institute of Advanced Study and National Academy of Medical Sciences, in Bombay on 18 March 1994. This was primarily a dialogue between three groups of people: (i) social scientists, (ii) practitioners of the medical profession, and (iii) planners.

Prof. J.S. Bajaj, Member, Planning Commission, who first suggested the idea of this Seminar, was the Chairperson of the Seminar.

The Seminar began with the discussions of a historico-philosophical account of the concept of poverty. The colonial notion of poverty as a phenomenon to be 'managed' was contrasted with the traditional notions of poverty of the Indian peasantry and with the Indian nationalist conception of poverty which grew out of a critique of the British-Indian bureaucratic 'management' of poverty. The discussion then ranged over issues like 'gender and poverty', 'accessibility, production and poverty', 'poverty and quality of life', 'population, poverty and sustainable developments', 'poverty and social unrest' and 'poverty in literature'.

This Seminar was, in many ways, a unique experiment. It brought together academics, persons involved in the planning of the economic, social and cultural future of the country and very distinguished members of the medical profession. The presentation of their different concerns often brought out elements hitherto unnoticed or only inadequately noticed by others.

While inadequacies in the approach of the Government throughout the last several decades were pointed out, it was also emphasized that these inadequacies were not endemic to the planning process as such. The role of the individual as well as non-governmental organisations in the process of alleviation of poverty was also stressed.

THE PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION OF SANSKRIT PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS IN ENGLISH AND REGIONAL LANGUAGES

The Institute organised this Workshop in collaboration with the Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi, from 3 to 7 August, 1993. It was conducted under the guidance of Professor Daya Krishna and Dr. Bhuvan Chandel. Besides Prof. J.S. Grewal, Prof. R. K. Kaul and other Fellows and Associates of the Institute, fourteen scholars from different parts of the country participated in the workshop. These included: Dr. Mukund Lath, Prof. K.T. Pandurangi, Prof. K.T. Prahaladachar, Prof. Rewati Raman Pandey, Dr. Kamla Dutta Tripathi, Dr. Achyutanand Dash, Mr. Tsapak Riggan, Prof. Lobsang Norbun Shastri, Prof. T.B. Siddalingaiah, Dr. D.N. Shanbhag, Prof. V.N. Jha, Prof. Rekha Jhanji, Dr. Rajeeva Ranjan Sinha, Dr. Ambika Datta Sharma.

The sessions with the issues discussed included:

- * A critical review of translation done;
- * the translations in Tibetan and Chinese: their method, approach and role in the growth of thought in those languages;
- * why translate for whom?;
- * problems of translation into English and Indian languages: the difference;
- * types of philosophical texts and the differences in the problems of translating them;
- * contextualising a translation: the model relation between translation, exposition, annotation and their ideal format;
- * which available translation/translations are model translations and why?; and
- * response to select translations made during the workshop.

Research Seminar on

METAPHOR IN PHILOSOPHY AND TRUTH IN LITERATURE

7-16 September 1993

The following scholars participated:

Prof. R. Sundra Rajan, Prof. C.D. Narasimhaiah, Dr. Satya P. Gautam, Dr. Ranjan Ghosh, Prof. S.R. Talghatti, Prof. V. N. Jha, Dr. Maya Dass, Dr. Sabujkali Sen, Miss Deepa Mishra, Dr. Sharmila Chatterjee, Dr. Arundhati

Mukherjee, Dr. (Mrs.) P.T. Saroja Sundar Rajan, Mr. Anthony Savari Raj, Shri V. Sani, Dr. Sripad Bhatt, Dr. N. Venu Gopalan, Dr. Mustafa Khawaja, Dr. J. Ouseparampil, Dr. K.B. Panda, Dr. S.E. Bhelke, Pankaj Basotia, Dr. Aniket Jaaware, Dr. Raghunath Ghosh.

LITERARY WEEK FOR WRITERS

A Literary Week was organised at the Institute from 22 to 27 November 1993. The main objective of the Literary Week was to provide an insight into the latest literary trends in creative writing and criticism. Nearly fifty young writers and critics of Hindi, Punjabi and English languages from Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and Delhi participated in the Literary Week. Shri Trilochan Shastri, Hindi poet and Sahitya Akademi Award Winner, inaugurated the Literary Week. Twenty five papers on the works of creative writers in the three languages were presented and discussed. Besides the formal sessions, informal poetry recitation sessions were organised in the evenings.