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Jean Bodin formulated the notion of sovereignty as illimitable and absolute power which was not subject to any limitation; whatsoever law was taken to be will of this sovereign. Further, sovereign was defined to be 'a determinate human superior, not in the habit of obedience to a like superior' by Austin.

Sovereignty is the 'untrammeled power of making laws in the state' (Bodin).

Sovereign is defined as inimitable in the sense that there is nothing that the sovereign cannot legally do; legally, there are no limits to the powers of the sovereign.

Sovereign is indivisible in the sense that if it is illimitable, there must necessarily be only one sovereign. For two or more sovereign cannot, he logically, illimitable.
Here it will be logically contradictory to speak of sovereignty in a pluralistic view.

This is the monistic view of sovereignty, which has been severely criticized by Laski, who advocated a pluralistic view of sovereignty.

Laski says that sovereignty can never be absolute—internally or externally.

Internally, customs, constitution, laws, etc. are limits to sovereignty. Externally, other nations' sovereign rights constitute justifiable limits to sovereignty of a state.

Further, with advances in democracy and decentralization, sovereignty is more and more indivisible. Power and authority have been divided to a great extent and this has led to "division of sovereignty." If one may say so.

(MacIver)

Monistic theory of sovereignty has thus
been a subject of scathing criticism and is no longer accepted as a single true doctrine of sovereignty. However, it has a grain of truth insofar as it emphasizes importance of supreme authority in the state.

Punishment is a kind of suffering—mental or physical or economical inflicted on an individual for a wrong that he/she has committed. It involves a moral penalty for the individual for moral wrong.

In itself, mere punishment involves infliction of moral harm. It is not good. As it reduces the moral satisfaction of the concerned individual. Further, general deterrence theory reduces individual to the status of a means. This is a moral sin as each individual is an end in himself, none a means to another.

punishment is good → for improving
punishment for punishment
Punishment should ideally be in proportion to the crime. However, proportionality of punishment is very difficult to measure and justice is therefore difficult to attain. Further, special conditions might warrant relaxation of punishment e.g., mentally unsound criminals, pregnant women, etc. However, here the justice part is overemphasized but the crime is ignored. Here, punishment is not good. Though not used in itself, punishment is an accidental part of justice. It is a means to rehabilitation, of undoing the moral harm, of deterring other criminals. Besides, rehabilitation of criminals is also advisable. Punishment is also essential as a means to ensure that the social morality is upheld (Durkheim) and hence punishing criminals is necessary. Further,
those who commit moral hazards deserve no sympathy (retaliationist view). Hence, punishment is amply justified at all levels: individual, social, criminal, moral, legal, and philosophical and ethical.

Secularism as a socio-political ideology deals with the nature of relationship between religion and the state. While some advocate complete separation between the two, others argue for an equal and neutral treatment to all religions (Indian view). Secularism of both Western and Indian variety contributes to betterment of individual and the state.

Individual betterment

1) It promotes broadmindedness and spirit of tolerance among people
2) It assures the individual that the state will not discriminate against him/her only on religious grounds.

✓ 3) It furthers feelings of unity and integrity.

✓ 4) Conductive to equality, liberty, fraternity.

✓ 5) Ensures conducive social atmosphere for fullest personal development — as an individual and as a member of society.

6) Ensures security and safety — no fear of religious violence and guaranteed justice in case of riots.

State:

✓ 1) Perceived as a neutral actor — nothing to do with religion.

✓ 2) If state intervenes in religious matters, it can only be for general social good.

✓ Not otherwise.

3) Executive, legislative, and judiciary are neutral and unbiased.
All this leads the state to formulate policies for industrial development. Affirmative action is also justified - e.g., 15% point programme for minorities by Indian government.

Secularism promotes mutual trust, harmony between individuals and state. Each perceives the other as a neutral actor interested in larger developmental goals and prejudices and biases are minimised.
The nature of religious language

has been one of the central problems in philosophy of religion. Paul Tillich considered religious language to be symbolic in nature, owing to the object of religious language.

Symbols, in opinion of Paul Tillich, participate in what they point towards and they necessarily point towards something beyond themselves. There appears to be an internal and organic relation between the symbol and that which it points towards. This association is inseparable and accepted or being necessarily true.

The ultimate Truth, according to Paul Tillich, is beyond categories of intellectual reasoning and analogical language are inadequate for purpose of description of religious experience. The nature of religious
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Religious Tolerance

The debate over search for absolute truth has given rise to multiple explanations regarding the question. Religious tolerance has become a necessity, metaphorically, religiously and socially.

Religious tolerance involves a broad-minded attitude that all religions are true and lead to the same goal, ultimate. They are different means to the same end. And not only this, true religious tolerance demands that all such religions are regarded as being equally true.

Religious tolerance involves the intrinsic acceptance of the fact that through absolute reality can logically be one, it can be attained through different means. All such means are of equal worth, none.
Intrinsically more valuable, more correct than the other.

Second important part of religious tolerance is that it involves an attitude of respect towards other religions - not an attitude of ignorance or indifference. Whatever differences persist between religions, these must be accepted, and respectfully tolerated. They must not be suppressed or crushed, nor ignored in an indifferent manner.

Religious tolerance stands out as the founding stone for a religiously plural society. Multiculturalism also demands great amount of religious tolerance. Similarly, secularism, democracy and nationalism also command a fair amount of religious tolerance.

The very fact that any claim to absolute truth in an exclusive manner is logically
Fallacious is an argument enough for tolerance.

Scholars, both Indian and Western have supported tolerance on metaphysical, ethical, religious grounds. Some examples are Jainism, Nyāya, Vedānta, Plato, Russell, and others.

The nature of religious experience and its analysis have always been an area of interest of philosophers. Its noetic quality, transience, and ineffability have been propounded by William James, as being the nature of religious experience.

There exists a debate among philosophers regarding the relative role of reason and faith in religious experience. Few philosophers claim that reason is more important than faith. In this case, however, generally, it is accepted...
that faith and passionate inwardness (Soren Kierkegaard) are the pillars of revelation. Revelation, not reason is of prime importance to religious experience (Hick). As Kierkegaard says "believe inorder to understand, donot understand inorder to believe". Further as Paul Tiddlich claims 'a proven God is no God'. What matters more is the experience of God, rather than the search of a proof for His reality.

Reasoning will lead to antinomies and irresolvable contradictions. Discipline of mind is no doubt important and essential, but it is not sufficient for religious experience. Reason has been subordinated by Kant, "to make room for faith".

Religious experience involves the entire personality of an individual and it has a poetic quality, which makes it ineffable. It is a feeling of inwardness, not an objective
reality or certainly, but subjective assurance. That experience is true and valid.

By very nature, religious experience deals with metaphysical questions. It is supra-rational and not arational or anti-rational. It is at best, non-rational. It is beyond the faculties of mind and categories of understanding.

Hence, it is said that it is not a rigorous discipline of mind but surrender of metaphysical faculties and living in a sea of union experience. This has been emphasised to a great extent by Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Paul Tillich, William James and others.

always start with question according to problem. Conclusion: according to question.
Female foeticide is extreme form of gender inequity.

Gender inequality has been an age-old problem and is manifested through various dimensions at different points of time. Female foeticide, which involves killing of the girl child even before she is born, is an extreme form of gender inequality.

Female foeticide involves killing of the girl child at the fetal stage itself, i.e., before birth itself. This type of systematic patriarchal bias against the girl child assumes a severe dimension in this case. Here, one is denying the girl child, the right to be born. This is grave injustice by all parameters. This is not only a moral sin but also against the values of humanism, equality, fraternity and liberty.
- Female foeticide against equality - discrimination on basis of gender. Sons are not aborted, only females are.

- Female foeticide against justice - one cannot take away the life of another person in any case whatsoever, especially when unborn child is hardly free.

- Female foeticide as against humanism - Humanism regards that all human beings are of equal moral worth; none more valuable than other.

- Female foeticide discriminates against girl child and is against humanitarian values.

- Criminal nature of female foeticide and foeticide as a form of violence - Female foeticide has been criminalised in most nations including India (PNDT Act). Further, it involves the notion and an act of violence against the unborn girl child - it involves a murder of a valuable life.
What makes female foeticide a rare and extreme form of gender inequality is that it begins before birth. It indicates that anti-women and patriarchal bias of the society. It denies women the very right to come into being. Further, no man has the right to decide whether another life is to come into being or not.

No doubt foeticide is allowed as a tool of population control policy. However, when it is specifically targeted against women, it is discriminatory in nature and unjustified.

This discrimination against women, which begins before birth, is later on replicated in other spheres at further stages in life—social, political, economic, religious or environmental.

Female foeticide is an expression of devaluation and debasement of human life.
and human dignity. It cannot be justified on any grounds whatsoever. Besides being a moral hazard, it has equally hazardous social, political and environmental consequences. Eg low sex ratio leads to increasing violence against women (rape) and the cycle of devaluation of life continues.

Hence, female foeticide is an extreme form of gender inequality, which further leads to other forms of inequalities.

**Ques. 3(c)**

Land and property rights of women in India.

Discrimination against women has been intrinsic to all societies—though in nature and extent differed. One such manifestation of gender discrimination is denial or discrimination in matters of land ownership and property rights. Since independence, India
has provided women with many rights regarding property ownership. However, societal conditions remain the same, and bias against women prevail even today.

The Hindu Marriage Act, Dowry Prohibition Act, Inheritance of Property Act, etc., have been formulated in post-independence era. Remarkably, these laws sought to correct the gender discrimination and provided for equal rights to women in property matters. However, all laws don't translate into social justice. This is what exactly happened in this case.

- Though legally, women were allowed to own property, they were not in a position to do so due to economic dependency.
- Further, many women own property only for namesake. The title deed is in their name, but all decisions are taken by male counterparts.
Hence functionally, they are still deprived of property, though they legally own it.

- Traditionally, women themselves were regarded as a property of their father/husband/son. Logically, property cannot own property—Hence, women were deprived of property rights.

- Economic subordination, political subjugation, cultural dominance and legal dependence have combined together to discriminating against women's right to land and property. This has however, changed since independence.

- Women own land and houses in many cases, but still, even here they face discrimination. It has been observed that at times women had to leave their land uncultivated, as no males would agree to cultivating their land. Thus, such land ownership does not empower women.
Land and property rights have been provided to women legally. However, there is a need to translate these legal provisions into empowerment of women. Social, political, cultural, and economic empowerment is necessary as a precondition to ensure full property rights. Also, rights only ensure entitlement to ownership. Its actual use and skills required thereof should also be taken care of to ensure full empowerment of women.

Conclude
Social prob. solution in Indian philosophy point of view
The search of absolute truth is a fundamental task of all religions. Though all religions claim to have discovered such a truth, we find differences (subtle ones) in their conception. Hence, problem of absolute truth leads one to religious pluralism.

- Religious pluralism

This involves the notion that truth is not to be found in one religion alone, but all religions have a legitimate claim to discovery of truth. Religious pluralism involves a broad-minded and tolerant attitude towards co-religionists. It can take any of the following four forms:

1. one religion is absolutely true, others are relatively true
2. all religions are equally true
8. All religions are true, but lead to different goals.

4. All religions are true, but lead to the same goal ultimately.

The core concept of religious pluralism is that it affirms the truth of other religious doctrines. It is not exclusive and monopolistic insofar as claims to absolute truth are concerned. It admits that it is possible that such truth can be acquired through different paths, which are legitimate in their own way.

Religious pluralism admits difference, but here difference does not lead to discrimination.

Unity and universality of religion

This is possible if we take the fundamental, core and vital concepts of all religions. These are more or less same in all religions be it Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam,
Christianity or any other. By extracting such indispensable principles, we can arrive at an universal and unified religion. However, this will require unusually broad and tolerant mindset.

Problem of absolute truth.

All religions are apparently in search of absolute truth. Now, each religion claims to have found out such absolute truth. The moment this is claimed, it implies that all other versions of truth are false or only relatively true. This will lead to a narrow and intolerant outlook and religious exclusivism. Further, absolute truth is internally contradictory as there can be nothing that is against it. Nothing can either verify, or falsify it. Hence it is untested and even untestable.

In fact, it was one of the solutions...
to the problems of religious plu-exclusivism, that religious pluralism was formulated. Claims to absolute truth cannot be logically sustained as jaina doctrine or anekāntavāda has indicated. Any such claim will involve itself in circular reasoning and will remain unproved till the end.

There is an organic link between the philosophical problem of absolute truth and the religious solution of religious pluralism.

Ques. 7(b)

Religious knowledge - knowledge regarding religious objects can be acquired through various means. Three prominent of these are: reason, revelation and faith.

Source of religious knowledge
  → Reason
  → Revelation
  → Faith
1. Reason - The role of reason in religion is of vital importance at various levels. - explaining religious doctrines, disproving contradictory doctrines, testing religious doctrines, eliminating superstitious beliefs, etc. Reason can also strengthen and weaken faith.

2. Revelation - considered to be ultimate source of all religious knowledge. William James said that qualities are - ineffability, indescribability, noetic quality, transience, involves passionate inwardness, considered as an "act of God" and man is said to be passive in the process.

Various scriptures, doctrines, etc. are said to be revealed through prophets, saints, nature, common man through dreams, etc.

3. Faith - occupies a prominent position in religious knowledge. As Kierkegaard says "believe in order to understand, don't understand in order to believe." Faith was also emphasized by Kant
as being the primary or source of all religious knowledge. Kant once said, "I had to destroy reason in order to make room for faith".

Similar opinion has been expressed by Sankara who relied more on shruti than on sruti. Further St Augustine proclaimed that "faith is essential to religion, for one can also have faith in that which reason has disproved."

**Difference between sources of religious and scientific knowledge.**

Religious and scientific knowledge are different in their very nature. While the former is subjective, the latter is conditional and universal and objective.

1. Science involves acquisition of knowledge through experimentation. Such experimentation is impossible in religious sphere, as the subject matter defies any controlled observation.
(1) Scientific knowledge emphasizes observation and induction and deduction based on the same. Religious knowledge too involves observation. However, this is internal observation, of the nature of revelation, and defies any inductive deductive analysis at all.

(2) Faith is a precondition to acquisition of religious knowledge. Though reason is important, faith is predominant. On the other hand, in science, the method is entirely rationalistic and reasoned.

(3) Use of religious knowledge, replication of experience is almost an impossibility. Unlike this, scientific experiments can be easily redone and verified. Hence, scientific knowledge is verifiable, religious knowledge is not.

(4) Science depends on the external world as the starting point of knowledge. Religion
begins with the internal sources of knowledge.

Thus, the very subject matter of religion and science is different. Logically, the knowledge that is obtained will differ. However, though religious knowledge differs from scientific, it is not anti-rational for that matter. We can, at best, call religious knowledge to be non-rational.

The need to put religious experience in words demanded the construction of a language that was suited to its purpose. Such a language is termed religious language.

In other words, religious language is that which seeks to explain the nature of religious experience, objects of religious faith, and so on. It is not that an altogether different language is to be constructed to describe religious knowledge, but that certain concepts, certain words are to be devised as per requirement. Further, the import and meaning should be accurately conveyed through such a language. If this is not attained, the very essence of religious knowledge will remain unattained. Hence, religious language becomes one of vital importance.
Logically, the nature of religious language has been analyzed by philosophers in myriad manners. Some of the important ones are as follows.

1. Paul Tillich - Symbolic Language

   Symbol is something which points to something beyond itself and it participates in that towards which it points. Tillich said that religious language is full of such symbols as it deals with supra-physical realities and religious experiences.

2. Analagical Language of St. Augustine and Aquinas

   St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas were of the opinion that religious language is not verbally different from ordinary language. It differs only in meaning. For e.g., when we say faithfulness of man and dog, we differ not in the word but in its meaning. Similarly, we can speak of religious topics in an
analogical manner. Analogies can be upwards (from man to God) or downwards (man to lower animals).

3 Theory of Blik by R.M. Hare

Blik means a world-view. If an individual has a particular view of the world, it is very difficult to change it, to alter it. This individual accounts all experiences from this particular viewpoint though it may involve manifest contradictions. What is important, to Hare, is individuals commitment to the view, not its objective truth or falsity.

4 Basil Mitchell's view

He has put forward the view that people keep on using certain words in a particular manner without ever questioning or reasoning. However, when a charismatic person proclaims that the use of a word is wrong and needs redefinition, people start
believing him/her without reasoning. Here again, like R.M. Hare’s theory, belief is important. However, there is a crucial difference between the two theories. While there is an element of doubt on part of believers in Mill’s theory, this is absent in Hare’s theory.

b. Wittgenstein’s Theory:

Early Wittgenstein clearly demarcated the sphere of saying and showing and said, “what can be said can be said clearly, what cannot be said cannot be said at all”. This gave rise to linguistic mysticism.

Later Wittgenstein however, rejected this theory and proclaimed that “look for the use, don’t look for the meaning”. The use of a particular word in a particular context is an indicator of its meaning.

c. Ayer and Logical Positivists: They have outrightly rejected all corruptions of religious
language as being meaningless and even as
being non-sensical. This meaninglessness is at
two levels:

a) words themselves are meaningless
   "being and Being", etc.

b) arrangement of words is meaningless
   (syntactical errors)

Each of the above theories throws a new
light on nature of religious language. Each
adds a new dimension to nature of religious
language. Besides these features, there are
several other vital features of nature of
religious language. These are:

a) Religious language, though made up of
   words of everyday use, differs
   significantly in its meaning.

b) Such language has meaning only to
   those who believe and understand it.
c) It points to something that is beyond sense verification.

d) Though not empirically verifiable, its statements are merely non-rational, and not anti-rational.

e) It differs from scientific language in that, it is not necessarily universal and certain.

f) Faith forms an important part in understanding religious language, its statements and their meanings.

3) Religious language is an attempt at "describing the indescribable" (James)

Thus, though it may not be able to capture the essence of religious experience, it necessarily points to the same.

6) Religious language is contextual, both temporally and culturally.
The nature of religious language is thus unique. And, it is suited to its purpose of dealing with explanations in religious sphere. Though criticized for being meaningless, it has great practical, psychological and religious utility.