Abstract

According to this abstract for this topic:- I consider comparative philosophy to be legitimate branch of philosophy itself; as I understand them, comparative aesthetics, comparative religion, etc. are also philosophical disciplines, concerned to further the cause of general aesthetics, philosophy of religion, there is sense in which the entire activity of philosophizing may be taken to consist in comparing and weighing different conceptions, definitions and explanations, with a view to arriving at the most satisfactory conception, definition, or explanation relating to a field of experience. This is not to say that a philosopher may not create new concepts or evolve new definitions and explanations; but the new concepts, etc. cannot be created or evolved in a vacuum. At the present time the creative activity of the philosopher necessarily proceeds against the background of, it. So we shall say it is a rich confusion of concepts or conceptual schemes for the being. So, the only respect in which the situation of the so-called student of comparative philosophy differs by the side of general philosophy. because a comparative philosophy describes all of the events of philosophical thinking as religious and behavioral mind in and particularly task of tacking a problem becomes harder for the student of comparative philosophy – particularly in the fields where rich reflective traditions exist in the several cultures known to him-the probability of his arriving at relatively more universal solutions also increases. To the extent to which these inference are not corroborated by the performance of those who have pursued comparative studies in philosophy in the past, the fault lies with the intentions and methods with which the scholars concerned have proceeded in their work. Here again I should guard against a misconception. Surely, it will be averred, one important task of a student comparative philosophy is to acquaint people, at any rate his readers and or listeners, with the actual philosophical situation in different cultures or cultural traditions, a task which may, in some cases, keep him occupied for a very long period, if not for the whole of his lifetime. I do not deny that this is an important task. However, I would leave that task rather to historians of philosophy than to philosophers proper. Doing comparative philosophy has not been and ought not to be identified with the writing of the history of one or more philosophical traditions, or with the juxtaposing of different such traditions. Before proceed further in the direction of characterizing comparative philosophy as I understand it, I would like to clarify my position in
regard to the nature and aim of that now controversial discipline called philosophy. While I hold no brief for speculative metaphysics, I still find it difficult to accept the identification of philosophy with linguistic analysis. I consider philosophy to be preeminently an intellectual or cognitive without reference to some area of experience. Reason in any of its characteristic forms is an attempt to conceptualize and order experience; as a rational discipline, philosophy too aims at conceptualizing and ordering certain types of experience. Here we are faced with the problem of demarcation the sphere of philosophy from that of the sciences. Let me offer a clue finding a solution of his this problem: concentrate on the distinction between science on the hand and the philosophy of science on the other.

The subject matter of the science, at any rate of the physical sciences such as physics is constituted by facts relating to entities or forces of a particular type. Thus physics studies facts relating to matter and energy biology those relating to the development and functions of living organisms, etc. philosophy, on the contrary, is concerned with studying values rather than facts. It may not be incorrect to affirm that philosophy studies facts concerning values, but even that will not enable us to get away from the distinction between facts and values, and between factual and values studies. A factual study directs its attention to the existential aspects of things and processes; a valuation study, on the contrary, concerns itself with these features or aspects of entities, situations, or activities in virtue of which the latter show them forth as meriting our preference of rejection to other entities, etc.

As a science physics concerned both to discover new facts about matter, motion, energy, etc and to explain or unify those facts Both the discovery and recording of factual data and their explanation involve conceptual processes, or the use of conceptual tools. These processes or tools constitute the subject matter of the philosophy of physics. Unlike physics, the correlates of the processed it studies. The philosopher of science does not ask, what were the physiological, psychological, social, and other factors which led to the emergence of a concept or formula in Einstein’s mind? On the contrary, he is concerned to bring to the surface those aspects of Einstein’s theory or theoretical concepts which render the theory or concepts significant and valuable for physics or for those interested in the cultural called physics. The philosophers is not directly concerned with learning about motions, interaction, energies, etc. with the study of which the physicist occupied; what interests him as a philosopher are those features or aspects of the physicist’s activity which make it meaningful and interesting as a human adventure. These
features and aspects may be called the aesthetic qualities of the activity in question. As viewed by the philosopher, the activity of the physicist is intrinsically interesting and valuable. Furthermore, it may be noted that the object of the philosopher’s attention is not so much this or that concept employed by the physicist as the general approach and method exemplified in the use of a concept or set of concepts. The philosopher contemplates a particular approach and method with a view to assessing its merits relative to other approaches and methods; he also seeks to separate by analysis the constituent factors in a conceptual approach or scheme.

According to some thinkers the subject matter of say, physics is not so much the facts relation to certain entities and/or forces as the judgments about them. Thus N.S. Campbell avers that the subject matter of physics consist of “those immediate judgments” of time, space number, identity, etc. for which “universal assent can be obtained” in other words, what the physicist directly faces is a world of concepts expressed in the form of statements or equations and not the physical world of objects and forces. This may be accepted provided that the possibility of addition to such statements through recorded experimental data is not ruled out. The physicist not only takes notice of the judgments already made but also adds to the stock of such judgment through ingeniously devised experiments. But if both the physicist and the philosopher direct their minds to the world of concepts expressed in judgments, what is the point of difference between in the philosophy and educational aspects.