

STUDYING THE UNIVERSE OF KNOWLEDGE: AN EDITORIAL

Mayukh Sarkar, Executive Editor

What we call “knowledge” is really just the collective memory of our species (*sapiens*)—our collected ideas, facts, fiction, myths, experiences, and emotions, reserved and gradually evolving. S.R. Ranganathan classifies “universe of knowledge” into three categories: basic, compound, and complex. This universe is conceptualised as an intricate, ever-changing multidimensional space entrenched in Indian Vedic philosophy. According to him “universe of knowledge” denotes the “universe of subjects”, and that universe is multi-dimensional, follows a continuum pattern and is infinite. In his words, “The number of items of knowledge - past, present, and future taken together tends to infinity...if infinity is taken away from infinity, then infinity itself will be left as residue. This represents the intuitive grasp of a certain experience by the seers of yore” (Ranganathan, 1964). Everything in the cosmos is constantly evolving, and just like any other system, the universe of knowledge also expands through time. Ranganathan (1968) manifested the mechanisms of this knowledge growth into four categories (dissection, denudation, lamination and loose assemblage), which are enlarged into fission, fusion, distillation, lamination, agglomeration, loose assemblage, and cluster by Neelameghan (1973), Gopinath and Seetharama (1979), his three qualified heirs, and further revised and restructured under three influential heads, i.e., specialisation, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary (Satija, Madali & Dutta, 2014).

Coming to the computational theory of knowledge is about capturing the dimension of diversity (semantic heterogeneity) among the different knowledge resources, represented through ontologies, teleologies, schemas, and entities (event, place, person, organisation) and learning their adaptivity properties, as well as establishing a certain level of connectivity between the human and soft agents. Diversity is ubiquitous in descriptions of the world, whether it is in language, meaning or concepts, opinions, viewpoints, knowledge, and data (in terms of semantics, entity types, and property values); instead of viewing diversity as a flaw that needs to be nullified or absorbed into

a generic, universally-appealing schema, Giunchiglia (2006) described it as an attribute to be preserved and capitalised upon; to capture the managing knowledge diversity, further suggested a approach, by coining the term “iTelos” (Giunchiglia & Fumagalli, 2019). A fascinating aspect of this study is the way in which the KnowDive Group at the University of Trento, led by Prof. Fausto Giunchiglia, has been resolving issues with knowledge representation and diversity by combining philosophy, linguistics, and cognitive science with rigorous computer science and mathematics.

From a classification standpoint, Dewey (1876) has separated the entire “universe of subjects” into 10 distinct classes; if we can visualise the subject matter from an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary perspective, we can analyse its various facets to discover new pathways to knowledge and avenues for research. The work’s ideas are like threads woven into a tapestry, connecting it to a “universe of concepts” grounded in various fields of study, from philosophy and linguistics to social science and pure science, technology and the arts, literature and history, geography and biography to religion and other generalisations. Due to the multifaceted nature of today’s social challenges, interdisciplinary approaches are more prevalent in the academy. Experts from various fields must collaborate to address today’s interconnected world’s social and technical challenges effectively. The interdisciplinary method, which views diverse specialisations of study as other expressions of the same fundamental unity of thinking, emerged as the dominant method for studying emerging domains (McGarry, 1981). Among the apparent social distinction between scientists and technologists, a distinction exacerbated by the connotation of “pure” and “applied”, the difference between those who provided the fundamental laws, canons, and principles and those who applied them in reality, the thin line between the theoreticians and technicians that becomes a well-known conflict of intellectual supremacy. Ultimately, however, as a result of this conflict, our subject is enriched in thought, and if the joint effort of both intellectuals revolves around a particular topic, it is capable of yielding an excellent outcome.

First, I welcome the opportunity to serve as the journal’s executive editor. Observing the name “*InterViews: An Interdisciplinary Journal in Social Sciences*” caught my initial attention for expanding the journal’s scope beyond the traditional confines of social science and encouraging dialogue with other academic disciplines. The primary goal of writing this editorial is to persuade modern academicians to develop new ways of seeing and thinking about the issues by donning fisheye lenses instead of conventional spectacles. The following six papers were selected for publication in this issue based on the qual-

ity and reviewers' remarks after the call for papers, which had an excellent response worldwide.

- In the paper entitled "*Family Strengths from a Finnish Perspective: A Thematic Analysis of an Interview*," a twenty-six-year-old Finnish lady in Qatar was interviewed, and theme analysis was used to examine the effects of her culture, ethnicity, and spirituality on her family's strengths, resilience, and environmental ties.
- The research, titled "*Reproductive Health among the Lisu Women of Arunachal Pradesh*," surveys 150 Lisu women from three locations in the Changlang District of Arunachal Pradesh (Gandhigram, Miao, and Kharsang) to investigate their general health, specifically during delivery and post-natal care of the mother, and how they deal with such situations.
- The study, titled "*Widowhood: A Case Study of Three Bihari Women*," delves into the experiences of three middle-class widows in Patna of Bihar, India, after the untimely deaths of their husbands. It examines the widows' familial environments, coping mechanisms, sources of support, hardships, and resiliency.
- The paper entitled "*Ethnography of the Apatanis of Arunachal Pradesh*," documents the heritages of tangible and intangible elements of the Apatani tribe of Arunachal Pradesh, India, through conducting in-depth interviews with members of the community's senior generation.
- The paper, titled "*Post-Colonial India: A Review*," examines how the country's post-colonial image differs from the truth, how British foreign policy led to numerous administrative reforms that weakened India's ties to its neighbours, and how the country has actively fought to change its image.
- The study, titled "*(Re)Constructing the Self in Prison: A Reflection from a Reading Part of My Soul Went With Him*," analyses the book *Part of My Soul Went with Him* by Winnie Mandela as a prison narrative that dives into the author's own (re)construction of self while incarcerated.

This issue also contains one article review and one book review.

- Ritwik Dutta reviewed the article "*Exploring Challenges of Online Education in COVID Times*" written by Deepak Pandit and Swati

Agrawal, published in the journal FIIB Business Review, vol. 11 no. 3, 2022.

- Paramananda Naik and Sanghamitra Sethi reviewed the book named “*Nutrition and Demography: An Anthropological Study on the Kondh of Odisha*”, a book edited by Kalpana Rani Sabat and Nirmal Chandra Dash, published by Capital Business Services & Consultancy, Bhubaneswar in 2022.

My deepest gratitude goes out to the management council of Saint Claret College, Ziro, for entrusting me with the role of Executive Editor and allowing me to offer you this issue of the journal. I’d like to thank everyone who contributed to this issue of the journal. The articles in this issue will be helpful to academicians worldwide, particularly in India. Again, I appreciate it.

References:

- Dewly, M. (1876). *A classification and subject index, for cataloguing and arranging the books and pamphlets of a library*. Hartword: Case, Lockwood & Brainard Company.
- Giunchiglia, F. (2006). Managing diversity in knowledge. In: M. Ali & R. Dapoigny (Eds.), *Advances in Applied Artificial Intelligence: 19th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Other Applications of Applied Intellifent Systems, IEA/AIE 2006, Annecy, France, June 27-30, 2006, Proceedings* (pp. 1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNAI, vol. 4031). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Giunchiglia, F., & Fumagalli, M. (2019). On knowledge diversity. In: A. Barton, S. Seppälä & D. Porello (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Joint Ontology Workshops 2019*. Retrieved from <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2518/paper-WOMOCOE2.pdf>
- Gopinath, M.A., & Seetharama, S. (1979). Interdisciplinary subjects and their classification. In A. Neelameghan (Ed.), *Ordering systems for global information networks* (pp. 121-35). Bangalore: FIDICR and Sarada Ranganathan Endowment.
- McGarry, K.J. (1981). *The changing context of information: An introductory analysis*. London: Clive Bingley.
- Neelameghan, A. (1973). Basic subjects and their arrangement: A summary. *Library Science with a Slant to Documentation*, 10(2), 207-221.

Ranganathan, S.R. (1964). Design of depth classification: Methodology. *Library Science with a slant to Documentation*, 1(1), 1-42.

Ranganathan, S.R. (1968). Basic subjects and their kinds. *Library Science with a Slant to Documentation*, 5(2), 97-133.

Satiya, M.P., Madali, D.P., & Dutta, B. (2014). Modes of growth of subject. *Knowledge Organization*, 41(3), 195-204.



Mayukh Sarkar
Executive Editor

Ziro
December, 2022