Chapter – I

Introduction

1.1 General Introduction:

What is the fate of humanity today? What will be the fate of humanity in the next millennium? Will humanity march towards peace and joy in the succeeding millennia or be wiped out the next millennia itself? - questions like these are staring at the face of this generation. (Gandhi (ed) 2000; 10)

says Dr. Venkatraman, the former president of India in his key- note address delivered in the Fourth International Conference on Peace and Non-violent Action conducted in New Delhi in the year 1999. His fears are not unfounded. For, the world has witnessed the destruction and the extent to which human beings can stoop down from their moral and ethical stature in the two World Wars. Apart from the World Wars, one has also seen many wars and dissensions that led to colossal damage of people, property and environment. This is high time one started acting on the proposition in hand i.e. Peace and Non-violence. Fruitful efforts have been taken by the international society to establish peace and non-violence. One such endeavor is the formation of the League of Nations followed by the United Nations.

Despite the formation of United Nations, one is still not able to achieve the desired result i.e. peaceful coexistence of people of different nationalities and cultures. It is unfortunate that people even fight for the religions whose aim is to create a peaceful and harmonious society. In this context, it becomes imperative to study the means of establishing peace and non-violence. In the modern era, where man is oriented only towards science the scene becomes rather distorted. So much of emphasis on science
leads to a unidirectional development. There is an imbalance and this imbalance adds fuel to the fire. As Dr. Radhakrishnan observes in his essay “An Ideal before the Youth”:

Escape from decline and catastrophe depends not on scientific ideas and material forces but on the perception of men and women….Any satisfactory system of education should aim at a balanced growth of the individual and insist on both knowledge and wisdom. It should not only train the intellect but bring grace into the heart of man. Wisdom is more easily gained through the study of literature, philosophy and religion.

They interpret the higher laws of the universe. (Iyengar ed 2005; 13)

Having realized the fact that the reading of literature, philosophy and religion brings about wisdom, it would be evident that this research work is an attempt in that direction. Wisdom is the quality of penetrating deep into the nature of things. If one wants to change the existing state of affairs, two things are required. First, the person should have a deep understanding of the mechanisms of the current state of affairs and the problems which stem out of them. Secondly, the person should have the vision of the future i.e. the upshot of the desired change and ways and means of effecting the change. These two points are so important without which any revolution becomes meaningless and wanes into oblivion. The researcher would like to effect a radical change in the society with a view to bringing about a utopia. This utopia is achievable because the cornerstone of this utopia is the individual and not the society because individual exists but not the society. Changing the society is like building castles in air. Society is an abstraction. Society is nothing but the collection of individuals. Without changing the individual, changing the society is a wild goose’s chase. To change an individual is not an easy task. Every individual behaves the way he/she behaves because
of his/her notions and perceptions of life and the society. Without effecting a change in their perception, one cannot change the individual concerned. A transformation at the grass-roots level is what is needed. And the transformation is often painful and heartbreaking. That's why most people have decided not to look at inside. They have been great extroverts whose attention was essentially on the outer world and they have not paid attention to the inner world of theirs. ‘The journey to the interior’ is the panacea to the raging problems of the world'. Acharya Tulsi said that societal transformation is possible only through individual transformation.

If the analysis boils down to the individual, what follows next? The analysis of the individual follows the proposition that the individual is at the center of things. For, an understanding of the nature of the individual is important to effect any change in him. Without this, any attempt to change the individual is going to be a cry in the wilderness. The researcher is going to deal with the psychological issues at length in the fourth chapter 'The Theory of Karma and Psychoanalysis’. But, some issues are to be delineated in the introduction because these psychological aspects will run through the entire thesis as the common thread. Dr. Scott Peck observes in his book 'Road Less Travelled':

Life is difficult. This is a great truth, one of the greatest truths. It is a great truth because once we truly see this truth, we transcend it. Once we truly know that life is difficult - then life is no longer difficult to understand and accept it - then life is no longer difficult. Because once it is accepted, the fact that life is difficult no longer matters. Most do not fully see this truth that life is difficult. Instead they moan more or less incessantly, noisily or subtly, about the enormity of their problems, their
burdens and their difficulties as if life were generally easy, as if life should be easy. (1998;15)

Man is a myth. He has not yet happened. There are chances of his happening. But he had not yet happened. As Dr. Scott-peck pointed out, 'life is difficult'. Life is a school. One has to learn the lessons at a great cost. If a person is open to life, courageous enough to encounter life in its nudity, he/she can go beyond the dualities of life. But the problem is there is a great deal of pull," the pull of the unconscious", to remain in the dark because to look at truth is often tortuous and painful. 'Truth is bitter' and that's why most people are not ready to look at it squarely. Instead of looking at it squarely, they become agitated. Their very agitation is the evidence of their not looking at the issue in hand. The agitation thus releases the energy and the pain is thrown out in the form of anger. 'Violence' cannot be properly understood if we continue to look at the external reasons alone. The psychology of violence must be understood to heal the violent mind. "If you don't have any wound on your body, even a sack of salt poured on you won't hurt you' is a saying worth its weight in gold. Either the energy is released in the form of anger or in the form of depression (even depression is anger turned inside). When these feelings go out of control, they explode, sometimes, much against the wish of the individual. An excerpt from Dr. Scott Peck’s “The Road Less travelled” will throw light on the issue:

Dr. Hilde Bruch, in the preface to her book 'Learning psychotherapy', states that basically all patients come to psychiatrists with "one common problem: the sense of helplessness, the fear and inner conviction of being unable to 'cope' and to change things." One of the roots of this “sense of impotence" in the majority of patients is some desire to partially or
totally escape the pain of freedom... They feel impotent because they have in fact given their power away. (1998; 43-44)

Every organism in the world wants to be happy. One cannot forget what Freud stated as the goal of every living organism i.e. to avoid pain to gain more happiness. If happiness is the pursuit of all living beings, why do we indulge in destructive activities? Indian religions have stated the triple formula as the substratum of life i.e. Sat, Chit and Anand (Being, Wisdom and Bliss). If every organism is driven towards happiness, then suffering and violence should not be the way of life. The answer for this question is not very easy. It has to be looked at from various angles. There are various reasons and the problem is multifaceted in its very nature. Any one dimensional solution will be very simplistic. The aim of the researcher is to look at some of the reasons (to the best of his knowledge) and try to find the way out. First the very word 'man' has to be understood deeply. The word man comes from the Sanskrit root 'manushya' In Tamil, it is 'manithan'. Manushya means consciousness and consciousness is ever expanding. It is not a finished product. On the contrary, it is a never - ending process. Dr Peck's observation is of immense value in this regard:

The science of anthropology and neuro-anatomy strongly suggests that the direction of all evolution is towards the development of the frontal lobes and hence the development of consciousness.... Thus, our evolution into consciousness has a far more profound implication.... It is when we are conscious that we have free will. More than anything else, I believe what is meant by God’s creating us in His own image is that, through the evolutionary process, He gave us free will. There is no free will when we are operating at a purely reflexive or instinctive level.

(1998; 66-67)
That is what the problem of human being is. The problem is that the process of growth is continuously on. This is what makes man anxious and tension-ridden. Man is a rope stretched between animal and superman. Fredrik Nietzsche says in his monumental book ‘Thus Spake Zarathustra’ that man is a rope stretched between animal and over man. Nietzsche is immaculate in his observation. Man is only a possibility. He has tremendous potential to be actualized. If the potential is not unleashed, man will be nothing more than a living vegetable. Nietzsche differentiates between the over-man and the ordinary man. He says that the common man is a laughing stock and a thing of shame to the over-man as apes are to the common man.

Man is continuously daunted by many psychological forces about which he has no inkling or whatsoever. As Heidegger pointed out, 'man is a crowd'. He is pulled at the same time by different forces in different angles. He feels utterly helpless and at last yields to them. Man is not a master in his own house. That is the greatest of all tragedies that occurred to humanity. Unless man becomes a master in his own house, the seething social problems can never come to an end. The individual's crisis must be managed first. Without managing the individual's crisis, one can never hope to think of curing the social crises. Doing so will be hoping against the hope. The very word 'individual' means' that which cannot be divided any further'. But not every individual is an individual in the true sense of the word. Man is not a 'unity' but a 'multiplicity.'

Man, as Nietzsche says, is a rope stretched between animal and superman. He is fluctuating all the time. This fluctuation causes 'angst', to use the terminology of the existentialists. Unless man becomes crystallized, his problems will continue to daunt him. The very crystallization of his personality is the settling of wisdom and maturity. But it is mandatory to analyze as to what hinders the process of crystallization of his personality. Only 'Truth' i.e. Satyam can liberate a person from his 'militant ignorance'
to use one of Dr. Peck's favourite phrases. But 'what is truth' should be the primary question.

Lao Tzu says that ‘Truth’ cannot be said and whatever is said is not an absolute truth. His words are economical and effective. The most important book of Jainas is 'Tattvarta Sutra' which means 'that which is'. That is a beautiful definition of 'truth'. Truth is that 'isness'. Though the ‘isness’ does not define anything, it is the very definition of truth, the most beautiful and accurate. Truth is 'That Which Is'. The very paradox of life is that which is very near is also very far. Nizzim Ezekiel in his poem ‘Enterprise’ portrays the meaninglessness of outward pilgrimage. He concludes the poem by saying that home is the place one has to gather grace.

Home is the place one has to gather grace. Only ‘that which is’ can liberate one. Then what happens? Why one is not able to perceive what 'is'? Reasons are many; first and foremost, man's search always begins outwardly. The whole substratum of western science lies in the principle of analyzing the outer world. The search for truth always starts with the journey to the interior. Secondly, our civilizations have done quite a lot of damage in the name of acculturation. Sigmund Freud, in his book 'Civilization and Its Discontents’, argues that all the civilizations up to now have been highly oppressive and unrelenting. Thirdly, one understands the world through one's language. Language is in no way connected to the reality and hence it is a great barrier. That's why Nietzsche said that humans live in the prison house of language. Above all, human beings are so exceptionally self centered that they fabricate anything and everything as it suits them. One more thing is that human beings are limited beings and their perception is highly limited. It would be next to impossible to understand the complex mechanisms of the universe outside and inside in its entirety because of our limited perception. The
biologist Edmund O Wilson puts it succinctly in his book 'On Human Nature'. An excerpt from Stevenson will be relevant in this context:

Steven Weinberg has pointed out that physical reality remains so mysterious even to physicists because of the extreme impossibility that it was constructed to be understood by the human mind. We can reverse that insight to note with still greater force that the intellect was not constructed to understand atoms or to understand itself but to promote the survival of human genes. (1987; 385)

Having said that there are reasons why one is not able to understand ‘that which is’, one has to be very sympathetic and flexible to be in tune with ‘that which is’. This thesis analyzes the concepts of Jain philosophy together with various modern movements like Postmodernism, Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis with a view to understanding ‘that which is’ knowing fully well that one’s knowledge is limited and subject to the factors said above. In spite of the limitations, the effort is worth taking simply because the results are astounding and rewarding. Equanimity of mind is a great blessing because all negative feelings like greed, jealousy, anger disappear when this state of mind is achieved. An individual with such a state of mind is a boon to the humanity. For in him lies the future of the desired utopia. The philosophy of ahimsa is the central doctrine of Jainism. Lord Mahavir is the very epitome of compassion and equanimity. So the researcher has attempted to study the philosophy of ahimsa in the light of psychoanalytic theory, Postmodernism and Deconstruction.

1.2. Postmodernism – An Introduction:

Postmodernism falls back upon modernism to draw energy for its sustenance as poststructuralism falls back upon structuralism. Postmodernism is a continuation of modernism even though it denounces some of the standpoints of modernism. The ‘post’
in Postmodernism is difficult to pin down. Does the post indicate ‘posteriority’ or ‘denial’? Is Postmodernism a denial of modernism or a development of modernism? Postmodernism defies definition because there are opposing tendencies even within Postmodernism. Postmodernism means different things to different people.

With the unpindownability of the term Postmodernism comes the problem of plurality of Postmodernisms. Is Postmodernism one singular standpoint applied to different areas of study? This question does not seem to be answered in the affirmative. To add to the obscurities associated with modernism, Postmodernism has its own share of complexities both on its own and on its association with modernism. There is only one surety with Postmodernism and that is its skepticism. The only certainty of Postmodernism is its uncertainty. Other than this aspect of Postmodernism, no two Postmodernists agree with each other. Robinson writes:

Nobody really knows what the label Postmodernism means. At least two famous Postmodernist philosophers have now disowned the term as vacuous, ambiguous and misleading. No one is even sure what modernism means, let alone in what sense we have recently gone beyond it, or rejected it, or developed from it. (2005; 35)

Postmodernism thus has been looked at in a variety of ways by different scholars. Though it is not possible to pin down Postmodernism, it is possible to draw an outline of the basic principles in contrast to modernist principles which would elucidate, to some extent, the standoff between modernism and Postmodernism. Modernism needs to be understood first in order to comprehend what Postmodernism is. Modernism has its roots in Enlightenment project and continued its grand proposals of grand narratives. Peter Barry writes:
For Hebermas the modern period begins with the enlightenment, that period of about one hundred years, from the mid seventeenth to mid eighteenth century, where a new faith arose in the power of reason to improve human society. …The so called enlightenment project is the fostering of belief that a break with tradition, blind habit, and slavish obedience to religious precepts and prohibitions, coupled with the applications of reason and logic by the disinterested individual can bring about a solution to the problem of society. This outlook is what Hebermas means by modernity. (1999; 85)

Modernity then stands for the ideals of progress through logic and reason. This belief, despite its vanquishing grand narratives like Christianity, gave birth to the grand narrative called science. Modernists believed that it would be possible to arrive at a ‘grand unified theory’ about reality. Modernism also stands for ideals but many modernist thinkers were disillusioned after the disastrous wars and the decline of human values. Modernity also stands for this longing for wholeness and a lost coherence, with the advent of science, Christian values started diminishing. People’s beliefs were shaken to the root. Though modernism looked for grand unified theories, it also marked the void which came to pass then as a result of the demise of Christianity. Modernists felt that nothing was the essence of their time. Psychology underscores the fact that whenever a long-standing opinion or belief is nullified and becomes obsolete, it is human to feel a kind of purposelessness and void. Modernism thus was going through the birth pangs of Postmodernism. The advent of science gave way to the execution of the long-standing religious beliefs of the west. T.S.Eliot recorded his angst in his ‘The Wasteland’ and W.B.Yeats expressed his ideas in his celebrated poem ‘The Second Coming’. This loss of the purpose and unity was also the hallmark of modernism. This
is where modernism is clearly different from Postmodernism. Postmodernism (at least most of the Postmodernists) revels in the fact that there is no universal truth or a grand unified theory and modernism laments for the same. An understanding of modernism will help one understand Postmodernism. In one word, Postmodernism celebrates difference and looks at any totalizing theory with suspicion. Postmodernism is then a continuation of modernism. Powell offers an easy-to-follow kind of explanation to distinguish between modernism and Postmodernism:

There is little agreement on the subject, partly because Postmodernism—whatever it is—is an attempt to make sense of what is going on now and we can see the present clearly only in retrospect. One Postmodern theorist, Ihab Hassan, offers a table of differences between the two movements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernism</th>
<th>Postmodernism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>form (conjunctive/closed)</td>
<td>antiform (disjunctive/ open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchy</td>
<td>anarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art object/finished work</td>
<td>process/performance/happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presence</td>
<td>absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centering</td>
<td>dispersal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genre/boundary</td>
<td>text/intertext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root/depth</td>
<td>rhizome/surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2002; 17)

This would have made the postmodern stance clearer. Postmodernism is the leela of Hinduism. Hinduism accepts everything. Hinduism allows trillions of gods because
Hinduism knows that reality cannot be confined to any form and anyone who does so does it because of ignorance and immaturity. Hinduism is very tolerant of diversities and tries to understand the significance of contrarieties to the whole. Hinduism has been so accepting that it is impossible to put all the viewpoints of Hinduism in one basket. Even contradictory philosophies are accepted in Hinduism. Jainology accepts that contradiction is part and parcel of reality. Thus postmodernism is a healthy attitude to life as it minimizes the chance for violence and maximizes the opportunities for freedom and justice.

1.3 **Poststructuralism- An Introduction:**

Poststructuralism is a movement which owes its existence to its predecessor ‘structuralism’ on whom it is dependent and from whom it takes a lot of theoretical standpoints. Even though poststructuralism takes much from structuralism, it denies much that structuralism claims to be valid. Poststructuralism is very skeptical of the foundation of knowledge and sets in motion a world of radical uncertainty. To understand Deconstruction better, it will be essential to take a quick detour of the historical background in which Deconstruction grew.

France has always been a haven for intellectuals. The French revolution has set the most appropriate atmosphere for breeding and nurturing intellectuals. The word intellectual is a product of enlightenment project. ‘Reason’, the Enlightenment philosophers thought, would lead one to infallible knowledge and the vision of Enlightenment became dim and the birth of modernism had already called into question the aspects of Enlightenment. This disillusionment with the Enlightenment project brought forth intense skepticism. This change in focus made the intellectuals look at language more seriously. Nietzsche had already called into question the efficacy of language and warned one against the deceptive and mind-blurring nature of language.
Thus their disillusionment with the Enlightenment project brought forth rigorous analysis of language. Intellectuals began attending to how words mean more than what they mean. Increasingly distrustful of language claiming to convey only a single authorization message – they began exploring how words can say many different meanings simultaneously. Truly, Fredrik Nietzsche was the first postmodern poststructuralist with his deep-gnawing doubts about languages. Robinson writes thus:

Nietzsche also saw languages as the key player in a continual process of human deception. Words are what we think with and we often automatically assure that there are entities ‘out there’ to which they refer. Words are useful to us because we can use them to simplify and freeze the chaos and complexities of our surroundings, but that is all they can do. Not only will our grammar control the way in which our thoughts are organized, but more drastically, it will determine what sorts of thoughts it is possible for us to have. (2005; 17)

While all these were happening in France, much had taken place in Geneva which would pave the way for and set the stage for the appearance of Deconstruction. Ferdinand de Saussure was born in Geneva, Switzerland, on 26th November 1857. When he was student at the University of Geneva, he came up with an amazing finding that proto-Indo-European languages did not have three vowels but five. This mistake was committed by many scholars that time and modern research has proved that Saussure was correct. Saussure exhibited his extraordinary talents even when he was very young. Saussure then started teaching and he was teaching ancient Sanskrit language. The world would have missed the insights of Saussure had the university officials not asked him to teach a course on general linguistics, Saussure worked out the lessons but he was eaten up by self doubt. But his colleagues and his students held him in high esteem. As a
matter of fact, Saussure’s ‘Course in General Linguistics’ was not written by Saussure. The first edition of ‘Course in General Linguistics’ was published in 1916, three years after Saussure’s death. Saussure’s students thought Saussure had much to contribute to the knowledge of the world. As a result, they compiled the lecture notes and published the landmark text.

Saussure made it very clear that language has no connection or whatsoever with reality. Saussure argued that the relationship between ‘words’ and ‘their meaning’ is arbitrary. This only strengthened the doubts which were strongly articulated by Nietzsche. Immediately after the publication of the course, Saussure was well received by the thinkers; Roman Jakobson was one of those thinkers who were deeply influenced by the Saussurean analysis of language. Thus Saussure’s ideas became popular.

With Jakobson’s move to Columbia University, Saussure’s idea also travelled to America. Claude Levi Strauss is one of the prominent scholars who popularized Saussure’s ideas. Claude Levi Strauss learnt the ideas of Saussure from Roman Jakobson and applied them to anthropology which came to be called structural anthropology. Roland Barthes is another prominent scholar who applied the ideas of Saussure to culture, society and any sign system. The study of signs, as practiced by Bathes and others, came to be called ‘Semiotics’. Saussure’s ideas influenced two important people who are but called ‘poststructuralists’, Jacques Lacan and Jacques Derrida. Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida and Foucault are the three important exponents of the movement called poststructuralism. This research work is primarily concerned about Derrida and his path-breaking theory of Deconstruction.

Jacques Derrida was born in a Jewish family in El-Biar Algiers. Derrida was born and brought up in a place where the Jews were openly discriminated. This childhood discrimination could have been one of the reasons why Derrida in his later
exposition was chiefly concerned with ‘center’ and ‘marginal’ and the process of ‘discriminating’.

Derrida’s deconstruction demands close reading of the text. Derrida was influenced by Nietzsche, Heidegger, Freud and Saussure. Even before Saussure’s structuralism became prominent, there were other schools of ‘structuralism’. In fact, they were not called structuralism. But their function and aim were similar to that of ‘structuralism’. In Anglo-American literary studies, ‘New Criticism’ was in vogue. ‘New Criticism’ subjected literature to threadbare analysis in order to understand the meaning. For New Critics, ‘form’ and ‘meaning’ are closely connected to each other and by analyzing the form the content will be revealed on its own. In its stance of form and meaning, New Criticism analyzed the individual texts and stopped there. New Critics did not look for the ‘common’ structure which makes the ‘event’ possible.

Thus ‘New criticism’ in America and ‘practical criticism’ in England prioritized the study of form by calling our attention to the medium. It is surprising that similar ideas were developed in different corners of the world at almost the same period. To this period belongs Empson’s book ‘Seven Types of Ambiguity’. Empson zeroed down on the slipperiness of language and by doing so paved the way for poststructuralism. However, Empson was of the view that context binds the otherwise fleeting meaning of a text. But for this, Empson’s work is in every respect a post-structuralist text. Barry writes:

Empson’s basic attitude to language is that it is a slippery medium indeed; when we handle language, we need to be aware that the whole thing is likely to explode into meanings we hadn’t suspected of being there at all. As we go from ambiguity type one to type seven, we seem to be approaching the frontiers of language, where the territory eventually
becomes unmappable, and we seem to end up looking into a void of linguistic indeterminacy. This can be seen as an anticipation from within the British tradition of poststructuralist views about the unreliability of language as a medium. But the placing of language within any context naturally tends to reduce or eliminate ambiguity. (1999: 30)

Empson’s ‘Seven Types of Ambiguity’ is in every way a predecessor of ‘Of Grammatology’. The seeds of poststructuralism were already sown by the ‘New Criticism’ and ‘Practical Criticism’. In Russia, a different sort of structuralism was taking shape. Russian formalism aims at finding out what makes a literary work of art different from a normal piece of writing. The ‘literariness’ in the language, according to the Russian formalists, is the difference between ‘work of art’ and ‘normal piece of writing’. Roman Jakobson was the most prominent exponent of Russian school of formalism. Jakobson emphasized the notion of Victor Shklovsky that ‘defamiliarization’ is what creates the difference between a literary text and other writing. The literary devices defamiliarize the ‘language’ that has become quite casual to the human beings. This defamiliarization is what makes a poem a poem.

Jakobson and others wanted to work out the process of defamiliarization. In the poems, this process of defamiliarization is easy to find. In a poem, one can find rhyme, meter, alliteration, assonance etc. These devices and others create the desired defamiliarization. When it comes to poems, the notion of ‘defamiliarization’ causes the poems to be well on the top. But how does one apply this insight to a fiction? This problem was later answered by Boris Tomashevski. He was of the opinion that the ‘defamiliarization’ took place in a novel not because of language but because of presentation. He came up with the explanation that it is not the story but the presentation of the story which gives birth to defamiliarization. He used the terms ‘fabula’ and
‘suzhet’ for stories and the presentation respectively. Vladimir Propp also published ‘The Morphology of Folktales’ which underscored the concerns of Russian formalism. Propp found that different folk tales are built upon the same plot but they differ in their exposition.

These two schools of thought were developed in different places but they do have a common thread running through them all. The French structuralism, developed by Saussure, is different from these two similar schools i.e. Anglo-American formalism and Russian Formalism. Both of them pointed out that form and meaning are inextricably bound up. They were correct in saying that Propp’s ‘Morphology of Folktales’ was an attempt to find out the common structure but it was not felt and argued that structure is what makes meaning possible. To quote Bertens:

However, for the French structuralism that is the main subject of this structure is even more fundamental than form. Form is inevitably bound up with meaning; structure, however, is what makes meaning possible. It is that which enables meaning to emerge. (2001; 55)

Saussure, like Anglo-American formalists and Russian formalists, focused his attention on language. Saussure wanted to understand how language as such functions. He posited that language is a system of signs and a sign comprises a signifier and a signified. A sign is like a paper and signifier and signified constitute the two sides of the paper. A sign does not deal with the referent. The relationship between the signifier and the referent is arbitrary. To be more precise, it is both arbitrary and fixed. Saussure’s structuralism already called into question the efficacy of language in representing reality. But structuralism advocated that one can find out the structure which makes meaning possible. Meaning is created via difference structuralism thus takes a postmodern stand. Ward writes thus:
Because there is no natural or inevitable bond between words and things, Saussure saw languages as an arbitrary system. From this starting point, structuralist and eventually postmodernist theory abandoned any question of ‘truth’. It argues that language can never be a transparent or innocent reflection of reality. (2007; 90)

This is the literary and philosophical background in which Derrida propounded the theory of Deconstruction. Deconstruction is a poststructuralist and a postmodernist theory. Derrida, accepting the claims of structuralism that difference is at the centre of the process of signification, extended it to have ‘deference’. To Derrida, the quest of meaning is like unlocking the Pandora’s box. Once it is opened, there is no way to end it. It is a continuous process of construction, deconstruction and reconstruction.

1.4. Psychoanalysis- An Introduction:

Psychoanalysis, as its name suggests, is an analytic method and it helps one understand one’s mind better. Freud is considered to be one of the three great scientists i.e. Copernicus, Darwin and Freud who changed the worldview on its head. Psychoanalysis and Freud are inseparable. Even though many psychoanalytic schools are now in existence, they all owe their existence to Sigmund Freud, the great Viennese psychologist. Freud attributes his intelligence to his Jewish background and his confidence to his mother’s love and faith in him. Freud's own experiences in childhood helped him understand the human psyche. Right from the beginning, Freud showed exemplary merit and remarkable intelligence. To add to it, he was meticulous and industrious.

Freud went to the University of Vienna medical school in 1873. He was a thorough scientist even then as he searched for the gonads of eels because everyone thought that they did not possess one. He dissected plenty of them in order to verify.
Freud was very keen to explain phenomena in a scientific and methodical fashion. Freud studied under Ernest Bruke. Ernest Bruke was heavily influenced by determinism. Freud's time was the period where Darwin's ideas gained currency and positivism ruled the roost. At this juncture, Freud got an opportunity to get training from Charcot which laid the foundation for psychoanalytic thought. Without an iota of doubt Freud was the first psychologist in the Victorian period who devised empirical methods to study the unconscious. For the first time in the Victorian period, someone looked at mind as something more than the construct of nerves. All psychic problems were ascribed to nerve disorder or some physical deformity. But, no one was ready to accept that the root cause of physical problems could be primarily psychological. Like any other discoverer, Freud was first vilified and he had to go through the stormy period before he was given the importance that he deserved. Freud himself was aware of the problems of receptions his theory would have. He writes:

This is the gap which psychoanalysis seeks to fill. It tries to give psychiatry its missing psychological foundation. It hopes to discover the common ground on the basis of which the convergence of physical and mental disorder will become intelligible. With this aim in view, psychoanalysis must keep itself free from any hypothesis that is alien to it, whether of an anatomical, chemical or physiological kind, and must operate entirely with purely psychological kind, and must operate entirely with purely psychological auxiliary ideas; and for that very reason, I fear, it will seem strange to you to begin with. (2003; 35)

Today, it would be casual and uncontroversial to emphasize that the root cause of one’s physical problems can be purely psychological. But in Freud’s time, it was more than revolutionary. Freud must be credited for the simple reason that the world
would have missed much but for Freud’s discovery of the unconscious. The word ‘discovery’ may not be appropriate, as philosophers and poets had already developed similar ideas. But Freud and Breuer paved the way for scientifically analyzing the unconscious.

Freud and Breuer established that there are “unconscious” forces, which lie at the root of most of the problems. This is the first achievement of psychoanalysis. Any student of literature, philosophy and religion will have no problem in believing the existence of the unconscious. The essence of all religions can be summarized in one sentence i.e. attitudes determine altitudes. Attitude is the sum total of one’s perceptions of oneself, others and the world. If psychology does not accept the existence of ideas and perceptions just because they are not material and their impact on one’s life, it will be disastrous. Freud himself pointed out this shortcoming of psychology. He writes:

But no portion of your interest has been directed to psychical life, in which, after all, the achievement of this marvelously complex organism reaches its peak. For that reason, psychological modes of thought have remained foreign to you. You have grown accustomed to regarding them with suspicion, to denying them the attribute of being scientific, and to handing them over to laymen, poets, natural philosophers and mystics.

(2003; 34)

When Freud was working with Joseph Breuer, his mentor, they came across the famous case of Anna ‘O’. Breuer noticed, during his sessions that whenever Anna ‘O’ expressed her problems with vigor and reexperienced the feelings, which happened at the time of formation of hysterical symptoms, she felt relieved. Breuer named this process ‘catharsis’ and the word means ‘purification’. Breuer and Freud were of the opinion that the hysterical symptoms appeared as a result of their being suppressed. In the case of
Anna‘O’, she suppressed the feeling of disgust. She happened to see her dog drinking water from the glass when she went to one of her acquaintance’s house. The very sight was so disgusting that she could not drink water anymore as drinking water brought back the incident to her mind.

Anna was not able to drink water as the event was always brought to her mind whenever she wanted to drink. This traumatic incident had affected her so much that she could not forget it. So Freud and Breuer concluded that the patient could not successfully banish the thought from her consciousness. Had the patient expressed her disgust at the same moment of her having experienced it, there would have been nothing to repress. Anna‘O’ did not vent out her emotions and suppressed them. As the energy was not expressed, it found its own outlet in the form of hysterical conversion. In order for this hysterical conversion to be checked, one has to channelize the energy in a positive way.

Anna‘O’ herself could feel the disappearing of the symptoms as she went through the process of ‘talking cure’. ‘Hysterical conversion’ then takes place when the patient is not able to repress the thought successfully. If the emotions associated with an event are not properly released, they may become the source of hysteria. ‘Repression’ itself is not enough to cause ‘hysteria’ as repression is not a conscious work done by the individual concerned. ‘Repression’ takes place unconsciously. When repression is not successful, then people try to suppress it consciously but from the outset this effort is doomed to fail and fail miserably.

Hysterical conversion takes place as a result of unsuccessful repression. When the source of the trouble is given energetic expression, the symptom disappears. Even though this insight was momentous, Freud was not completely satisfied by the explanation. It is understandable that seeing the dog drinking water from the glass is
disgusting; but it alone is not enough to explain the formation of aqua phobia as a result. Freud thought that there must be something to it than meets the eye. This is where Breuer broke away with Freud. Berg writes:

Not stopping at the idea of hysterical conversion, Breuer and Freud subjected the process of strangulation to even closer scrutiny. They made two important observations. First, they noted that it was not just any experiences that were suppressed, but wishful impulses. Wishful impulses that were in conflict with the patients other wishes and their ethical standards… In this way, Breuer and Freud managed to explain hysteria. Breuer was satisfied with this. Freud. However, was not.

(2003; 4-7)

Even though Freud broke away with Breuer, the idea of repression and catharsis remained with him forever. Freud had to look into the methodological aspects of treatment also. Breuer followed the method of hypnosis and Freud was not happy with the hypnotic method as he thought that it did not take one to the root of the problem. Freud also came across other problems in the practice of hypnosis. The hypnotic method practiced by both Freud and Breuer was different from the hypnosis, which was in vogue then. Hypnosis was the process of hypnotizing the patient concerned and then to give the patient counter-suggestions to cure him of his/her illness. Freud and Breuer did not make use of this method, as they knew that this method did not take them to the causal connections between the pathology and the event. Then Freud discontinued the hypnotic method as it, in his viewpoint, resulted in transference (the idea was not accepted by Breuer) and Freud could not succeed in all the cases. Waelder gives the following reasons for Freud’s giving up the practice of hypnosis:
The fact that not everyone responds to hypnosis and his reluctance to work in a kind of twilight condition unfavorable to scientific results were among the motives, which induced him to discontinue hypnosis and to look for a method applicable in full consciousness. From then on Freud did not hypnotize his patients. Consequently he could no longer ask them to tell him the genesis of their symptoms of which they knew nothing. (2003; 8)

From there, Freud’s journey was tortuous and hard. Freud was convinced of the fact that unconscious forces are operative in human mind and this conviction gained its grounds in Freudian scheme of things as he was trained by both Charcot and Breuer. History, everywhere, seems to follow the same line. Derrida deconstructed Saussure but without Saussure Derrida would not have become what he became. Freud went much ahead of Breuer (and Charcot), who was not ready to agree with Freud. But Freud would not have become Freud without Breuer. Freud was convinced that unconscious forces are operative and these forces drive man and influence him and man is not an autonomous individual, as humanism would hold it.

Thus psychoanalysis paved the way for understanding human psyche in a better way. Thanks to Freud, the importance of childhood came to be understood. Psychoanalysis demonstrated with evidence that psychic health is not possible through repression as a result of which much in the west has changed. Psychoanalysis is a boon to humanity as it takes human beings on the road of mental health and harmony.

1.5 Jainism: An Introduction:

Jainism is one of the oldest religions in India. It is pre historical. The first tirthankara Lord Rishabha was mentioned with respect in the Vedas. It suggests that Lord Rishabha must have preceded the Vedic period. But the life time of Lord Rishabha cannot be pinned down accurately. The last tirthankara was Lord Mahavir. It is said that
the major Indian religions have been influenced by the ideas of Jainism. In this regard, it would be illuminating to quote M.S. Abhinandan:

Equally revealing are the ideas of a Jaina scholar who believes that the concept of Bodhisattva in Buddhism, who delays his liberation to guide fellow beings is an adaptation of the concept of tirthankara; that Practical Truth and Natural Truth in Shankara's teachings are inspired by the Practical Reality and Actual Reality of Jainism; that Anekantavada of Jainism is a remarkable rationalization of Zero, which developed into the philosophy of shunyavada. (2005; 120-121)

Even though Jainism has influenced other religions of India, it still remains as a religion of minorities. The term 'Jainism' comes from the word 'jina' which means the conqueror. Here conquering does not mean physical conquest. On the other hand, it is a spiritual conquest i.e. self-conquering. It refers to a person who has conquered himself. In other words, he has become the master in his own house. The researcher has mentioned in the introduction that unless a man becomes a master in his own house (Freud's usage), the seething social problems cannot come to an end. In the context of Jainism, one can say that unless one becomes a Jina, the seething social problems will not come to an end. One can now see how the principles of Jainism are relevant to the problems of our time. Even Mahatma Gandhi was greatly inspired by the philosophy of Jainism.

Jainism is a religion of values. It does not believe that an all powerful god created this universe. According to Jainism, the cosmos is beginningless and endless. In the Jain scheme of things, there is no creator, protector and destroyer. Jainism does not believe in god but in godliness. An individual can unearth his latent potential and attain Godhead. Every individual is capable of uplifting himself to the highest level of
consciousness and has the potential hidden in him. As a result of this conviction, Jainism does not encourage any caste system. In fact Mahavir voiced his concerns against the then prevailing caste system of Hinduism. To quote Sadhvi Visrutavibha:

In Jain religion, Castism is considered unreal. It does not give any spiritual importance to Castism. He said, 'Brahmana, Ksatriya, Vaisya and Sudra are all divided according to their work any not according to their caste. A single person can belong to all the four classes in his life'.... It is the penance and austerity which deserve respect and not the caste.

(2007; 38)

In fact, Jainism is a highly democratic and socialistic religion by principles. It treats everyone equally. Mahavir boldly initiated women in his order even when Buddha was hesitant about initiating them. It is recorded in history that Mahavir had more nuns in his order than monks. Mahavir considered that all living beings are equal and practised absolute reverence for all life forms. So it would be evident by now that Jainism is more of a way of life than a religion in the normal sense of the word. It enunciates and emphasizes discipline and compassion. A quick detour of Jainism will be rewarding as it will help one understand the philosophical concepts of Jainism in relation to the other concepts.

Jainism came to be called so only after the life of Mahavir. Before him Jainism was known as "Arhat Dharma". The term Arhat was used till Lord Parsvanatha. Mahavir was known as Shramana Bhaghavan. Jainism was not founded by Lord Mahavir as is normally believed. Mahavir was the last i.e. twenty forth tirthankara of the tradition of tirthankaras. Lord Rishabha was the first tirthankara and was born in a royal family. He organized the people who were otherwise nomadic and led them to prosperity. One day he happened to see the sudden death of a dancing girl in the middle of her performance.
This incident shook him up and made him realize the ephemeral nature of life. This incident spurred him to inquire the nature and meaning of life. He renounced all his wealth and became an ascetic. It was Lord Rishabha who propounded the principle of non violence and co-existence first. So Jainism is a religion which shaped the Indian mind from the pre historical period. The following excerpt from 'Tattvarta Sutra' puts Jainism in its place.

The Shramana religions rejected the authority of the Hindu scriptures (Vedas) and deities, denied the efficacy of sacrifice and, most importantly. It displayed pronounced antagonism to the tradition of Brahmanical (priestly) supremacy. Jainism is one of the two extant Shramana religions and the only one to survive in India. The other Survivor, Buddhism, disappeared from India by the fourteenth century. Today there are approximately seven million followers of Jainism, the vast majority of whom live in India. (1994; 25)

All the tirthankaras were enlightened masters and led their followers towards truth. Out of the twenty four tirthankaras, only lord Mahavir and his predecessor are historical and others are pre-historical. Actually, the word Tirthankara means 'those who build the bridge'. It would be evident that tirthankaras are those wise men who helped their followers attain enlightenment and thus helped them cross over. Lord Mahavir was born in the year 599 BC. Little is known about his early life. He was born in a very rich family and his father was a minor ruler.

He got married at the right age and fathered a child. When he happened to see a group of wandering monks, he felt an urge to join them in the pursuit of truth. But he did not do so because of the insistence of their parents. At the age of twenty eight, he lost his parents. He waited for sometime till his brother saw through the period and
consolidated the business and then he took leave of them in pursuit of truth. He became an ascetic and subjected himself to penances with a view to attaining the supreme knowledge i.e. kevalgyan. After twelve years of incessant and untiring efforts, Mahavir attained enlightenment. Mahavir lived thirty years after his enlightenment teaching and guiding his followers. His followers spread over the whole country. Jainism took roots in south India also thanks to them. An old rock inscription in Shravanabelgola commemorates the visit of Badrabahu, the leader of the monks who went to south India to propagate Jainism. Jainism is rock solid as a philosophical system. Rarely does one find discrepancies among the different groups of Jainism in terms of philosophical system.

But there are two major divisions in Jainism i.e. Svetambara and Digambara. Svetambara literally means 'White clad' and Digambara literally means 'Sky clad. So, the Digambaras do not wear any clothes and insist that their stance is more akin to Mahavir’s. There is one more disagreement between the two. Digambaras maintain that Mahavir did not get married at all. Further splits also took place in these divisions. Notable among them were those who gave up idol worship and devoted themselves to scriptures. Terapanthi in Svetambara and Samaiyas in Digambara are those who gave up the idol worship altogether. If one puts aside these minor differences, Jainism is an undivided philosophical stand point. In spite of their differences, all the schools of Jain philosophy unanimously agree that discipline and compassion are the keys that will unlock the door of enlightenment. In essence, Jainism revolves around the three cardinal principles i.e. right knowledge and right conduct. Apart from the three cardinal principles, Jainism classifies nine categories of truth. They are as follows:

1. Jiva (Sentient being)
2. Ajiva (non-sentient being)
3. Punya (merit)
4. Papa (demerit)
5. Asrava (cause of influx of karma)
6. Samvara (cause of stoppage of influx of karma)
7. Nirjara (shedding off Karma)
8. Bandha (bondage of karma)
9. Moksa (liberation)

of all these, Jiva and ajiva are the most important principles. For, all other things come to happen only because of the interaction between the two. An excerpt from 'Studies in Jainism' will explicate the issue further:

The Jaina philosophy might be summed up (in the following way)... A close analysis of this brief statement shows that it involves seven propositions: First, that there is something called living; Secondly, that there is something called non-living; thirdly that the two come into contact with each other, fourthly, that the contact leads to the production of some energies; fifthly, that the process of contact could be stopped; sixthly, that the existing energies could also be exhausted; and lastly, that salvation could be achieved. These seven propositions are called the seven tattvas or realities by the Jainas. The first two great truths are that there is a jiva or a soul and there is an ajiva or non-soul. These two exhaust between them all that exists in the universe. (1997; 19)

Jain philosophy believes that the interaction between jiva and ajiva causes the existence of this universe. The theory of karma is the central doctrine of Jainism. In this regard, all Indian systems of thought with the single exception of charvakas agree that the karma is the determiner of the cycle of birth and death. Karma in Jainism is thought
to be a psychophysical force which is attracted from outside by soul when it is soiled by desires. Jainism holds that the purpose of life is moksha and moksha is possible only when these karmic particles are cast off through contemplation and penance. Karma is not 'fatistic' but individualistic and every individual is free to free him/her from the karmic bondage.

Moksha is the end and aim of life according to Jainism and the road to moksha is understanding and right conduct. To bring about right knowledge, Jainism recommends ‘tarka’ and ‘vada’. The nature of reality is examined and theories pertaining to the nature of reality are postulated which are the results of rigorous logical analysis they are as follows:

1. Anekantavada
2. Nayavada
3. Syadvada
4. Aparigraha
5. Ahimsa
6. Karma

Jainology is not just a religious faith but a philosophical system. It is a logical system of thought. At every step, Jain philosophers employed logic and the whole system is an interconnected continuum. Treating jainology as a mere religious faith devoid of logical discourse is vacuous and inappropriate. Jainology is an attempt to understand truth i.e. ‘that which is’ and it deserves serious attention and accolades.

**1.6 Scope and Objectives of the Study:**

This dissertation ‘Postmodernism, Deconstruction, Psycho analysis and Jainism’ attempts a comparative study focusing on the common concerns among them. Though Mahavira, a great visionary, propounded Jain philosophy two thousand years ago in
India, the key ideas of Jainism like Anekantavada, Syadvada, Karmavada, Aparigraha and Ahimsa are akin to modern theoretical concepts embedded in western movements like postmodernism, poststructuralism and psychoanalysis.

Both Anekanta and Postmodernism profess many-sidedness of reality. Truth can be understood by a mind which is postmodern or anekantic in its outlook for such an approach leads to truth without any pre-conceived notion of superiority or inferiority. A person who thinks that he knows closes himself to knowledge. Hence both Postmodernism and Anekantavada of Jainism are important to be understood. In this respect, both the oriental and western philosophical perspectives converge. Absolutism is untenable at the highest level of analysis and reasoning; our language, knowledge and almost everything are relative in nature. An understanding of the concepts of ‘syadvad’ in Jain philosophy and ‘difference’ in Deconstruction will reveal the nature of meaning and its evasiveness. Both of these theoretical orientations problematize the notion of absolute reality embedded in western philosophical tradition.

Mahavira’s principles of karma, aparigraha and ahimsa focus on the need for the self to attain wholeness. The theory of karma was introduced with a view to making man responsible. Responsibility never comes without freedom. Only a person who is in tune with truth will be responsible. The very aim of psychoanalysis is to provide a harmonious and tranquil mind which is in tune with reality. Thus, the goal of psychoanalysis and Jain philosophy are similar though they differ in the exposition of their concepts. Thus, there are enough common grounds between these philosophical traditions. To underpin the commonalities of these traditions is the main focus of the present study.

A comparison of these diverse systems of thought which sprang up in different space and time as responses to the call of different cultural environments will invite the
modern readers to note the striking similarities between them in their concerns of human welfare and the central issues which confront humanity. Violence and obsessions of one kind or another characterize the collective and individual consciousness more alarmingly at the present context because of the monistic understanding of issues and reality. These social and individual afflictions can be prevented only by educating people of the relative nature of knowledge, many-sidedness of reality the need to harness the unconscious for the harmonious and balanced growth of the individual and the necessity of inculcating wisdom along with knowledge.

These are the implicit aims of the research and it focuses on these aspects which form the core of the diverse theoretical propositions taken for a comparative study. Secondly, there is a need to reread the ancient philosophical and religious discourses in the light of or in conjunction with the modern theories so as to see not only their current relevance but also to show that the oriental, especially Indian, philosophical traditions are not the containers of obscurantism or exoticism or strange practices but systems of thought which are as vibrant and as discursive as the western metaphysical discourses are. As a result of European colonization and the discursive practices of the west, the European discourses of the knowledge received privileged position undermining the culture and knowledge of the oriental as the inferior other. There is an urgent need to intervene and deconstruct this western construct and to write our way back into history others have written by defining the distinctiveness of other cultures and articulating the relations to dominant traditions of thought and writing.

1.7 **The Scheme of the Study:**

While attesting the importance of intercultural interface, the present study focuses on the commonalities of approach to issues between modern schools of thought and an ancient Indian philosophical thought namely Jainism. To place the key concepts
of Jainism in conjunction with the contemporary theories and to affirm their relevance in the modern context form the core aim of the present research.

Having outlined the topic of research, the scope and justification, a comparative study of these schools of thought is done under the following chapters. In the introduction, a brief outline of the key concepts of Jainism, Postmodernism, Poststructuralism and Psychoanalysis is given. The areas of commonalities between these systems of thought are identified and the significance of the research is underlined and the goals or objectives of the study are highlighted.

The second chapter ‘Anekanta and Postmodernism: Many-sidedness of Reality and Non-absolutism’ deals with the concepts of Anekanta in Jain philosophy and skepticism of Postmodernism to show how we move in a world of radical uncertainty and how there is no absolute truth to arrive it. Anekanta philosophy holds that truth is multifaceted in its very nature. Once has to understand the term anekanta to comprehend its implications. The word anekanta has both aneka i.e. many and anekant i.e. many sides. Anekanta philosophy states that truth is not singular and there are multiple truths. The implication is that one has to understand that whatever one says is only one aspect of the truth which is one of the many truths. Thus anekanta philosophy is a philosophy of non-absolutism and a precursor for the philosophy of ahimsa.

Postmodernism is essentially anti-realist and it refuses to accept the notion of transcendental reality. This is the import of Buddha when he said that one should be a light unto oneself. One’s discretion should decide, in the light of the situation, the rightness or the wrongness of an action. No readymade Philosophy is of use. Postmodernism is suspicious of all meta-narratives like Marxism and capitalism. It does not believe that any ideology or discourse including science can lead us to ultimate reality and become a ‘Grand unified theory’ i.e., a theory of everything.
The chaos theory of modern physics attests to the view that even science fails to offer explanation as to the irregular side of nature. Nietzsche, the father of postmodern philosophy, questioned the traditional belief in a grand theory capable of explaining the entire phenomena. All this show that there is a world of radical uncertainty where everything is relational and differential and nothing like unchanging reality or absolute truth. Thus Jainism and Postmodernism encourage relativism and many-sidedness of reality. Though these two converge in their anti-essentialist stance, Jainism offers a way to attain enlightenment through penance with purity of mind. Thus it differentiates itself from other philosophies. Postmodernism and Anekantavada, by questioning the notion of transcendental reality allow for pluralism and respect for differences. An understanding of these concepts will help one come out of one’s narrow outlook enlarging one’s world view with space for accommodating the other points of view.

The third chapter ‘Syadvada and Deconstruction; Relative Nature of Knowledge and Inadequacy of Language’ focuses on the idea that poststructuralist position and Jain concepts of syadvada subvert the foundations of language in order to show that its seeming meaningfulness dissipates into a play of conflicting indeterminacies. Anekantavada talked about multidimensional nature of truth and hence gave birth to ‘non-absolutism’. What can be derived from the above statement is “if truth is multi-dimensional, its expression also follows suit”. ‘Syat’ means ‘in one respect’. Whatever is said is true in one respect. ‘Syadvada’ is not just a philosophical system but an existential truth. It is understood only when one encounters insoluble problems that stare at the person in his attempt to uncover ‘Truth’.

Syadvad explains the inadequacy of language. One uses language to talk about anything and everything. But language, because of its own limitations, cannot express truth in its entirety. Mahavira understood the limitations of language; structuralism and
post-structuralism also explicate the limitations of language. Structuralism established that language does not have any relationship at all with the world outside or inside and that language communicates not because of its association to the world outside but because of its internal difference. Structuralism has already destroyed the traditional notion that language is related to the outside world. When structuralism had already established the self-regulated and differential nature of language, Derrida broke new grounds by means of his concept of ‘differance’ showing that meaning is endlessly deferred.

Language creates an illusion that one is able to capture reality through language. Inadequacy of our language to express truth led Mahavir to form ‘syadvada’ and ‘sapta bhangi’. Since language cannot explain truth in its fullness, the theory of ‘syadvad’ has been established. An understanding of ‘syadvad’ and ‘deconstruction’ will make a man more conscious of the nature of meaning and its evasiveness. If ‘language’ as such is on no solid ground, then all our knowledge which rests on language will be and should be questioned. Thus both ’Syadvad’ and ‘deconstruction’ will lead a person to a healthy mindset where room for other standpoints and interpretations will be available.

The fourth chapter ‘Theory of Karma, Aparigraha and Ahimsa and Psychoanalysis’ deals with the ways and means by which non-possessive state of consciousness could be developed so as to free human mind from violence, and obsession and achieve total control of one’s mind. The theory of karma was introduced with a view to making man responsible. Responsibility never comes without freedom. A man who is free of all chains is a really responsible person. Responsibility scares many people and they run away from it. By shirking responsibility, they also shirk their freedom. Freedom and responsibility are two sides of the same coin.
Psycho-analysis strongly suggests that unless a man takes rein of his own mind, there is no redemption. Freud said that the greatest tragedy that happened to humanity is that he is not a master in his own house. The very purpose of the theory of karma is to instill responsibility in the minds of people. This is to make them realize that they are the architects of their own destiny. Thus the aims of the theory of karma and the goals of psycho-analysis are identical. The former is philosophical in its exposition and the latter is clothed in scientific terminology.

To establish peace and nonviolence, Aparigraha is of great value. One has to understand the principle of ‘Aparigraha’ deeply to appreciate the relevance of the principle. Aparigraha means non possessiveness. Ego-centricity is the root cause of all problems. ‘Possession’ is good as long as it does not possess the individual. The moment the ‘possession’ possesses the possessor, he loses the capacity to be the master of his possession. To be the master of one’s mind is the goal of psycho-analysis and Jainology.

Psycho-analysis aims to bring ‘awareness’ to the mind as ‘unconsciousness’ is the source of all problems. One has to look at oneself and recognize their past and accept their inadequacies and waywardness. Pain and suffering are inevitable in the path of mental maturity. ‘Where there was id, there shall ego be’ is the goal of analysis and also of Jainology. “Conduct is the essence of knowledge” said Mahavir. Right conduct is possible only when there is right knowledge. False knowledge is the reason for the distressing situations in life. Removing this false knowledge is the first step towards right knowledge. Right knowledge is the first step towards right conduct and right conduct is first step towards creating peaceful and non-violent society.

In conclusion, all the arguments of the previous chapter are summed up and the suggestions of further research are given. The aim of the present research is underlined
by focusing the attention on the need to get right kind of knowledge and awareness so that peaceful co-existence and living are made possible. The present study strongly affirms that the social and personal disasters can be prevented only by educating people of the relative nature of knowledge, many-sidedness of truth, inadequacy of language, the limitations of intellect, the dark continent inside i.e. unconscious and the necessity of accepting one’s responsibility for one’s action and thus understanding the inevitable fact that one is one’s own architect.