SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES

LIBERALISTIC-CUM-HUMANISTIC REVOLUTION THROUGH THE PHILOSOPHISING OF THE THEORY OF DECONSTRUCTION

Mudasir Rahman Najar
Email: mudasirmail92@gmail.com

Abstract: The theory of deconstruction is an evaualtive method that challenges the logic prevalent from the times immemorial across the arts, humanities and other social sciences. This philosophic tendency is very significant in the intellectual development of out times to develop adynamic societ. That means a traditional and conservative social structure has to be be bypassed to crack avenues for innovations in the various walks of life and numerous fields of knowledge. Moreover, the expansive scope of the practice of translation that also enhances intellectual potential of the target language for the maturity of humanity. A kind of change in one's approach against the notion of essentialism towards the observation and understanding of mundane thing and average practices is the soul aim of deconstruction. Regarding the concept of logocentrism, Bradley while quoting Derrida, exposes the unequal and imbalanced analyses and validity of binarie. This raises the arguing against the unjust binaries as Bradley refers to Derrida who says that as writing is considered just a mediation, so are the other ways of communication like speech and other traditionally dominant binaries. This means that the reading process of the theory of deconstruction is happening inside not outside and thereby higlights the indeterminateness of the textual discourse. Here, he talks about the ethical standards of good and evil; and he also talks about the ideological analyses and the discursive study of this serious definition of morality.Therefore, it is understood to a large extent that deconstruction is very significant in the contemporary times; and it carry the power of intellectual transition for the limitless changes across the various structures of human sciences.
KEYWORDS: Language, Discourse, Meaning, Deconstruction, Reality

It has been the paradigm shift from the all traditional approaches to literary practices in the form of the theory of deconstruction. This is, in general, a meithod of evaluating art, literature, and the structures within the other social sciences to highlight the semantic and technical issues that ironically proves opposite to the main though asserted by the textual discourse. It is also a reding strategy that opoosese the western

thought of logocentric approach to all the intellectual practices across the various disciplines of humanities, social siences. So, in order to understand the manin agument of the theory, we need to undratand the key tems related to the theory of deconstruction.

DERRIDA'S career in brief

Born in 1930 in El-Biar, near Algiers, in French colonial Algeria, Derridas returned to metropolitan France on Algerian independence in 1962 like other French people along with their families. Though from a very luxurious family, he as a Jew has suffered from antisemitism and faced discrimination during the World War Two. Algeria was under the control of the Vichy government in France, intesified with Nazi mentality to the extent of brutalising Jews. Suffering exclusion from high school in 1941, Derrida felt sad but there was more intensified horror in the Holocaust. While completing his studies at the Lyc?e from 1943, he has developed keen interest in philosophy.

He studied the Husserl archives at the University of Louvain in Belgium from 1953 to 1954, with the most elevated tradition in the study of Phenomenology and worked on M.A. thesis on Husserl. He stayed at the University of Paris I Sorbonne-Panth?on until 1984 where he was later director of philosophical studies. His fame in the United States goes back to 1966 when he participated in aconference at Johns Hopkins University on Structuralism, presenting what has

since become one of his most widely read papers, 'Structure, sign and play in the discourse of the human sciences'. Nevertheless, it is widely recognized that Derrida's philosophy as put forward in d i f f e r e n t books like Speech and Phenomena (SP) (Derrida 1973 [first published in 1967]), Of Grammatology (OG) (Derrida 1976 [first published in 1967]), Writing and Difference (WD) (Derrida 1978 [first published in 1967]), Margins of Philosophy (MP) (Derrida 1982 [first published in 1972]), Dissemination (D) (Derrida 1981 [first published in 1972]). Hence, it is said that his international reputation was secured by the publication of above first three important and original books. These early successes set him on the road to exceptional fame and influence in philosophy and in other disciplines. When Derrida died in October 2004, the sad event was announced by the office of the President of the Republic of France.

Key Terms of Deconstruction

Nicholas Royle in his book Jacques Derrida under the caption 'Key Ideas' tries to indicate to some essential ideas related to the theory of deconstruction. He further says that there is also a notion of an endless process that from one statement to another satatement.

Of course, we could argue that there is a series of terms that have been closely associated with the name of Derrida: deconstruction, differance, the trace, arche-writing, text, spacing, the supplement, dissemination, undecidability, the

hymen, the pharmakon, iterability and so on. (And so on: where would we stop? And why? Enough here perhaps simply to note that one of his 'key ideas' would be the 'and', the 'and so on' or 'et cetera'. 'And in the beginning, there is the and': see Etc. 282.) But even these 'terms' are not 'terms' in the sense of something ?nal, selfenclosed, teleological ('term' comes from the French terme, a limit, from Latin terminus, a boundary). Each of these peculiarly non-terminal terms is part of what Derrida has called an open 'chain of substitutions' (Pos 14). (Royle, 13-14)

Royle while writind about the basic thought of Derrida's theory, quotes Peggy Kamuf as he (Kamuf) writes : Derrida is 'a thinker without borders, or rather a thinker of the always divisible border, not least the frontiers dividing the world's map into nation-states, or even the natural borders of its continents' (Kamuf 2002, 2). 'The crossing of borders', as Derrida notes in Aporias (1993), always assumes the 'institution' of an 'indivisible line' (A 11). (Royle, 15). This also indicates to the global importance of the theory of deconstruction.

So, in order to contextualise the conceptual parameters, we will have to go for the brief understanding of above-mentioned terms with some other relevant terms as follows:

1) Language: In general terminology, language is a means of communication with the help of written or spoken symbols in the forms of words or phones. By denying the assumption that language conforms to a rational order of some external reality apart from human interpretation of various phenomena, language has been defined by Saussure as the system of binary oppositions in the form of signs broken into signifier and signified that play an interactive role for the generation of ideas and communication of messages.

2. Meaning: We can generally observe that the words in a particular system of signs with the tendency to differ with rest of signs generate meaning. The lexical items of a languageare exercised to have the semantic properties for their users. A framework investigating the dynamics of linguistic change and social coordination in virtue of which the word 'bachelor' has been assigned the function of expressing the lexical concept adult unmarried male would be an example of a foundational theory of word meaning.

3) Epistemology: It is the branch of study about the nature of knowledge in terms of the discovery or creation of knowledge. That means the debate about the validity and justification of knowledge is the main concern. It is usually observed that the branch of epistemology centers on (a) the essence of knowledge-is it created or discoverd (2) Validity and scope of knowledge. (3) Relation of knowledge with concepts like belief, justice, reality and truth.

4) Reality: In everyday usage, it means "the state of things as they actually exist." The term reality, in a

wider sense indicates the whole of which everything is a part, including everything that exists, has existed, or can exist, whether it is observable, comprehensible, or contradictory in regard to various pure sciences, social sciences and philosophies, or any system of perception or analysis.

5) Truth: This is something idealistic that is reality in its ultimate. The main cause of reality as per the metaphysical claims that implicitly point towards an 'extratextual', transcendent reality called truth. Therefore, truth acts as an energy; and governs every human action and and plays a pivotal role in every social relation and ethico-politcal structure that belongs to this material world.

6. Logocentricism or Metaphysics of Presence: As the traditionally accepted term 'logos' that in Greek means, speech, thought, law, or reason is the central principle of language and philosophy. Philosophised by Derrida, Logocentrism asserts the basis for the reason that set foundation of all social and intellectual constructions.

7. Difference: Related to the concept of metaphysics of presence, Derrida uses the term "differance" to describe the origin of presence and absence. Differance is though complicated to explain, is a French verb "deferrer" means both "to defer" and "to differ." This dual presentation of the term is used to demonstrate that the meaning of a linguistic sign is the simultaneous operation of distinction and

temporality. Thus, difference may refer not only to the state or quality of being deferred, but to the state or quality of being different.

8. Trace: Quite relevant to the concept of differance, the idea of trace also is important to mention. Trace is the absent part of the sign's presence and carries a semantic imprint from which a sign differs/ defers. Every present, in order to know itself as present, bears the trace of an absent which defines it. The trace in presenting itself, becomes effaced. Because all signifiers viewed as present in Western thought will necessarily contain traces of other (absent) signifiers. This proves an idea that the signifier can be neither wholly present nor wholly absent.

9. Arche-writing: Related to Ecriture that means writing, the term 'arche-writing' is used by Derrida to describe a form of language which cannot be conceptualized within the 'metaphysics of presence.' Arche-writing is an original form of language which is not derived from speech. It is a form of language which is unhindered by the difference between speech and writing.

10. Supplement: Actually, Derrida takes the term "supplement" from Rousseau, who saw a supplement as "an inessential extra added to something complete in itself." Derrida argues that what is complete in itself cannot be added to, and so a supplement can only occur where there is an originary lack.

11. Hymen: Greek word for skin and membrane the term plays a metaphor forwhere it is difficult ot

differ between inside and outside. That means one cannot say categorically whether some thing or idea is there or not.

13. Pharmakon: This is a paradoxical term that plays between the two opposite terms like poison and cure. This a referent for the ambiguous and and indecisive state of mind or stage of analyses. These are the basic ideas that would help us to understand the main concepts of the theory of deconstruction.

Barry Stocker in 'Derrida's Philosophy' talks about the magnitude of Derrida's philosophy in terms of the subject matter across the various fields of knowledge as in the following lines:

Certainly, though Derrida never tries to engage with answers to standard philosophical questions, it is much easier to think of the earlier language and mind. The later texts tend to say more about core themes in ethics, aesthetics, political and legal philosophy, but these issues are also present in the earlier texts in a context where Derrida is developing themes within metaphysics, knowledge, language and mind, though Derrida never explicitly approached philosophy in such a compartmentalized way. (Stocker, 9).

Moreover, Stocker further tries to set place for Derrida in the world of philosophers and talks of the two groups of philosophers with their tendencies affiliated to them. He says that these two worlds of philosophies namely, ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY that gives (great importance to formal logic, resolve paradoxes, takes natural science as a model, aims at very contemporary debates) and tends to describe and define everything explicitly; whereas CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY that gives importance to (arrive at paradoxes, orientated towards aesthetics and subjective experience, to emphasize the literary qualities and historical context of texts in the history of philosophy) and tends to use indirectness, context and style to describe and define. Though Derrida as per Stocker is not holding any specific position amongst the above two categories, he shares some characteristics of one and some characteristics of the other. In this context, the distinction that Derrida has in philosophy is discussed in by Stocker in his introduction. He says that since Derrida influenced by Husserl who has been affiliated more with analytic philosophy. Thus, Derridean philosophy is inclusive and cannot be categorised to put limits to it scope.

JACQUES DERRIDA By Nicholas Royle

Answering The Question: Why Derrida?

Royle defends Derrida's distinction in interrogating the very foundational issues in philosophy as below:

Literature is in any case, for Derrida, indissociably bound up with questions of politics, democracy and responsibility, religion, nationality and nationalism, identity and law. It is by way of the literary, then, that I hope to provide an account of how,

more than any other contemporary writer or thinker, Jacques Derrida has de?ned 'our time' ...If Derrida is the great thinker of 'our time', it is because he is concerned with a questioning and rethinking of what the term 'epoch' or the phrase 'our time' could or should mean. (Royle, 8)

From the above lines, we mean the philosophy under the garb of deconstruction is very significant in the intellectual development of out times. Because, in order to develop a society, we need to come out from the conservative cocoon of traditional thinking to crack avenues for innovations in the various walks of life and numerous fields of knowledge.

Royle while quoting Derrida himself, also highlights the issues of translation as a motivating factor for the exploration and elevation of human intellect and social magnitude in the following passage:

He (Derrida) himself has stressed the notion of translation as 'transformation'. As he states in an interview in 1968: 'for the notion of translation we would have to substitute a notion of transformation: a regulated transformation of one language by another, of one text by another' (Pos 20). Translations alter languages. Translation as transformation will also be my subject in what follows. In this way I hope to show that Derrida's work - however slowly, humbly, insidiously - is about changing the English language and about what, 'in changing language, change[s] more than language' (TSICL 55). (Royle, 10)

The text referred above indicates to the expansive scope of the practice of translation that also enhances the semantic and intellectual potential of the target language.

Norris in Deconstructlon in a Nutshell , talks about the non-tradional nature of the theory of deconstruction. He says that Derrida has the purpose to unleash the orthodox knots in the field of philosophy and epistemology. It opens the way for the innovations and inventions in the field of human sciences. The following quote is indicating to the unconventional tones of the theory of deconstruction as:

Deconstruction means to be essentially anti-essential and highly unconventional, not to let its eyes wax over at the thought of either unchanging essences or ageless traditions, but rather to advocate an in-ventionalistic incoming, to stay constantly on the lookout for something unforeseeable, something new. Deconstruction is a way of giving things a new twist; it is bent on giving things a new bent, which is what sets the nerves of both essentialists and conventionalists on edge. ... (Norris, 41-43)

The change in one's approach towards the observation and understanding of mundane thing and average practices is the soul of deconstruction. Hence, the stand against the notion of essentialism is a way to transition from good to better and so on.

Norris at other occasion under the caption Deconstruction Is

Serious Business highlights the basic characteristic of the theory in terms of its tendency to deconstruct irrespective of temporal periods. That means it has to deal with from the oldest like Plato, Aristottle to the most contemporary like Kant, Hegel and others as , 'In the "Roundtable," Derrida reaffirms his love of the great tradition of Greek philosophy and of Plato and Aristotle in particular. (Norris, 99-102). This emnpahsisnes on the origin of deconstructive elements in the literary practices before the actual deconstruction has happened.

Arthur Bradly in Derrida's Of Grammatology initially refers to the tittle of the book Of Grammatology, as he says that "grammatology' quite literally means 'writing talk' (gramme-logy) and this somewhat paradoxical idea of speaking about writing is, we will see later on, very revealing (Bradle, 5).' He further highlights the core issue of deconstruction that, he believes, lies in the understanding of the thoughts Rousseau, Sassure and Levi Strauss. He further says that beyond the charges of 'obscurantism', we can say that deconstruction is not a theory in traditional sense with its specific rules but an intellectual process that occurs within the structure of text. These are the lines with which Bradley express this idea about the theory of deconstruction: For Derrida, what has become known as 'deconstruction' is not a 'theory' in the traditional sense of a general set of rules that can be applied to particular cases, but rather something that always takes place within, and cannot be separated from, the singular texts he is reading. (Bradle, 3-4). Thus, the theory of deconstruction is an event that takes place in the process of reading of any particular text to highlight the tendincies against the set themes and arguments.

Regarding the concept of logocentrism, Bradley while quoting Derrida, exposes the unequal and imbalanced analyses and validity of binaries wherein one is illogically given the prominence over the other as is shown in the below passage:

In Derrida's view, the 'metaphysics of presence' historically operates by erecting a series of binary oppositions between concepts, values or terms where, in each case, one concept is identi?ed as the bearer of presence itself whereas the other is identi?ed with the falling away, or loss of, that presence: the transcendental is privileged as more 'present' than the empirical, the ideal is championed over the material, the soul over the body, the masculine over the feminine and so on ad in?nitum. (Bradle, 6-7).

The above quote indicates to the the unjust binaries that has been justified by the consolidation of traditional thought patterns. This also limits the ways to critical thinking to develop the innovative practices in our society.

Bradley moreover elucidates an example with regard to the issue of binary, say, speech and writing. He

proves it that witing cannot be demeaned with regard to speech, because writing has its own significane in the representation of speech. So, it is neve just an extension of speech. The following quote explains the unust discrimination between the two terms:

To raise what will be the single largest, controversial and far-reaching argument in the Grammatology, Derrida challenges the logocentric attempt to champion speech over writing by arguing that all language - whether spoken or written - might be described as 'writing': writing is another name for language itself. □For Derrida, as we will see, what this claim actually means is that all language is characterised by that quality of mediation that the logocentric tradition historically attributes to 'writing' alone. If the logocentric account of writing tends to presume that writing comes on to the scene in order to ?lter the pure expression of speech, Derrida will suggest that this state of mediation is the original condition of all language including the - supposedly ideal - spoken word. (Bradley, 8-9)

The above text arguing against the unjust binaries, Bradley refers to Derrida who says that as writing is considered just a mediation so are the other ways of communication like speech. This means that the reading process of the theory of deconstruction is happening inside not outside and thereby higlights the indeterminateness of the textual discourse.

In WRITING AND DIFFERENCE, Derrida in his seminal and most famous essay, Structure, Sign and Play in The Discourse of The Human Sciences begins with the quote from Montaigne in the the from of epigraph, We need to interpret interpretations more than to interpret things. (Montaigne). Thereafter, he talks about the inauguration of an 'event' a phemomenon that has set history against the foundation of wetern logocentrism i.e. the grand store of logic that structurlise the all constructs in the world. The following quote describes the process in this way:

Perhaps something has occurred in the history of the concept of structure that could be called an "event," if this loaded word did not entail a meaning which it is precisely the function of structural-or structuralist-thought to reduce or to suspect. Let us speak of an "event," nevertheless, and let us use quotation marks to serve as a precaution. (Derrida, 351).

That means there is times immemorial downwards, a progress in the consolidation of a transcendental centre spread over the numerous fields of knowledge including tradition, culture, ethics, aesthetics, human sciences and pure sciences. It is this cetre that now carry the power to organise and execute the fuctions of structure and restrains the move beyond the set structure. About the nature of centre, Derrida writes as, 'The center is at

the center of the totality, and yet, since the center does not belong to the totality (is not part of the totality), the totality has its center elsewhere. The center is not the center. The concept of centered structure although it represents coherence itself, the condition of the episteme as philosophy or science- is contradictorily coherent. (Derrida, 352). This peculiarity of the existence of 'center' proves its vulnerable and impermanent state yet the most pivotal and dominant hold on the movements of structure. He further says that the supposed centre in the traditional intellectual construction of in varius human sciences is a;ways vulnerable to other temporary cnetres. So in the structures of various fields, a centre , must be thought of as a series of substitutions of center for center, as a linked chain of determinations of the center. (Derrida, 353). The impermanence of centre is also proved with the state that the center can be replaced by another other centre and the new center is equally vulnerable to the other centres, so on and so forth.

Derrida also says that since the western history about the presence of a centre is metaphysical and has been repeatedly asserted. This centre no doubt plays a role but always remains outside the system. And it has been observed that across the timescale this power of this centre has been in shifting mechanism in terms of its substitutions and replacements. Besides, the system of communication that has been used in the past centuries is indispensable in the deconstructive process. Because, there are no alternative systems available other than the general language as has been confessed by Derrida himself. This how the idea has been expressed as follows:

There is no sense in doing without the concepts of metaphysics in order to shake metaphysics. We have no language-no syntax and no lexicon- which is foreign to this history; we can pronounce not a single destructive proposition which has not already had to slip into the form, the logic, and the implicit postulations of precisely what it seeks to contest. (Derrida, 354)

Since the process of deconstruction has to take place within the structure of any literary text, the traditional language becomes a must for the rebuttal to the unjust intellectual claims based on the accidental discourses.

Derrida further gives us two modes of interpretation, as one moves towards the traditional logic and the other moves beyond the conservative mode of interpretation bound to be under the canons of western logocentrism. The way, these two interpretations are illustrated is as in the following passage:

There are thus two interpretations of interpretation, of structure, of sign, of play. The one seeks to decipher, dreams of deciphering a truth or an origin which escapes play and the order of the sign, and which lives the necessity of interpretation as an exile. The other,

which is no longer turned toward the origin, a?rms play and tries to pass beyond man and humanism, the name of man being the name of that being who, throughout the history of metaphysics or of ontotheology-in other words, throughout his entire history-has dreamed of full presence, the reassuring foundation, the origin and the end of play. The second interpretation of interpretation, to which Nietzsche pointed the way, does not seek in ethnography, as L?vi-Strauss does, the "inspiration of a new humanism" (again citing the "Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss"). (Derrida, 369-70)

He further explains that in the first interpretation there is no mature and determined choice; and in the second interpretation, there is the process of moving beyond the tradition of conservative understanding of the subject matter.

Therefore, it is evident that there is no fixed centre and the shifting of this centre to margin and vice versa is a continuous process.

Christopher Norris in Fundamental Themes and Concepts in Derrida's Thought under the caption, Truth and Writing, talks about the relation of truth with writing. He says that the reading is a process and under this process, there is always the dialectics of proving and disproving the existence of truth across the structure of text. The same idea is illustrated by Paul de Man in the below quote:

To be sure, de Man continues, "[t]his does not mean that there can be a true reading," in the sense of a definitive interpretation or work of textual-conceptual exegesis that would obviate the need - or exclude the possibility - of further reading and debate. Rather it is to say that "no reading is conceivable in which the question of its truth or falsehood is not primarily involved" (ibid.). It seems to me that the idea of reading as an "argument" - an argument sustained in, by, and through the practice of textual analysis - is one that takes us to the philosophic heart of Derrida's work. (companion to Derrida, Norris 34)

The text referred above indicates to the the process of reading not simply a narrating or dictating but it is an argumentative phenomenon and a process of developing a sort thesis.

Under the caption, The Deconstruction of the Sign, Derrida talks about the instability of meaning vis a vis the relationship between signifier and signified. As Sassue says that there is always a relationship between the signifier (the written or spoken word) and the signified (the concept or the thing), Derrida challenges this notion of linguistics and says that there is chain of transfers from one signifier to another without reaching to the final signified or the ultimate or definite meaning. He elaborates this idea in the following quote:

For Derrida, every signier relates to other signiers that surround it in space and time and so we can never reach a pure thought or concept - a signi?ed - that exists in and of itself

independently of all signiers: what is supposedly beyond language is plunged back into language. If we take a very simple example of this, it becomes much clearer: every time we look up a word in the dictionary - 'love', for example - what we and is not the meaning of that word but merely other words that act as synonyms for it ('love' means 'adoration' or 'desire') or even antonyms ('love' means the opposite of 'hate'). Just as every time we try to end the meaning of a word in a dictionary we are referred to other words, Derrida argues, so every time we try to establish the signied of a signier we are led to other signiers. Now, this state of affairs, where every signier refers to other signiers, forces us to consider exactly what we mean by the term 'signied', in the frst place. The thing that Saussure persists in calling a 'signied' idea or concept must - according to the strict logic of his own theory - be merely just another signier that is no more privileged than any other within the system.

Thus, the meaning is not essential to words but it is a mutual exchange of relationships that determine the state of their meaning.

1. Poststructuralist Difference

As we know that there is a system of differences in terms of signs and each sign is divided into signifier and signified. Derrida in this context use the term 'difference' that in French means both difference from other with regard to state or location; and defference with regard to temporality. This means in other words that meaning is generated in the process of difference from other signs and at the same time the meaning is deffered to other signs continuously. This idea has been clarified in the below mentioned passage:

This archi-difference would be neither the difference within a system nor the difference between or among systems. Instead, diff?rance would refer to the movement or marking out of differences that would then allow for something like a relatively stable time and space. Thus difference would not be the difference between spatial points, nor the difference between two moments in time (such as a before and after), for these differences are secondary to an ungrounded diff?rance that cannot be located in a temporal origin or event within the world (such as language or culture): "it is this constitution of the present as an 'originary' and irreducibly nonsimple (and therefore, strictu sensu nonoriginary) synthesis of marks, or traces of retentions and protentions... that I propose to call... differance. Which (is) (simultaneously) spacing (and) temporalization" (MP, 13). (Claire Colebrook, 61-62)

This idea of difference and deference across the vast domain of words with their meanings prepares a labrynth of meanings and the concepts thereof.

Bradley in his book Of Grammatology under the caption, The Deconstruction of Metaphysics, mentions that the main debate for

deconstructing the transcendental signified begins with comparison of signifier and signified where signified was found lacking to justify the definite meaning. This chain goes on to debate between soul and body; ideal and material, and the chain of binary goes on.

Just as the idea of an originary trace enables us to question the supposed 'presence' of the signi?ed, in other words, so it also contains the seeds of a powerful critique of the presence of other privileged concepts like the soul, the ideal and the transcendental: what appears to be a pure, unmediated and present term can, in each case, be shown to acquire its de?nition from the traces of other elements which are, at least apparently, absent. (Bradley, 41-73)

With this, Derrida challenges the transcendental detrminancy in the world of western logocentrism across the structures of various arts, literatures and other social sciences.

Bradley further under the caption, There is No Outside-text talks about this famous term in an ambiguous way. He says that Derrida is not categorically claiming that nothing is beyong text, but he says that the process of textuality is largely representing the reality of the outside world. He further gives the example of Roussoue and his texts and claims that it is more in his texts tha the person is represented and is known than in hie real life. The following quote in this regard explains the idea:

In summary, then, Derrida's claim that 'il n'y a pas de hors-texte' is neither an attempt to assert that language is the only reality nor to deny the existence of reality per se but rather to stress the impossibility of gaining access to any pure or immediate presence that exists wholly independently of the processes of dierence and deferral: Rousseau was never purely or simply 'there' in the ?rst place. (Bradley, 114)

This means that language, not doubt, helps to represent reality and even asserts the notion of reality. Besides, from the deconstructive vision, even being the coherent and systematic in its structures, language cannot achieve the claims of definite movements towards reality.

Kelly Oliver in The "Slow and Differentiated" Machinations of Deconstructive Ethics talks about the binary oppositions and the differnces that exist between them. He also indicates to the internsion of Derrida as in the following quote:

In his first posthumously published book, The Animal That Therefore I Am, Derrida describes his approach as a "philosophy of limits." There, he says that he is not trying to abolish the limits between these various oppositions; rather he is attempting to multiply limits and thereby acknowledges more differences. In other words, deconstruction is machinations of deconstructive ethics not about showing how good and evil, mind and body, or man and animal are the same. Rather, Derrida argues that it is about showing how these oppositions are too simplistic and

cover up complicated and fluid differences within the categories. (Kelly Oliver, 106-7).

With this, Derrida wants to go beyond the blindfolded attitude to develop a space for the refinements in the strict and compartmentalised thinking in our society.

Besides, there is another issue raised by Derrida regarding the strict binary oppositions thnat have controlled human actions. Here, he talks about the ethical standards of good and evil; and he also talks about the ideological analyses and the discursive study of this serious definition of morality. The below mentioned quoute has attempted to highlight this issue:

If morality divides the world into Good and Evil, or Natural and Perverse, then hyperbolic ethics demands that we constantly question those binary oppositions and our own investments in them. Do we make such distinctions in order to foster nourishing and healthful relationships or do we divide the world in order to conquer it and take others as trophies (cf. Oliver 2007)? In terms more familiar to recent discussions in ethics we might ask: Do we circumscribe differences to justify hierarchies and domination or to respect them and acknowledge their value? More Derridean questions are: How can we tell the difference? And, who is this we anyhow? (companion to Derrida Oliver, 121)

Once again the quote referred above is wintess to the notion that the delibrate and unjust differnces that has divided the world on the basis of morality is leadind people to a disasterous state.

Robert in PARODY AND DECONSTRUCTION under the caption Linking Parody and Deconstruction, talks about the similarity between parody aand deconstruction. He says that deconstruction like parody takes the subject matter from the very source it deconstructs. That means it adapts the same subject matter to get the semantic cum linguistic characteristics to turn aginst and to subvert the discourse that text is trying to project. He mentions the passage below to assert the link between the two as:

It is clear that deconstruction, especially as Derrida practices it, nests in the structure of the texts and ideas it criticizes, as a cuckoo infiltrate and takes over the nests of other birds. It operates from inside the arguments of metaphysical texts and systems such as structuralism and phenomenology, showing how they cannot totalize the visions they proclaim, and precisely where they double and collapse. It is not primary thought, always secondary, always "borrowing all the strategic and economic resources of subversion from the old structure." And this is precisely what parody does too. It is preeminently a genre-bricoleur, living off the energies and inadequacies of previous writings, "borrowing them structurally" and transforming them with a critical eye... (Robert 681-83)

This means that in order to prove

the indefinite nature of the argument, one has to substantiate the argument from the traditional discourse.

Norris under the caption Community Without Community talks about the democratic set up that he thinks is very congenial to the general diffirences. He further puts forth the term 'community'in negative sense and thinks it as a threat to the social integration. He says that there are adverse effects of community in terms of social tensions and communal wars. In the below mentioned quote, this idea is more forcefully asserted as:

Communitarianism, on the other hand, assumes some sort of deep truth in the tradition upon which the individual draws as long as he remains tapped into its flow; whereas for Derrida one must watch out for the ways tradition and community become excuses for conservativism, for the exclusion of the incoming of the other, and hence constitute "as much threat as promise," as much a trap as a tap. (Norris 106-109).

Norris under the tittle Identity Without Identity elucidated the argument against the essentialism of identity. He says that there is no 'homogenous' state of identity and we should not confuse ourselves with compartmentalised state of identity. He while quoting Derrida tries to elaborate on this topic in the following passage:

☐ Indeed, what better example of that than Derrida himself, who addresses the question of European identity as someone who is "not quite European by birth," that is, as someone from the "other shore," a Levinasian image for the "other" which is literally true of Derrida, who was born in Algeria, on the southern Mediterranean coast. A French-speaking Algerian Jew whose family had emigrated from Spain in the last century, Derrida says of himself that he has become, with the years, an "over-acculturated, over-colonized European hybrid" (AC 13/0H 7). He is European without quite being European, French without being French, Jewish without being Jewish, Algerian without being Algerian (and even a little bit American) ... (Norris, 113-115)

The above quote negates the essentialism of identity and claim that there is a kind of hybrid identity formation that neutralises conservative sense of identity.

Norris in the caption, Justice, If Such a Thing Exists mentions the characteristics of justice different from other laws. He calls justice an 'impulse' that is to be fulfilled immediately without anyn preconditions. He further asserts that justice is to be deliverd whatever the condtions exist there in the society. The is further determined with following quote as 'Justice cannot wait for all the facts to come in, which they never do. Justice cannot wait for the System to be completed, as Johannes Climacus might have said, which is supposed to happen soon, the final results being expected in a week or two.' (Norris, 136-138).

This means that justice is a natural phenomenon that has to be delivered in a proper way without giving the unnecessary excuses to delay it.

Theological Determinism is very pivotal in the making of social structure in terms of peaceful relations or the war like situations. But here it is more the violence and inhumane practices that are being justified under the religious precepts. Norris while mentioning the name of Derrida, unveals the horrible interpretation of religious war mongering as is quoted in the following:

The messianisms have all the makings of a catastrophe, that is, of war. This they unfailingly provoke, with merciless regularity, under one of the most grotesque and terrifying names we know, that of a "holy war," which means, alas, killing the children of God in the name of God, who too often really are child/ren, killing the innocent in the name of peace and justice, killing in the name of the promise. Today, Derrida says, the war waged by these messianisms over the "appropriation of Jerusalem" has become a world war (SdM lOl/SoM 58). Nor are the philosophical messianisms innocent of this blood. ... (Norris, 156-61).

There is a strong evidence that war and religion has been manipulated to instigate the inhuman practices and the extreme violence.

Contrary to his tradtional messianism, there is another idea of messianism that Royle claims is 'a messianism without religion, even a messianic without messianism' (SM 59). This means that there is a sort of commitment for the human development without the religious dogmatism and the 'promise' for the intellectual and amotional emancipation.

Bialasiewicz and Minca in Beyond Europes 'old' and 'new' talk about the transitional space for Europe to grow beyond the trivial divides and conservative fragments. This would also help the great ideas of Europe to get diffused across the globe.

Important questions were also raised, however, not only about the European attempt at self-definition, but also about Europe's place in the world: Habermas and Derrida argued, for instance, that Europe could only define itself 'internally' by defining a 'European project', a 'European model' that transcended its boundaries: a cosmopolitical order based on the recognition and protection of certain basic rights and the principles of international law [. . .] being European should also mean rejecting certain practices, certain violations wherever they occur. (2003, 44-5; emphasis in original)... (Bialasiewicz and Minca 370)

Bialasiewicz and Minca further extends the discussion by referring to Umbrto Eco's idea of translation as a step further for the progression in tems of socio cultural and human development. They quote him to discover some qualitative attributes of translation as the text follows:

Umberto Eco (1993) has long argued that the one and only 'true' language of Europe is translation.

Here, we would like to extend Eco's argument, adopting the notion of translation as a (geo)political paradigm: as a complex field of possibilities that requires an endless process of mediation and interpretation; that requires the capacity of living with always-temporary solutions, in the acknowledgement that the search for definitive answers is not only illusory but also inherently violent. ...As we have already argued, the ideal of peace and the necessity of co-existence have shaped the European project from its very early days. Translation, as a metaphor of mediation and co-existence between diverse peoples and cultures, can yet prove Europe's most original - and important - contribution. (Bialasiewicz and Minca 371)

Royle further under the caption, BE FREE writes in rhetorical terms about the term 'be free' in terms of subordination. That means the notion of so-called freedom is being diffused in imperative manner and the spirit of 'being free' is lost. This idea is explained with following quote:

As an order, 'be free' tells you to be what you cannot be except in obeying this order: to obey the order to 'be free' is not to be free. You are free to do anything as long as you accept that you are not free to disobey what I am hereby ordering you. Come on, be free. But is it an order, in fact? Who is the 'I' here? And who is the reader or addressee of this piece of graf?ti transplanted from an imaginary wall on to the page in front of you? In grammatical

terms we could describe the words 'be free' as an imperative. ...(Royle, 31)

There must be a feel of 'being free' that is one must comprehend the sort of conditioning from which he got freedom and should feel the difference of being free. This should also be experienced in terms of free will both physical and psychological cum intellectual. The state of matter that Role indicates by quoting from Of Grammatology that 'Derrida asserts: '[logocentrism] has always placed in parentheses, suspended, and suppressed for essential reasons, all free re?ection on the origin and status of writing' (OG 43). In doing so, he opens up the question of what such 'free re?ection' might look like. Will we ever be up to reading these words, 'be free'? (MO 47) (Royle, 33).'

Royle in A New Enlightenment extends the indispensable state of 'being free' by commenting on its democratic role in the socio-political structure that inturn gives scope to intellectual flights in the various institutions. This idea has been futher elaborated in the below quote:

He (Derrida) is committed to what he has called a new enlightenment, one that does not forget the European Enlightenment or Aufkl?rung associated with the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), but that nevertheless marks itself out differently, one that af?rms a different step or gait, a different movement, process or 'bearing' (d?marche is Derrida's word here: see AT 60). There is

something apocalyptic about Derrida's writings, about the 'tone' of his work as well as the arguments. More particularly, Derrida's apocalypticism aims at showing up a derailment that has always already taken place in the structure of so-called apocalyptic discourse. ...(AT 51) (Royle)

Therefore, it is understood to a large extent that deconstruction is very significant in the contemporary times; and it carry the power of intellectual transition for the limitless changes across the various structures of human sciences. This has been textually indicated by Kates under the caption The Success of Deconstruction in the below mentioned quote as follows:

From ?rst to last, Derrida, then, has seen his work in this way: Derrida, by his own testimony, engages with the unthought of philosophy, but this ultimately in order to carry on thought and its responsibility, not abandon it altogether. His is a vital renovation of thought, a renewed and transformed commitment to the living responsibility that philosophy alone has previously instantiated-and this indeed at a time in the present day when the possibility of maintaining or ful?lling such a commitment has appeared most in doubt. These, I maintain, are the

real stakes of Derrida's endeavor. (Kates, 1-5).

Therefore, the theory of deconstruction in the contemporary times is indispensably crucial and asserts on the the power of intellectual transition across the stagnant state of thinking.

Finally, we have come to the conclusion that the theory of deconstruction is a revolutionary theory that has challenged the age-old set discourses especially in human sciences. This shift has also opened the numerous opportunites for the new paths to be explored in the various walks of life and numberless fields of knowledge. That means a traditional and conservative social structure has to be be bypassed to crack avenues for innovations in the various walks of life and numerous fields of knowledge. A kind of change in one's approach against the notion of essentialism towards the observation and understanding of mundane thing and average practices is the soul aim of deconstruction. Referring to Derrida, Bradley emphasises to discover impartial and unjust state of binaries. This means that the reading process of the theory of deconstruction is happening inside not outside and thereby higlights the indeterminateness of the textual discourse.

References:

Bradley, Arthur. Derrida's Of Grammatology. An Edinburgh Philosophical Guide. Edinburgh University Press. © Arthur Bradley, 2008. BOOK

Derrida, Jacques. Writing and Difference. Translated by Alan Bass. Taylor & Francis Reprinted, British Library. 2005. BOOK

Direk, Zeynep. Leonard Lawlor. A Companion to Derrida. Editors, 2014, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. BOOK

Foucault, Michel. The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. Pantheon Books, New York. 1972. BOOK

John D. Caputo. Editor. Deconstructlon in a Nutshell, Conversation with Jacques Derrida. Fordham University Press New York 1997. BOOK

Kates, Joshua. Essential History Jacques Derrida and the Development of Deconstruction. Northwestern University Press Evanston, Illinois, 2005. BOOK

Nicholas Royle. Jacques Derrida. Routledge. 2003. BOOK

Norris, Christopher. Deconstruction: Theory and Practice. Edition. 3. Routledge. 2002. BOOK

Stocker, Barry. Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Derrida on Deconstruction. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2006. BOOK

Bialasiewics Lluiza, Claudio Minca. "Old Europe, new Europe: for geopolitics of translation." ResearchGate. Area (2005) 37.4, 365-372. Blackwell Publishing, Ltd. School of Geography, Politics and Sociology, University of Newcastle. http://www.researchgate.net. PAPER

Phiddian, Robert. "Are Parody and Deconstruction Secretly the Same Thing?" New Literary History, vol.28, no.4, pp. 673-696. 1997. Archived at Flinders University: dspace.flinders.edu.au. PAPER